

How to Cite:

Syafruddin, S., Thaba, A., Rahim, A. R., Munirah, M., & Syahrudin, S. (2021). Indonesian people's sarcasm culture: an ethnolinguistic research. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 160-179. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1150>

Indonesian People's Sarcasm Culture: An Ethnolinguistic Research

Syafruddin

Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia, Indonesia

Aziz Thaba

Lembaga Swadaya Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan Matutu, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

Abdul Rahman Rahim

Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Munirah

Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Syahrudin

Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract--This research investigates the semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic aspects of the culture of Indonesian sarcasm, especially East Indonesia, namely South Sulawesi with an ethnolinguistic framework. Researchers collect sarcasm utterances and study the semantic aspects. Furthermore, the speech is used in a social experiment to obtain pragmatic data. Social experiments are carried out in two situations, namely the situation of friendship (close) and the situation free (situations not knowing each other). The utterance of sarcasm for Indonesians is a culture for expressing thoughts and feelings towards a particular problem, event, situation, or object (generally human). Indonesians use sarcasm in various emotional situations such as anger, disappointment, regret, even in joking situations. Semantically, Indonesian sarcasm has bad, insulting, or immoral meanings that can intimidate even hurt the feelings of others. So, pragmatically the use of sarcasm can lead to antipathy and even conflict. Self-control is required to respond to sarcasm.

Keywords---ethnolinguistics, Indonesian culture, language function, linguistic, pragmatic data, sarcasm, semantic aspects, sociolinguistic.

Introduction

This research was carried out based on the researchers' concern about the presence of foreign tourists in Indonesia, particularly the South Sulawesi Province. Some of the foreign tourists in Indonesia are victims of residents who are not responsible for teaching the form of speech sarcasm without giving knowledge about the meaning, function, and impact of the speech. Because of not understanding the meaning, function, and impact of the speech, not a few among foreign tourists get problems such as antipathy, even conflict from residents for using the speech sarcasm freely. The irresponsible actions of these residents are not commendable. Therefore, this study is part of the moral responsibility of researchers to educate foreign tourists about the culture of Indonesian sarcasm that cannot be used freely, with the hope that no more foreign tourists will receive similar abuse.

In this article, we investigate the semantic and pragmatic aspects of speech sarcasm using an ethnolinguistic framework. At first, we identified various sarcasm utterances used in the community and collected them into findings data. Next, the data is analyzed to find its semantic meaning. After the semantic meaning is known, the sarcasm speech is used in a social experiment to obtain a pragmatic picture. The communication situation in the social experiment was designed as naturally as possible without being known by the people who were made as respondents.

The composition of this article is as follows; the first part is specifically for a description of the initial problem that forms the background of the study. The second part is specifically for the literature review on sarcasm whose emphasis is on the function of language, semantics, and pragmatics. The research question follows the background and literature review, then precedes the participant, material, and data analysis. The results and discussion are presented next. The final part is the conclusion in closing.

Research on sarcasm

In Indonesia, research on sarcasm has often been found, ranging from sarcasm to literary works, mass media, social media, to the immediate environment of society. The diversity of research on sarcasm certainly results in diverse and interesting results, but there are still gaps in the results of each study. Some research on sarcasm in literary works such as; [Apriyanto \(2011\)](#) examines the existence of sarcasm and mixed code in a film. The stylistic and pragmatic approaches are used as a basic reference for finding sarcasm and code-mixing. [Dinari \(2015\)](#) examines the types and markers of sarcasm in a literary work in the form of a novel. The stylistic and semiotic approach is used as a basic reference to find the types and markers of sarcasm. [Afrinda \(2016\)](#) examines the element of sarcasm in the lyrics of contemporary dangdut songs (2000s) using a semantic approach. [Widiastuti \(2016\)](#) examines the style of sarcasm in a romance using a stylistic approach. [Hartavi et al. \(2018\)](#) examine the position and role of sarcasm in a literary work to be used as a basis in character education in schools. [Lailiyah et al. \(2019\)](#) examine the markers and utterances of sarcasm in literary works using a semantic, semiotic, and stylistic approach. [Cahyo et al. \(2020\)](#) examine

the use of sarcasm in the lyrics of a song that tells the story of communism. The study uses a semantic and stylistic approach.

Some research on sarcasm in the mass media such as; [Mahmudah \(2012\)](#) examines the use of sarcasm as a news headline in national newspapers. The research uses a linguistic approach, especially semantics, pragmatics, and stylistics. [Solekah \(2013\)](#) examines the use of sarcasm in the criminal news section of a national newspaper by utilizing a linguistic approach. [Fertsu \(2014\)](#) examines the contents of a national television program to find out the use of utterances of sarcasm. This research uses a semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic approach. [Permatasari \(2014\)](#) examines the use of sarcasm in a criminal section of a local newspaper using a semantic approach. [Muhsyanur \(2015\)](#) do some news headlines in a local newspaper to find the use of sarcasm. The study was conducted using a semantic approach. [Irfariati \(2017\)](#) examines the use of sarcasm in the comments column of an online news report about a national political figure. Researchers use sentiment analysis to determine the use of sarcasm in the comments column.

Furthermore, several studies on the use of sarcasm on social media have been conducted by [Resvitayani \(2010\)](#); [Lunando & Purwarianti \(2013\)](#); [Amir et al. \(2016\)](#); [Barat \(2018\)](#); [Hardiati \(2018\)](#); [Arridho \(2019\)](#); [Christina \(2019\)](#); [Muhammad \(2019\)](#); [Kamaliyah \(2020\)](#); [Sukmono \(2020\)](#). The studies involved several social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, Line, MiChat, Telegram, to Youtube. These studies have a variety of objectives, ranging from identifying various forms, functions, and markers of sarcasm in social media. The study approach used in this research is linguistics, studying aspects of semantics, semiotics, pragmatics, to aspects of language style or stylistics.

After seeing various sarcasm studies in Indonesia, no one has dared to say that sarcasm in their research findings is Indonesian culture. They tend to attribute sarcasm to the findings only as a common symptom of language use. It is this gap that provides an opportunity for researchers to study sarcasm utterances that are often used by the Indonesian people, especially in South Sulawesi with ethnolinguistic reviews. This is intended as an effort to prove that sarcasm is an Indonesian-language culture. Because researchers believe that accustomed behavior shapes culture.

Furthermore, at the international level too, studies of the language of sarcasm are also popularly carried out, both sarcasm on social media, mass media, and on the public environment. [Bamman & Smith \(2015\)](#); [Rajadesingan et al. \(2015\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2015\)](#); [Sulis et al. \(2016\)](#); [Saha et al. \(2017\)](#) conduct sarcasm analysis on the Twitter social media platform by reviewing semantic, pragmatic, and psychological aspects. Some studies also carried out the design of the identification model of sarcasm with sentiment analysis such as [Justo et al. \(2014\)](#); [Joshi et al. \(2015\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2015\)](#); [Bharti et al. \(2016\)](#); [Joshi et al. \(2017\)](#); [Ludlow et al. \(2017\)](#); [Ravi & Ravi \(2017\)](#); [Saha et al. \(2017\)](#). Several other studies also analyzed the impact of the use of language sarcasm on adult psychology such as [Creusere \(1999\)](#); [Uchiyama et al. \(2006; 2012\)](#); [Fournier et al. \(2008\)](#); [Bohrnv et al. \(2012\)](#); [Shany-Ur et al. \(2012\)](#); [Kim \(2014\)](#); [Matsui et al.](#)

(2016); Jakobson et al. (2018); Morou et al. (2018); Heintz & Ruch (2019); Pomaredav et al. (2019); Zhu & Wang (2020).

Language, individuals, and society

When we see people who are angry, often we will find the use of language that is rude, disrespectful, or even hurt feelings, then we will say to ourselves or others that it is natural because the person is angry, so language can be interpreted as a reflection of the condition of others (Clark, 1996; Miller & Johnson-Laird, 1976; Thomason, 2001). Language functions as a tool to express thoughts and feelings (Miller & Johnson-Laird, 1976; Tomasello, 2009a, 2009b; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). For that, we can understand the intentions and feelings of someone from the language they use. Practically speaking, language functions as an interaction tool that is realized through communication activities (Allen, 1995; Baker, 1992; Chomsky, 2006; Matras, 2009). Language is also interpreted as a convention of meaningful sound signal systems as a marker of human dependence, creativity, and culture (Aitchison, 2012; Kramsch & Widdowson, 1998). Language convention is a process of understanding that makes language accepted and used in a certain group. Language is a universal and unique product (Allen, 1995; Douglas, 2014; Pinker, 2003c, 2003b, 2003a). It is said to be a universal product meaning that language is created and used by all humans in the world, whereas unique means that language stands on one particular identity marker that makes one language different from other languages (McNamara, 2000; Newmeyer, 2000; Tiersma, 1999; Jain et al., 2020; Jorgensen, 1996).

In sociolinguistic studies, language is associated with the existence of society (Blommaert, 2007a, 2007c, 2007b, 2010; Kim, 2014; Kunneman et al., 2015). First, tradition, culture, or habits in a social group organize language with certain social goals. In this case, language is designed to meet the goals and needs of human life. The language user will modify speech to achieve the expected goals (Campbell-Kibler, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; Campbell-Kibler, 2010; Schiffrin, 1996). The speakers' habit of organizing this kind of language shapes the culture in society (Steyerl, 2006). Second, social norms or values that apply in society affect and shape the linguistic behavior of the community. Social norms or values that apply in certain social groups provide knowledge about the limits of good and bad, or things that are prohibited and allowed. Knowledge of these values and norms is what directs people's behavior in the language (Campbell-Kibler, 2009; Schiffrin, 1996). Third, language variations mark the social framework of the speaker (Spolsky, 1998). In sociology, the social framework is characterized by the division of social classes of society both horizontally (differentiation) and vertically (stratification).

The social class is then used as the basis for distinguishing language behavior (Meyerhoff, 2018; Wardhaugh, 2011). For example, the language behavior of people with low-class (poor) economies will differ in language behavior from those of high-class (rich) economies. Fourth, the use of linguistic resources for political purposes. A language is a unit of meaningful sound whose function is to influence the mind, feelings, and even regulate the work of others. That way, a person can achieve his political goals by using language as a means of political provocation and propaganda (Beard, 2000; Joseph, 2006; Lasswell, 1965; Putrayasa, 2021).

Fifth, examine the social aspects of bilingualism. Bilingualism is a symptom of language use due to contact with different languages (Appel & Muysken, 2005; Matras, 2009; Thomason, 2001). Sociolinguistics highlights all aspects of social society (Blommaert, 2010; Figueroa, 2014; Djumabaeva & Kengboyeva, 2021). The flow of sociolinguistics is possible from social problems which are then associated with language, or vice versa from language associated with social problems (Eades, 2010; Mesthrie, 2011).

Sarcasm, semantics and pragmatics

In stylistic studies, sarcasm is a type of language used to insinuate or hurt the feelings of others directly using rude or disrespectful words (Bradford, 1997; Verdonk, 2002; Wales, 2014; McDonald & Pearce, 1996; Taylor, 2015). It is said that this style of language is the coarse allusive form of mastery compared to several other allusive forms such as satire, irony, cynicism, and innuendo (Nurgiantoro, 2018; Wicaksono, 2017). As the definition of sarcasm, the semantics associated with the meaning of language that can offend or hurt the feelings of others (Afrinda, 2016; Kanzunnudin & Kastatria, 2012). Semantics is a language discipline that focuses its study on the meaning contained in a language, code, or other representation that can be interpreted (Fillmore, 2006; Higginbotham, 1985; Jackendoff, 1983; Löbner, 2013). If language is seen as a meaningful sound unit for expressing thoughts and feelings, then the meaning created from those expressions, thoughts, and feelings is semantic. In linguistics, semantics ranks third after sound and form (grammar) (Davidson & Harman, 2012). Semantic units can be divided into two namely lexical semantics and grammatical semantics (Frawley, 2013; Adachi et al., 2004; Eisterhold et al., 2006). Lexical semantics is the study of the meaning of language in lexical units, while grammatical semantics is the study of meaning for changes in grammatical forms of language (Cruse, 2011; Cruse et al. 1986; Lyons & John, 1995; Wierzbicka, 1988; Wierzbicka, 2002; Zaharna, 1995).

Language users expect a response or effect from language. In such situations, pragmatics is a field of study. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the use of language associated with its context (Verschueren, 2005). Pragmatics is also a field of language studies relating to the meaning desired by the speaker outside the grammatical unit of language (Noveck & Sperber, 2004; Verschueren, 2005). One area of pragmatic study is a speech act. This study focuses on the meaning of language that influences the behavior of the speech partner. Searle (1968) divides speech acts into three parts, namely locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary speech acts are propositions in the category of saying something. Illocution is a speech act that semantically has the power to encourage speech partners to take certain actions concerning the locution itself. While perlocution is the result of the meaning and power that is generated by the locution of the speech partner in the form of actions or actions expected by the speaker. The use of sarcasm in terms of its function and meaning can also be assessed pragmatically, both at the level of locution, illocution and its focus. Leech (2016) says that speech that threatens, accuses, curses, or scolds as sarcasm is an illocutionary act. While Halliday (1970) said that speech that intends to criticize, revile, reprimand, nag, and insult as sarcasm is also a form of illocutionary speech acts.

The meaning of language

Language is a unit of meaningful sounds outside of human limitations in understanding certain languages (Frawley, 2013). For example, an Indonesian speaker who is not able to understand and use German, then German remains in the language, because only the limitations of Indonesian speakers cannot understand and use German. It is different if someone makes certain sounds from their articulator that cannot be found in a particular language, then these sounds cannot be said to be language because they cannot be interpreted by the speaker, what else are the speech partners.

The meaning of language is something related to what we can interpret, understand, or accept from a language (Cruse, 2011; Cruse et al., 1986). Others say that the meaning of language is the relationship between name and understanding. There is a relationship between the sounds captured by the human sense of hearing and those interpreted by human psychology itself (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2006). For example, when someone hears the word "Chair", what appears in his mind is an object called a chair, his form can also be described or demonstrated. That is what is called meaning. The meaning can be divided into two parts, namely linguistic meaning and cultural meaning. The meaning of language (linguistics) is the meaning that results from the two units of language that have been a convention. This meaning is divided into two namely lexical meaning and structural meaning (Cruse et al., 1986). Lexical meaning is the meaning of the smallest unit of language that is lexeme or word. While the structural meaning is the meaning formed from the structure or structure of certain languages such as sentences. Social (cultural) meaning is the meaning created by a certain social or social identity or identity (Kramersch & Widdowson, 1998).

Result

In South Sulawesi, the regional languages are diverse, there are Bugis, Makassar, and Toraja languages. For this reason, sarcasm from the three languages was collected through interviews as follows; *borro* (Bugis), *tania tau* (Bugis), *mate lino* (Bugis), *pongoro* (Makassar), *ujangeng* (Bugis), *kabulamma* (Makassar), *cundekke* (Bugis), *kacuping* (Bugis), *tai baro* (Toraja), *garring pua* (Makassar), *sinjoknale* (Bugis), *ja'tappa* (Bugis), *jabe* (Makassar), *macapilla* (Bugis), *asu* (Bugis, Toraja), *kongkong* (Makassar), *telaso or tai laso* (Bugis, Makassar, Toraja), *tai lessi* (Bugis), *telang* (Makassar), *baga* (Toraja), *lembe* (Bugis), *tolo* (Makassar), *jokko or majokko* (Bugis, Toraja), *balala* (Makassar), *soko* (Bugis), *sundala* (Makassar). Some of these sarcasm are described as a sample in this article, others are included in the form of an attachment.

The word *asu* is popularly used by people in South Sulawesi, specifically Bugis and Toraja. In Indonesian the word *asu* means 'dog'. In addition, the word *asu* means the word Hongkong in Makassar language. Dogs are a type of mammal known as barking and licking habits. For the people of South Sulawesi, dogs are pets (for certain types), animals for hunting, and animals to protect certain places. Most people of South Sulawesi believe that dogs are unclean or haram animals (for adherents of Islam). In addition, dogs are also known as dangerous

animals because in some cases dogs can injure humans or even lead to death. Dogs are also commonly used as markers of something related to magical things. The word *asu* or *kongkong* becomes a sarcasm in its use because the resulting connotation becomes very rude or disrespectful, namely the attitude or behavior of someone who resembles a dog, such as looking for a face (licker), dirty, unclean, dangerous, creepy, or detrimental to others. Generally, the word *asu* or *kongkong* is used to blaspheme, chide, scold, insult, or demean the speech partner. The following is an example of a speech event using *asu* or *kongkong* sarcasm.

Example of speech event 1 (original quote)

Actor : (Approach an unknown target and suddenly say) *Bisanya ko berbuat begitu kepada teman ku, dasar asu!*
 Respondent : *Kurang ajar* (angry expression while standing clenched fist ready to punch the actor)

Example of speech event 1 (customized quote)

Actor : (Approach an unknown target and suddenly say) How could you do that to my friend, you dog!
 Respondent : Insolent (angry expression while standing clenched fist ready to punch the actor)

Based on the speech situation, said [*Bisanya ko berbuat begitu kepada teman ku, dasar asu!*] is the location. While the bad meaning conveyed by the speaker and understood by the speech partner (respondent) is the focus. Next, utterance [*kurang ajar*] in response to actors' utterances and angry expressions accompanied by the act of standing and clenching their hands, it is necessary. After being confirmed, it is known that the respondents rated that speech [*Bisanya ko berbuat begitu kepada teman ku, dasar asu!*] is so rude or disrespectful that he feels humiliated in front of others. What makes these utterances even more rude or disrespectful is because the actors and respondents do not know each other. From this speech situation, it is clear that conflicts (fights) between actors and respondents have the potential.

However, in a speech situation where the actors and respondents know each other, the reaction that results from the speech is different, as in the following speech situation description;

Example of speech event 2 (original quote)

Actor : (Approach the known target and suddenly) *Bisanya ko berbuat begitu kepada teman ku, dasar asu!*
 Respondent : *Hei.....magako? Kaget ku, enjel (endak jelas)*

Example of speech event 2 (customized quote)

Actor : (Approach the known target and suddenly) How could you do that to my friend, dog!

Respondent : Hey... what's up? I was not clear

Speech event 2 is the same as speech event 1. It's just that the situation is different, because the actors and respondents know each other. The reaction given by the respondent from the actor's utterance [*Bisanya ko berbuat begitu kepada teman ku, dasar asu!*] mediocre even though the meaning of the speech is the same when spoken to unknown respondents. This happened because of the social relations that had formed between the actors and the respondents, namely getting to know each other, so that angry reactions such as the situation in speech 1 were not found. Conversely, in the speech event two respondents considered that the speech was strange or unclear, so the reaction issued was in the form of speech [*Hei.....magako? Kaget ku, enjel*] which means the respondent was shocked and surprised by the incident. Once confirmed, it is known that the respondent is well acquainted with the character of the actor so that the impact of the speech that has a rough value does not hurt the feelings of the respondent. In addition, friendship status is also a consideration for respondents to issue rude or angry reactions. Based on the two cases, the use of sarcasm and the impact will be different if viewed from the situation of the speech, namely whether the speaker and the speech partner know each other or not.

Telaso or *tai laso* (Bugis, Makassar, Toraja) are used by the people of South Sulawesi, especially Bugis and Toraja. This word consists of two words namely "*tai*" which means poop, and "*laso*" meaning male genitals or penis. In the Indonesian language the word *telaso* or *tai laso* means "*tai* (dirt) penis" whose use is only intended for men. This word is commensurate with the word *tai lessi* in the Bugis and Toraja languages, and the *telang* word in Makassar, only the target of its use is for women. As with the meaning, "*tai laso*", "*tai lessi*" or "*telang*" is something that is disgusting because it refers to the "*tai*" droppings and the "*laso*" and *lessi* genitals. *Laso* said, *lessi*, *telang* is a human sex. For the people of South Sulawesi, sex is a sensitive part, if the expressed meaning is something that is dirty or degrading someone's dignity. The following is an example of a speech event using *telaso* sarcasm or *tai laso*, *tai lessi*, or *telang*.

Example of speech event 3 (original quote)

Actor : (Approach the target (male respondent) the unknown and suddenly say) *Wei... telaso, apa muambil disini?*
 Respondent : (No words were issued, only angry expressions while standing and staring intently at the actor)

Example of speech event 3 (customized quote)

Actor : (Approach the target (male respondent) the unknown and suddenly say) Hey... penis discharge, what are you doing here?
 Respondent : (No words were issued, only angry expressions while standing and staring intently at the actor)

Speech event 3 above occurred between two men. The event explained that the utterance [*Wei... telaso, apa muambil disini?*] is a locution, while the focus is on

the respondent's understanding of the utterance. The reaction of standing with an angry expression while staring intently at the actor is the focus. After being confirmed, the respondents considered that utterance [*Wei... telaso, apa muambil disini?*] contains meanings that are bad, rude, and disrespectful to cause feelings of emotion, even provoking conflict or conflict. However, the ability to control oneself from the emotions generated by the speech can be controlled by the respondent. From this case, we can know that the function of self-control has an important role to reduce the bad possibilities that can occur as a result of speech sarcasm. Then, what if the speech event involves men and women. The following is evidence of the event and the speech situation.

Example of speech event 4 (original quote)

- Actor : (Approach the target (female respondent) the unknown and suddenly say) *We... tai lessi, apa muambil disini?*
 Respondent : (Shocked) *Ih, kurang sopannu cowok, jaga itu mulutmu! Siapa ko berani kasi begitu ka...bencong!* (A very angry expression, then stood up and glared at the actor. Some women around him were also angry while commenting negatively about me)

Example of speech event 4 (customized quote)

- Actor : (Approach the target (female respondent) the unknown and suddenly say) Hey... vaginal discharge, what are you doing here?
 Respondent : (Shocked) *Ih, you rude man, watch your mouth! Who are you to say that to me... Sissy!* (A very angry expression, then stood up and glared at the actor. Some women around him were also angry while commenting negatively about me)

Speech 4 is as locus and illusion as is Speech 3. Only the intensity of the fix is different. Speeches from actors are responded with different reactions. Female respondents gave a harsher reaction, even those around the respondent also gave a strong reaction to the speech. After being confirmed, the strong reaction from the respondent and the people around the respondent was because in addition to the sarcasm speech it had a bad meaning for women, also because the social norms of society in South Sulawesi taught that men had responsibilities and had the obligation to respect and respect a woman as a man respects and respects his mother. Even social norms provide a measure that real men are men who are able to maintain the dignity of women. This also applies in terms of speech, a man is not allowed to say rude or obscene to women, especially to mention his genitals. Men who speak of this variety of sarcasm can be labeled a sissy.

Baga (Toraja), *lembe* (Bugis), *tolo* (Makassar) are three words of sarcasm that are often found in South Sulawesi society. This type of sarcasm has no connotation at all, meaning that the meaning is directly to the target. Sarcasm is like that, *lembe*, *tolo* which has the same meaning which is stupid or incompetent. For people in South Sulawesi, this sarcasm has a mean rude and disrespectful, for this sarcasm is popularly used to demean, insult, or intimidate others. Because, actually every person does not like to be called stupid or incompetent, despite the

reality. The following is an example of a speech event using the sarcasm of *Baga, lembe, tolo*.

Example of speech event 5 (original quote)

- Actor : (Go to an unknown target and say) *Coba jawab teka-teki ku? Waktunya dua menit.*
 Respondent : (Confused) *Apa hadianya kalau bisa ka jawab i?*
 Actor : *Uang 50.000, mau?*
 Respondent : *Oke...*
 Actor : *Ditutup jadi tongkat, dibuka jadi tenda?*
 Respondent : *Tidak tahu kak*
 Actor : *Deh,,,,baga!*
 Respondent : *Ih... apa sih* (annoyed expression)

Example of speech event 5 (customized quote)

- Actor : (Go to an unknown target and say) Try to answer my riddle? The time is two minutes.
 Respondent : (confused) What is the prize if I can answer?
 Actor : 50.000, would you like to?
 Respondent : Oke...
 Actor : Closed as a stick, opened as a tent?
 Respondent : I don't know sis
 Actor : Ouch....Stupid!
 Respondent : Ugh... what the heck (annoyed expression)

Speech event 5 above occurred between (male) actors and female respondents. Speech [*Coba jawab teka-teki ku? Waktunya dua menit*] is a locution of actors, uttered [*Hadiahnya apa jika saya dapat menjawab?*] is the locus of respondents, said [*Uang 50.000, mau?*] is a locution of actors, uttered [*oke...*] is the locus of respondents, said [*Ditutup jadi tongkat, dibuka jadi tenda?*] is a locution of actors, uttered [*Saya tidak tahu kak*] is the locus of respondents, said [*Aduh....Bodoh!*] is the locution of the actor, and [*Ih... apa sih (ekspresi kesal)*] is the locus of respondents. The focus is on all processes of understanding and generating responses from the speeches of actors and respondents. Whereas the focus is on answers or reactions to the speech partners' utterances. From the speech event, the actor asked the respondent to answer a puzzle within two minutes. But unfortunately, the respondent was unable to answer the puzzle so the actor said sarcasm "how" which meant that the actor justified the respondent as a woman who was stupid or incompetent in answering the puzzle.

From the sarcasm, the respondent gave an expression of annoyance. That is, sarcasm is like, *lembe, tolo* interpreted by the respondent as a speech that is not polite, unpleasant, or even demeaning someone's dignity. This is as the result of the confirmation of the respondent. In a friendship situation, the use of this type of sarcasm does not provide a strong enough reaction. Only to the extent of hurting the feelings of others. Not to the physical action like a fight. In the case under study, sarcasm *baga, tolo, lembe* produced a different reaction if used to people with different situations.

Sarcasm *jokko* or *majokko* (Bugis, Toraja), *balala* (Makassar), *soko* (Bugis) have the same meaning, that is greedy. Sarcasm is used to insult or demean other people who have a greedy character in the meaning of denotation, whereas in connotation *jokko* or *majokko* sarcasm (Bugis, Toraja), *balala* (Makassar), *soko* (Bugis) are used to insult or curse for people who take the rights of people another or a ruler who acts unjustly or takes away the rights of his people, or a corrupt leader. Never use *jokko* or *majokko* sarcasm (Bugis, Toraja), *balala* (Makassar), *soko* (Bugis) when someone is enjoying their food. Even if the person is a friend or friend, using this sarcasm will greatly hurt the person's feelings, especially if the sarcasm is used to people who are not known or have a higher status. Besides having a bad charge of meaning, users of this sarcasm will also be labeled as people who are rude, not ethical, or people who cannot respect others. So bad is the meaning contained in this sarcasm that the impact is like that. The following is an example of a speech event in the use of *jokko* or *majokko* sarcasm (Bugis, Toraja), *balala* (Makassar), *soko* (Bugis).

Example of speech event 6 (original quote)

Actor : (Approaching unknown targets who are enjoying Coto dishes)
Dede... balalana ini e!
 Respondent : (Allow and look sharply at the actor) *Tai laso* (to punch the table)

Example of speech event 6 (customized quote)

Actor : (Approaching unknown targets who are enjoying Coto dishes)
 Wow!... you're so greedy
 Respondent : (Allow and look sharply at the actor) *Tai laso* (punched the table and immediately stood up punch the actor)

Speech event 6 occurred between two men in a food stall serving Coto (one of the special foods in South Sulawesi). Speech [*Dede... balalana ini e!*] is a locution. The process of interpreting the utterances made by the respondents is illocutionary. While the respondent's reaction is a act of perlokusi. In the speech event, the actor approached a man who was enjoying a meal in the form of Coto, then the actor said [*Dede... balalana ini e!*] addressed to respondents. Because of the speech, the respondent was angry as shown by hitting the table throwing fists at the actor. After being confirmed, the respondent's angry expression occurred because he judged the actor to be impolite, and his words also contained meanings that were bad or rude so that the respondent felt unappreciated or insulted by the actor.

Discussion

In Indonesia, speech sarcasm colors the social life of its people. Look at the various studies that have been done by previous researchers such as Apriyanto (2011); Dinari (2015); Afrinda (2016); Widiastuti (2016); Hartavi, Suwandi & Hastuti (2018); Lailiyah et al. (2019); Cahyo et al. (2020); Mahmudah (2012); Solekah (2013); Fertsya YS (2014); Permatasari (2014); Muhsyanur (2015); Irfariati (2017); Resvitayani (2010); Lunando & Purwarianti (2013); Amir et al. (2016); Barat (2018); Hardiati (2018); Arridho (2019); Christina (2019); Muhammad

(2019); Kamaliyah (2020); Sukmono (2020). Then strengthened by the results of this study, we boldly say that sarcasm is the culture of Indonesian society. We dare say that by holding on to a number of reasons; 1) the results of these studies serve as scientific evidence that sarcasm is massive and sporadic in its development in society, 2) the views of experts who say that the existence of language marks the culture of certain social groups (Blommaert, 2007a; 2007c; 2007b; 2010). In other words, language is part of human culture. Because the concept of culture itself is something that is accustomed to form patterns of behavior or attitudes that become difficult to remove or forget. Therefore, the use of sarcasm as a language that has become a habit in Indonesian society strengthens the hypothesis that the habit of using sarcasm by Indonesian people has become a culture in language.

Viewed from the semantic aspect, language is used by humans to express thoughts and feelings (Miller & Johnson-Laird, 1976; Tomasello, 2009a, 2009b; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). For that reason, in this expression, the speaker positions the meaning to be understood by the speech partner as a manifestation of the psychological condition of the speaker. Sarcasm is a rude or dirty word expressed by the speaker as an expression of anger, annoyance, disappointment, or just joking with the intention of being sarcastic. Sarcasm itself is used to insult, harass, demean, or intimidate the speech partner. Thus, when sarcasm is used, the psychological picture of the speaker is none other than anger, annoyance, disappointment, or just joking with the intention of insinuation, and the purpose is to insult, harass, demean, or intimidate the speech partner. That is what is said that the language-using community has the ability and intelligence to organize language to realize certain goals (Campbell-Kibler, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; Campbell-Kibler, 2010; Schiffrin, 1996).

Pragmatically, the speech of sarcasm can cause an adverse reaction, such as anger, annoyance, disappointment, or even acting physically to hurt the speaker in retaliation for the speech of the sarcasm. This is as found in this study, respondents gave angry expressions, clenched fists, hit tables, hit speakers, to reply with utter sarcasm. The main reason why the reaction was created, because sarcasm itself is a speech that is actually not acceptable with the moral or language ethics in Indonesian society, especially South Sulawesi. To that end, using sarcasm to speech partners that are not based on an event that is contrary to the morals or values that apply in the social life of the speaker and the speech partner will have a fatal impact. It is different if sarcasm is addressed to people who are declared worthy of the speech of sarcasm itself because their behavior violates certain norms or values, then sarcasm itself is considered as acceptable language behavior. The link between norms or social values determines the reaction of sarcasm in line with views Campbell-Kibler (2009) dan Schiffrin (1996) that social norms or values that apply in certain social groups provide knowledge about the limits of good and bad, or things that are prohibited and allowed. Knowledge of these values and norms is what directs people's behavior in language.

Related to the reaction caused by the utterance of sarcasm, there is an interesting dimension to be discussed based on the results of this study. First, the speech sarcasm gives a different reaction in terms of the intimate situation between the

speaker and the speech partner. In this case, a bad reaction from sarcasm will be more severe or dangerous if it is told to an unknown speech partner, while to a speech partner who has a more intimate social relationship such as friendship or family causes a relatively flat or mediocre reaction, only to the offended level. Second, for a specific sarcasm utterance, the reaction will be different if it is told to the speech partner who is of different sex. Female speech partners will react very violently if they get sarcasm from male speakers.

Conversely, the reaction of male partners would be simpler or even mediocre if the speakers were women. This is because the norms or values that apply in South Sulawesi society that treat women must be gentle to get the prestige and label as real men. 3) using sarcasm to people who do not understand its meaning does not get any reaction, because the speech partner does not understand what is meant by the speaker. However, in terms of language ethics, speakers of this situation mark speakers as individuals who cannot respect others. Language is used as a tool to harass, insult, or insult others, especially if it is spoken in front of many people who understand that sarcasm. Conversely, if a speaker who does not understand the meaning of the sarcasm utterance and uses it to the speech partner who understands it, then the greater the likelihood of a bad reaction is obtained by the speaker such as getting violent acts in the form of beatings or other forms in response to the sarcasm utterances he uses. 4) Self-control or strong self-defense will make the speech partner avoid offense or emotions that can harm both parties. However, for the people of South Sulawesi, if their personalities are innocent or not in a condition worthy of receiving sarcasm, then acts of violence also become part of self-protection, because self-esteem is the main thing.

The results of this study are very important to read, especially for foreign tourists visiting South Sulawesi. Besides enjoying the beauty of tourism, tourists should also take the time to learn the local language and Indonesian, either directly or read this article. Because we do not want foreign tourists to get bad treatment from unscrupulous locals who provide bad language-related teaching (Sarcasm) to them. Let the events that have passed be learning for us to still respect others. Language in its natural form is a blessing that deserves to be grateful so that humans can interact with one another, exchange ideas or thoughts and experiences. Language is not to be used as an instrument of crime. End of this discussion, sarcasm is a form of Indonesian-language culture, sarcasm is only born in certain situations. For this reason, avoid situations that can cause the speech.

Conclusion

Indonesians have a habit of speaking with harsh, disrespectful, bad meaning, or dirty words. The habit of speaking is a manifestation of the expression of thoughts and feelings of anger, annoyance, disappointment, or even joking with the intention of insinuation (the simplest), which is then called sarcasm. Because the utterance of sarcasm has become a habit of the people of Indonesia, especially people in South Sulawesi, then by itself said sarcasm into Indonesian culture or tradition. When someone does an action or act that is not pleasing to someone's heart or violates certain social norms and values, then sarcasm is a reward. In

this situation, the speech partner as the target of sarcasm gives a normal reaction or even a strong reaction, depending on how the speech partner realizes his mistake. However, if the sarcasm speech is given to the speech partner who has no errors and thus gets the reward of sarcasm then the reaction will be very bad. The severity of the reaction from sarcasm is influenced by several factors, first the intimate situation that exists between the speech partner and the speaker. Second, gender differences react differently from speech sarcasm. The reaction of women as speech partners will be tougher if sarcasm is spoken by men. Otherwise, the reaction of men is relatively normal or mediocre (only cause offense) if the speech sarcasm is spoken by women. Third, using sarcasm to people who do not understand its meaning does not get any reaction, because the speech partner does not understand what is meant by the speaker. However, in terms of language ethics, speakers of this situation mark speakers as individuals who cannot respect others. Language is used as a tool to harass, insult, or insult others, especially if it is spoken in front of many people who understand that sarcasm. Conversely, if a speaker does not understand the meaning of the sarcasm utterance and uses it to the speech partner who understands it, then the greater the likelihood of a bad reaction is obtained by the speaker such as getting violent acts in the form of beatings or other forms in response to the sarcasm utterances he uses. Fourth, self-control is an important aspect to stem the adverse effects arising from speech sarcasm.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Afrinda, P. D. (2016). Sarkasme dalam lirik lagu dangdut kekinian (Kajian semantik). *Jurnal Gramatika*, 2(2), 79709.
- Aitchison, J. (2012). *Words in the mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Allen, J. (1995). *Natural language understanding*. Pearson.
- Amir, S., Wallace, B. C., Lyu, H., & Silva, P. C. M. J. (2016). Modelling context with user embeddings for sarcasm detection in social media. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1607.00976*.
- Adachi, T., Koeda, T., Hirabayashi, S., Maeoka, Y., Shiota, M., Wright, E. C., & Wada, A. (2004). The metaphor and sarcasm scenario test: A new instrument to help differentiate high functioning pervasive developmental disorder from attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Brain and development*, 26(5), 301-306. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0387-7604\(03\)00170-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0387-7604(03)00170-0)
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2005). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Apriyanto, B. (2011). *Analisis Majas Sarkasme dan Campur Kode pada Film Punk in Love yang Disutradarai Oleh Ody C. Harahap*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Arridho, S. (2019). *Komentar Sarkasme di Instagram Terhadap #DebatCapres2019*. Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language* (Vol. 83). Multilingual Matters.

- Bamman, D., & Smith, N. A. (2015). Contextualized sarcasm detection on twitter. *Ninth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Barat, P. C. G. J. (2018). Representasi Hate Speech dalam Posting-an Media Sosial Instagram. *Prosiding Jurnalistik*.
- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge London.
- Bharti, S. K., Vachha, B., Pradhan, R. K., Babu, K. S., & Jena, S. K. (2016). Sarcastic sentiment detection in tweets streamed in real time: a big data approach. *Digital Communications and Networks*, 2(3), 108–121. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcan.2016.06.002>
- Blommaert, J. (2007a). On scope and depth in linguistic ethnography. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 682–688.
- Blommaert, J. (2007b). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(1), 1–19.
- Blommaert, J. (2007c). Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(2), 115–130.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bohrn, I. C., Altmann, U., & Jacobs, A. M. (2012). Looking at the brains behind figurative language—A quantitative meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies on metaphor, idiom, and irony processing. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(11), 2669–2683. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.07.021>
- Bradford, R. (1997). *Stylistics*. Psychology Press.
- Cahyo, A. N., Manullang, T. A. A., & Isnain, M. (2020). Analisis Penggunaan Gaya Bahasa Sarkasme pada Lagu Bahaya Komunis Karangian Jason Ranti. *Asas: Jurnal Sastra*, 9(1).
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2009). The nature of sociolinguistic perception. *Language Variation and Change*, 21(1), 135.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2010a). New directions in sociolinguistic cognition. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 15(2), 5.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2010b). The sociolinguistic variant as a carrier of social meaning. *Language Variation and Change*, 22(3), 423.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2010). Sociolinguistics and perception. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(6), 377–389.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind*. Cambridge University Press.
- Christina, S. (2019). Sarcasm in Sentiment Analysis of Indonesian Text: A Literature Review. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi*, 13(2), 54–59.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge university press.
- Creusere, M. A. (1999). Theories of Adults' Understanding and Use of Irony and Sarcasm: Applications to and Evidence from Research with Children. *Developmental Review*, 19(2), 213–262. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1998.0474>
- Cruse, A. (2011). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*.
- Cruse, D. A., Cruse, D. A., Cruse, D. A., & Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge university press.
- Davidson, D., & Harman, G. (2012). *Semantics of natural language* (Vol. 40). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Djumabaeva, J. S., & Kengboyeva, M. Y. (2021). Bilingualism and its importance in human life. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.451>

- Dinari, I. (2015). Jenis-Jenis dan Penanda Majas Sarkasme dalam Novel *The Return of Sherlock Holmes*. *Prosiding Prasasti*, 1, 497–503.
- Douglas, D. (2014). *Understanding language testing*. Routledge.
- Eisterhold, J., Attardo, S., & Boxer, D. (2006). Reactions to irony in discourse: evidence for the least disruption principle. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(8), 1239–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.12.003>
- Eades, D. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and the legal process*. Multilingual Matters.
- Fertsa YS, H. (2014). *Penggunaan Sarkasme dalam Televisi Indonesia (Analisis Isi Program dalam Tayangan Pesbuker DI ANTV 28 Mei-31 Mei dan 3 Juni-5 Juni 2013)*. University of Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Figueroa, E. (2014). *Sociolinguistic metatheory*. Elsevier.
- Fillmore, C. J. (2006). Frame semantics. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, 34, 373–400.
- Fournier, N. M., Calverley, K. L., Wagner, J. P., Poock, J. L., & Crossley, M. (2008). Impaired social cognition 30 years after hemispherectomy for intractable epilepsy: The importance of the right hemisphere in complex social functioning. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 12(3), 460–471. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2007.12.009>
- Frawley, W. (2013). *Linguistic semantics*. Routledge.
- Halliday, Michael A K. (1970). Language structure and language function. *New Horizons in Linguistics*, 1, 140–165.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood, & Matthiessen, C. (2006). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. A&C Black.
- Hardiati, W. (2018). Tindak Tutur Sarkastik di Media Sosial (Sarcastic Speech Acts in Social Media). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya (JBSP)*, 8(1), 123–131.
- Hartavi, A. N., Suwandi, S., & Hastuti, S. (2018). Peran Majas Sarkasme Dan Nilai Pendidikan Karakter Dalam Puisi Mencari Tanah Lapang Karya Wiji Thukul Dan Relevansinya Dengan Pengajaran Sastra Di Perguruan Tinggi. *Basastra: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 7(1), 94–102.
- Heintz, S., & Ruch, W. (2019). From four to nine styles: An update on individual differences in humor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 141, 7–12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.12.008>
- Higginbotham, J. (1985). On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16(4), 547–593.
- Irfariati, I. (2017). Majas Sarkasme dalam Penulisan Komentar pada" 5 Ironi Akil Mochtar, Ketua Mk yang Ditangkap Kpk". *Madah*, 6(2), 163–174.
- Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition* (Vol. 8). MIT press.
- Jakobson, L. S., Pearson, P. M., Kozub, Z., Hare, C., & Rigby, S. N. (2018). Links between traits associated with the broad autism phenotype and empathy and young adults' ability to decode speaker intentionality. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 50, 11–21. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2018.03.001>
- Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and politics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Joshi, A., Bhattacharyya, P., & Carman, M. J. (2017). Automatic sarcasm detection: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 50(5), 1–22.
- Jain, D., Kumar, A., & Garg, G. (2020). Sarcasm detection in mash-up language using soft-attention based bi-directional LSTM and feature-rich CNN. *Applied Soft Computing*, 91, 106198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106198>

- Jorgensen, J. (1996). The functions of sarcastic irony in speech. *Journal of pragmatics*, 26(5), 613-634. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00067-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00067-4)
- Joshi, A., Sharma, V., & Bhattacharyya, P. (2015). Harnessing context incongruity for sarcasm detection. *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 757-762.
- Justo, R., Corcoran, T., Lukin, S. M., Walker, M., & Torres, M. I. (2014). Extracting relevant knowledge for the detection of sarcasm and nastiness in the social web. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 69, 124-133. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2014.05.021>
- Kamaliyah, I. (2020). *Pengaruh Penggunaan Bahasa Sarkasme Di Media Sosial*.
- Kim, J. (2014). How Korean EFL learners understand sarcasm in L2 English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 60, 193-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.016>
- Kunneman, F., Liebrecht, C., Van Mulken, M., & Van den Bosch, A. (2015). Signaling sarcasm: From hyperbole to hashtag. *Information Processing & Management*, 51(4), 500-509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2014.07.006>
- Kanzunudin, M., & Kastatria, N. R. (2012). *Sarkasme dalam Media Cetak*. Yayasan Adhigama.
- Kim, J. (2014). How Korean EFL learners understand sarcasm in L2 English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 60, 193-206. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.016>
- Kramsch, C., & Widdowson, H. G. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Lailiyah, S. N., Ekawati, M., & Asmara, R. (2019). Penanda dan Fungsi Ujaran Sarkasme dalam Novel Cantik Itu Luka Karya Eka Kurniawan Serta Pembelajarannya dalam Teks Ceramah di SMA. *Repetisi: Riset Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(2), 117-135.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1965). *Language of politics*.
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Löbner, S. (2013). *Understanding semantics*. Routledge.
- Ludlow, A. K., Chadwick, E., Morey, A., Edwards, R., & Gutierrez, R. (2017). An exploration of sarcasm detection in children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 70, 25-34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2017.10.003>
- Lunando, E., & Purwarianti, A. (2013). Indonesian social media sentiment analysis with sarcasm detection. *2013 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and Information Systems (ICACSIS)*, 195-198. IEEE.
- Lyons, J., & John, L. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahmudah, M. (2012). Sarkasme Judul Berita Surat Kabar Nasional. *Retorika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 8(2).
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matsui, T., Nakamura, T., Utsumi, A., Sasaki, A. T., Koike, T., Yoshida, Y., ... Sadato, N. (2016). The role of prosody and context in sarcasm comprehension: Behavioral and fMRI evidence. *Neuropsychologia*, 87, 74-84. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.04.031>
- McNamara, T. (2000). *Language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Mesthrie, R. (2011). *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Meyerhoff, M. (2018). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Miller, G. A., & Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1976). *Language and perception*. Belknap Press.
- Morou, N., Papaliagkas, V., Markouli, E., Karagianni, M., Nazlidou, E., Spilioti, M., ... Kosmidis, M. H. (2018). Theory of Mind impairment in focal versus generalized epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 88, 244–250. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2018.09.026>
- McDonald, S., & Pearce, S. (1996). Clinical insights into pragmatic theory: Frontal lobe deficits and sarcasm. *Brain and language*, 53(1), 81–104. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1996.0038>
- Muhammad, R. (2019). *Ungkapan Sarkasme oleh Haters dalam Media Sosial Youtube*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Mataram.
- Muhsyanur, M. (2015). Telaah Sarkasme pada Judul Berita dalam Surat Kabar Palopo Pos. *Prosiding Prasasti*, 1, 269–274.
- Newmeyer, F. J. (2000). *Language form and language function*. MIT press.
- Novack, I. A., & Sperber, D. (2004). *Experimental pragmatics*. Springer.
- Nurgiantoro, B. (2018). *Stilistika*. UGM Press.
- Permatasari, M. A. I. (2014). *Analisis Bahasa Sarkasme Pada Rubrik Kriminal Surat Kabar Solopos Edisi September-Oktober 2013*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Pinker, S. (2003a). *How the mind works*. Penguin UK.
- Pinker, S. (2003b). Language as an adaptation to the cognitive niche. *Studies in the Evolution of Language*, 3, 16–37.
- Pinker, S. (2003c). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. Penguin UK.
- Putrayasa, I. B. (2021). Political language variation: stylistic based study. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.45>
- Pomareda, C., Simkute, A., & Phillips, L. H. (2019). Age-related differences in the ability to decode intentions from non-literal language. *Acta Psychologica*, 198, 102865. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2019.102865>
- Rajadesingan, A., Zafarani, R., & Liu, H. (2015). Sarcasm detection on twitter: A behavioral modeling approach. *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 97–106.
- Ravi, K., & Ravi, V. (2017). A novel automatic satire and irony detection using ensembled feature selection and data mining. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 120, 15–33. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2016.12.018>
- Resvitayani, A. (2010). *Majas Sarkasme dalam Penulisan Komentar pada Grup Facebook "Cicak VS Buaya"*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Saha, S., Yadav, J., & Ranjan, P. (2017). Proposed approach for sarcasm detection in twitter. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 10(25), 1–8.
- Schiffrin, D. (1996). Interactional sociolinguistics. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*, 4, 307–328.
- Searle, J. R. (1968). Austin on locutionary and illocutionary acts. *The Philosophical Review*, 77(4), 405–424.
- Shany-Ur, T., Poorzand, P., Grossman, S. N., Growdon, M. E., Jang, J. Y., Ketelle, R. S., ... Rankin, K. P. (2012). Comprehension of insincere communication in neurodegenerative disease: Lies, sarcasm, and theory of mind. *Cortex*, 48(10), 1329–1341. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.08.003>
- Solekah, M. (2013). *Majas Sarkasme Pada Rubrik Kriminal Dalam Koran Meteor*.

- Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Steyerl, H. (2006). The language of things. *European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies*, 3, 359.
- Sukmono, N. D. (2020). Sarkasme pada Post-Literasi dan Pra-Literasi dalam Media Youtube (Kanal Game Online). *Jurnal Pendidikan Modern*, 5(3), 102–113.
- Sulis, E., Irazú Hernández Farias, D., Rosso, P., Patti, V., & Ruffo, G. (2016). Figurative messages and affect in Twitter: Differences between #irony, #sarcasm and #not. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 108, 132–143. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2016.05.035>
- Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact*. Citeseer.
- Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Legal language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, C. (2015). Beyond sarcasm: The metalanguage and structures of mock politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87, 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.08.005>
- Tomasello, M. (2009a). *Constructing a language*. Harvard university press.
- Tomasello, M. (2009b). *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Harvard university press.
- Uchiyama, H., Seki, A., Kageyama, H., Saito, D. N., Koeda, T., Ohno, K., & Sadato, N. (2006). Neural substrates of sarcasm: A functional magnetic-resonance imaging study. *Brain Research*, 1124(1), 100–110. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2006.09.088>
- Uchiyama, H. T., Saito, D. N., Tanabe, H. C., Harada, T., Seki, A., Ohno, K., ... Sadato, N. (2012). Distinction between the literal and intended meanings of sentences: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study of metaphor and sarcasm. *Cortex*, 48(5), 563–583. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.01.004>
- Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Verschueren, J. (2005). Pragmatics. In *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics* (pp. 99–110). Routledge.
- Wales, K. (2014). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Routledge.
- Wang, Z., Wu, Z., Wang, R., & Ren, Y. (2015). Twitter sarcasm detection exploiting a context-based model. *International Conference on Web Information Systems Engineering*, 77–91. Springer.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2011). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (Vol. 28). John Wiley & Sons.
- Wicaksono, A. (2017). *Pengkajian Prosa Fiksi (edisi revisi)*. Penerbit Garudhawaca.
- Widiastuti, S. (2016). *Gaya Bahasa Sarkasme Roman Ser! Randha Cocak Karya Suparto Brata*. Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2002). Australian cultural scripts—bloody revisited. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(9), 1167–1209. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00023-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00023-6)
- Wierzbicka, A. (1988). *The semantics of grammar* (Vol. 18). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55–82.
- Zaharna, R. S. (1995). Understanding cultural preferences of Arab communication patterns. *Public Relations Review*, 21(3), 241–255. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0363-8111\(95\)90024-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0363-8111(95)90024-1)
- Zhu, N., & Wang, Z. (2020). The paradox of sarcasm: Theory of mind and sarcasm

use in adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 163, 110035.