

The Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used in Students' Social Interactions at Universitas Islam Makassar

Ahmad Tika Alfarabi¹, Warsidi²

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Makassar

Corresponding Author

ahmadtika77@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aims to determine the strategy of impoliteness and the factors that influence the use of impolite expressions by students in social interactions at Makassar Islamic University. This research uses descriptive qualitative method with simple random sampling, and instruments in the form of audio recordings and interviews. Data analysis techniques include data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The results showed that there were 22 data included in the incivility strategies, which included five strategies according to Culpeper: veiled incivility, positive incivility, negative incivility, sarcasm or feigned incivility, and withholding politeness. The most frequently used strategy is sarcasm or feigned incivility. In addition, there are five factors that cause incivility, namely social status, age difference, gender difference, social distance or familiarity, and situation. Incivility allows the expression of socially recognized views and can be an important factor in the development of peer-to-peer communication, so this concept of human values and the role of incivility requires further attention in research.

Keywords: Impoliteness, Pragmatic, Social Interaction, Speech Act

INTRODUCTION

Impoliteness is often seen as the opposite of politeness, where Bousfield (2008) argues that instead of simply reducing face threat FTA, impoliteness directly opposes politeness. (Mugford, 2008) sees incivility as a violation of social norms or intentional acts of humiliation and disrespect in interactions. Furthermore, (Omar, 2012) explain that politeness and impoliteness are two sides of one coin that reflect two aspects of our language behavior, namely positive politeness and negative impoliteness. Culpeper in (Mugford, 2008) adds that incivility occurs when the speaker intentionally attacks the interlocutor's face, or when the listener interprets the speaker's behavior as a deliberate facial attack, or a combination of both. This form of impoliteness arises when the speaker unintentionally offends, acts inconsistently with the listener's politeness expectations, or is deliberately insulting to damage the listener's face or protect his or her own face. In the study of pragmatics, as explained by (Yule, 1996), conversational context is very important because pragmatics examines the implied meaning of an utterance, which involves more than just the words spoken. Impoliteness as part of pragmatics involves how utterances are understood and their impact in social interactions. In addition, the theory of speech acts first introduced by (Austin et al., 1975) outlines how language acts, whether through locution (literal meaning), illocution (intention of the utterance), or perlocution (impact of



the utterance on the listener), can convey meaning beyond the words themselves. This understanding of pragmatics is essential to avoid misunderstandings and support effective communication in social contexts.

Impoliteness is an expression or behavior that causes disharmony in social interactions (Piskorska, 2013; Warsidi et al., 2023) and is often considered unworthy of research because researchers such as Leech and Brown & Levinson focus more on politeness than impoliteness. Culpeper later challenged this view by developing a theory of impoliteness through his article "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness" which is based on the concept of "face" (Goffman, 1967) that refers to one's self-image (Thomas, 2014) and image (Brown, 1987). In this study, it is found that there are many language phenomena that show incivility among university students that may not be realized by speakers and have the potential to become normal in social life. Therefore, this study aims to provide students with an understanding of the use of impolite words in verbal interactions, as well as to uncover how impoliteness strategies affect power dynamics, identity, and interpersonal relationships. The findings provide important insights into how impolite behavior affects interpersonal communication, as well as pave the way for the development of more effective strategies in facilitating more harmonious and respectful

Tri Sanjaya (2023), Chintiabela (2017), and Primadianti (2015) conducted research that both analyzed impoliteness strategies in films using a pragmatic approach and Culpeper's theory of impoliteness. Chitiabela (2017) conducted a pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in Carrie movie and found four types of impoliteness strategies in Carrie movie, namely bald on record strategy, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or pseudo politeness, with all three functions of impoliteness, namely affective, coercive, and entertaining. The impoliteness responses found in the movie include accepting, resisting, and not responding. Meanwhile, Primadianti (2015) in "A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Paranorman Movie" found that the bald impoliteness strategy is the most dominant type used by other characters towards the main character. This study also shows that the most frequent response to impoliteness is offensive counterattack, where the response to impoliteness is influenced by the way the face attack is carried out and the relationship between the face attacker and the targeted party. These three studies show similarities in approach and focus on how incivility is realized and responded to in film contexts, with differences in the dominant strategies and functions underlying acts of incivility.

Harahap (2022) at title "Impoliteness in the E-News Social Media Comment Section: A Descriptive Study" was focused on analyzing impoliteness in the E-News social media

comment section. Internet users frequently did not realize the impolite utterance they used. This study deals with qualitative method which aims to investigate impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's theory. It examines what impoliteness strategies that stated by internet users in the comment section of E-News Instagram account. The data were taken from the comment section of CNN related to political issues. There were 5 impoliteness strategies found in social media users in E-News social media comment section, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withholds politeness. Positive impoliteness was the highest strategy realized by internet users in E-News social media comment section. Meanwhile, the factors for using impoliteness in E-News social media comment section are disagreement, anger, frustration, disappointment and lack of trust, seeking change/betterment, emotional, relief/happy and dishonesty.

Yaniar (2017) in her research entitled *Impoliteness Strategies in Pitch Perfect and Pitch Perfect 2 Movies* analyzed impoliteness strategies in Pitch Perfect and Pitch Perfect 2 movies using a pragmatic approach. This qualitative research aims to identify the types of impoliteness strategies chosen by the characters, how the characters respond to face-threatening actions (FTAs), as well as the characteristics of offensive events that trigger impolite actions. Using Jonathan Culpeper's theory of impoliteness strategies, as well as Derek Bousfield and Timothy Jay's theory of offensive events, it was found that five impoliteness strategies were used by the characters, in order from most to least frequent: positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, vague impoliteness, sarcasm or pseudo politeness, and withholding politeness. Characters often hurt the intended party through insults and the use of unclear language. These FTA actions usually trigger a response from the attacked party, which is often an offensive counterattack. The offensive event that most often triggers an act of incivility is a status difference, where a character with less power attacks or retaliates against a more powerful character with a harsher response. Other factors that influence acts of incivility include physical appearance, socio-physical background, intention, language, gender and age.

This study investigates the use of impolite expressions by students in interactions on campus, with the hope that students can understand the use of impolite words, especially in verbal form, towards interlocutors. Therefore, the researcher is interested in conducting a study entitled "The Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used in Students' Social Interactions at Universitas Islam Makassar (UIM)." This research contributes to the understanding of impoliteness strategies in communication, where various tactics are used by speakers to express disagreement, annoyance, or rejection impolitely. Through

pragmatics and speech act approaches, this study highlights how impoliteness strategies become an integral part of social interaction, influencing power dynamics, identity and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, to focus on completing this research, the researcher follows questions namely what impoliteness strategies are used in students in social interaction at UIM, and what are the influencing factors for the uses of impolite expressions in students in social interactions at UIM.

METHOD

In this research, the researcher employed a qualitative descriptive method to address the research questions. According to Goli et al. (2020), qualitative research focuses on explaining social phenomena and understanding the world we live in and why things occur. Unlike quantitative approaches, qualitative research emphasizes processes rather than just results or products and analyzes data inductively. This method was applied to describe students' impoliteness expressions, the factors influencing the use of such expressions, and the effects of impoliteness on social interaction at Universitas Islam Makassar. The subjects of the research were chosen using simple random sampling, involving students from UIM, where the researcher is a part of the academic community with relevant findings that needed further investigation.

The researcher used audio recorders and field notes as instruments to collect data, including conversational records and interviews. Conversational records helped obtain data on impolite remarks used by students during social interactions. Interviews, based on Arikunto (2010) approach, involved direct communication between the investigator and respondents to gain insights into the factors causing impoliteness. These interviews were conducted in a flexible, free-guided format, allowing for in-depth exploration. The collected data were analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model, which includes data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing to identify impoliteness strategies and their underlying factors based on Culpeper (1996) theory.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Impoliteness is simply the opposite of politeness, and in practice, this behavior can trigger conflict or social disharmony, rather than creating harmony. Immanent language behavior that has been inherent in society can hinder the formation of a moral society and support the formation of students' characters. The following is an analysis of some examples of students' impoliteness strategies in language.

1. The analysis impoliteness strategies

Table 1. Total Percentage the Strategies of Impoliteness

Strategies of Impoliteness	f	%
Bald on Record Impoliteness	2	9%
Positive Impoliteness	1	4,5%
Negative impoliteness	7	32%
Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	11	50%
Withholds Impoliteness	1	4,5%
Total	22	100%

Source: Data processing result, 2024

Bald on Record Impoliteness

This strategy is a strategy use by people who say impoliteness statements to someone using a facial attack before or while someone is saying the impoliteness thing. This means that this strategy is the first thing people do when they hear impoliteness statements. Impoliteness can occur because some abuses end in anger and frustration. The following is the data found on audio recorders which are included in the Bald on Record Impoliteness category.

jangko sembarang nu bilang!

“Don’t say something wrong!”

The speaker states as if the listener is wrong in assuming. It refers to bald on record impoliteness because when using bald on record impoliteness strategy, participants always have an intentional threat to deal with. If it is oral speech, of course the listener will be offended. This is an intentional threat to be met, the offending participant appears to be acting maliciously with the intent to pose an overt threat.

Positive impoliteness

This strategy is used to ignore or show disrespect to someone, but in a positive way. This means that people show their dislike without obviously expressing it, for example with a fake smile or insincere words. The goal is to appear disrespectful without hurting the other person's feelings. This strategy reduces violence because it does not hurt people directly.

“bah, Aman ji (Fake Respond)”

“It’s okay (Fake respon)”

The statement above states that the incident that the speaker has just experienced is the damage to the speaker’s vehicle which was caused by the person he was talking to. The speaker gives a false response as if the incident is something that can be tolerated, therefore

the comments above can be categorized as positive impoliteness.

Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness or negative impoliteness is the intention to strike a negative blow in the listener's face. Putting others down, asking rhetorical questions, and invading someone's personal space are some ways to manifest negative impoliteness or negative impoliteness. The following is the data contained in the audio recorder which is included in the Negative Impoliteness strategy.

"Bukan begitu tolol, pake otak ko sedikit kuliah bah"

"it's not like that you fool, use your brain when studied"

The speaker expressed his dislike for his interlocutor's ability to think and answer questions from assignments given by their lecturer without considering the feelings of the listener. This strategy leads to Negative impoliteness

Sarcasm or mock politeness

Impoliteness strategy proposed by Culpeper (2008) is sarcasm/mock impoliteness. According to Culpeper, sarcasm is an unpleasant action carried out using insincere politeness. In other words, sarcasm/mock impoliteness is an expression of feelings and meanings that are the opposite of what the speaker feels and says. The following is one of the data contained in the audio recorder which is included in the sarcasm/mock Impoliteness strategy.

"oi binatang. Cepat cepat ko sedikit klo di suruh ko"

"hei you animal, hurry up"

The speaker made this comment because the interlocutor only talked to other people when the speaker asked the interlocutor for help. The speaker intends to give an expression that is considered humorous by saying animal

Withholds impoliteness

This strategy is an action that refers to the absence of politeness in the expected place. Like not saying thank you to someone who gave a gift. The following is one of the data contained in the audio recorder which is included in the withhold impoliteness strategy.

*"Thanks nah, hamper ma na pukull kak *****"*

"(Not Responding)"

*"Thanks, I almost get hit by *****"*

"(Not Responding)"

The sentence above explains that the speaker tried to express his gratitude to the person

he was talking to, but the person he was talking to did not respond to the speaker's thanks. For this reason, this sentence can be included in withhold.

2. The analysis of factors impoliteness

Table 2. Total number and Percentage the factors impoliteness

Factors of Impoliteness	f	%
Sosial status	2	25%
Age difference	-	0%
Gender difference	1	12,5%
Social distance or familiarity	5	62,5%
Situation	-	0%
Total		100%

Source: Data processing result, 2024

DISCUSSION

After analyzing 22 recordings, researchers found five impoliteness strategies, namely bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withhold impoliteness, with the most common impoliteness strategy used in student social interactions at UIM is sarcasm or mock impoliteness. The researcher also found three factors causing impoliteness in student interactions on the UIM campus, namely social status, gender differences, and social distance or familiarity, with social distance or familiarity being the most dominant factor. The results of this study are compared with previous studies by Harahap (2022), and Chintiabela (2017), which also used Culpeper's impoliteness strategy. The difference is that this research focuses on social interaction. Based on the comparison, the researcher concluded that impoliteness does not only occur in social reality but also in movies and social media as entertainment and learning. Impoliteness contains many meanings, which are divided into five categories. This research aims to examine social phenomena that are often overlooked, such as language that was previously considered taboo is now a habit in everyday life, the impact of which is caused by our lack of attention to these changes.

CONCLUSION

This study investigates impoliteness in the context of students' social interaction at UIM. From the data analysis, it can be concluded that there are five impoliteness strategies used by UIM students, namely bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mocking politeness, and withhold impoliteness. In addition, there are three factors that cause impoliteness, namely social status, gender differences, and social distance or familiarity, while age differences and situations are not factors that cause impoliteness

in this study.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktek. (No Title)*.
- Austin, J. L., Urmson, J. O., & Sbisà, M. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words: Second Edition*. Harvard University Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=V43VS07TGEMC>
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction. Jo hn Benjamims*.
- Brown, P. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chintiabela, G. (2017). A Pragmatic Analysis of impoliteness Strategies in Carrie Movie. *Sastra Inggris-Quill*, 6(1), 79-86.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. *Language Power and Social Process*, 21, 17.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Pantheon.
- Goli, Y. S., Ye, J., Ye, Y., & Kalgora, B. (2020). Impact of ecological related innovations enhancing the efficiency of corporate environmental responsibility. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 10(01), 191.
- Harahap, F. (2022). *Impoliteness In The E-News Social Media Comment Section: A Descriptive Study. Unpublished Dissertation. Medan: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara*. <http://repository.umsu.ac.id/handle/123456789/18951>.
- Locher, M. A., & Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness and power in language'dalam Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mugford, G. (2008). How rude! Teaching impoliteness in the second-language classroom. *ELT journal*, 62(4), 375-384.
- Omar, Z. K. (2012). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Some of Harold Pinter's Plays. *Journal of AL Anbar University for Language and Literature*(8).
- Piskorska, A. (2013). *Relevance Theory: More than Understanding*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=jL0wBwAAQBAJ>
- Primadianti, N. (2015). A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS IN PARANORMAN MOVIE. *Sastra Inggris-Quill*, 4(3), 215-222.
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Tri Sanjaya, W. (2023). *An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategy in Cruella Film 2021 UNIVERSITAS JAMBI*.
- Umi Zuhriyah (2024). *The Deadly West Nile Virus Outbreak in Israel and WHO Explanation*
- Warsidi, W., Syakila, S. N., & Dahniar, D. (2023). Illocutionary Speech Acts in Oprah Winfrey's Motivational Speech: A Pragmatic Study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Yaniar, D. (2017). *Impoliteness strategies in pitch perfect and pitch perfect 2 movies*
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. OUP Oxford. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=E2SA8ao0yMAC>