



Students' Impoliteness Strategy During Online Learning in Covid-19 Pandemic

Lenggar Berryl Permana; Sarwiji Suwandi; Budhi Setiawan

Indonesian Language Education Master Program, Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i12.3184>

Abstract

Politeness is a societal norm and a special strategy applied by humans to facilitate and maintain the sustainability of their social relationships. The opposite condition of the concept of politeness is impoliteness. If politeness maintains the continuity of human social relations, then impoliteness can cause disturbances, misunderstandings, and damage to social relations that affect the ideal conditions of social harmony. This study aims to explain the impoliteness strategies used by MTS Ma'arif Andong students in online learning through the *WhatsApp* application. The research method used in this research is descriptive qualitative research method. The data is the speech of students' impoliteness via *WhatsApp*. The data source of this research is a document in the form of a screenshot of a class *WhatsApp* group conversation. Data triangulation was used to test the validity of the data in this study. Data analysis is done by interpreting the data that has been collected. The results of the study found eight impolite speeches that matched the impoliteness strategy by Culpeper (2005). From the five impoliteness strategies, four impoliteness strategies were found that match the data, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness

Keywords: *Impoliteness; Online Learning; Covid-19 Pandemic*

Introduction

Politeness is a special strategy used by humans with the aim of fostering the continuity of human relationships and minimizing certain actions to others. Politeness is something that is universal, even though politeness itself is expressed differently in each culture. In addition to the differences in the lexicon in each language, there are differences in how to conceptualize the world and the relationships between individuals in speech communities (as well as virtual communities and networks). Politeness is considered very important and becomes a norm in society that must be applied when interacting with other people. It is known that politeness is fundamental to human communication which can regulate social interactions and enable smooth and easy communication, as well as avoid interpersonal problems and build close relationships (Leech, 2014). Failure to convey politeness appropriately can lead to difficulties in social interactions, misunderstandings, and even conflicts, both within and across cultural contexts (Kecskes, 2015).

Within the scope of pragmatics, there are main rules of competence that need to be obeyed. According to Lakoff (1973) there are two rules, namely being clear and being polite or courteous.

Conditions that oppose or contradict the rules of pragmatic competence are called impoliteness. Politeness is a deviation from what is understood as politeness, and basically has a confrontational nature and disrupts social harmony (Yus, 2011). Culpeper (2011) defines impoliteness as a negative attitude towards certain behaviors that occur in certain contexts. The behavior had at least one or was deemed to have had emotional consequences for at least one participant, i.e. caused or was deemed to have caused the offence. In line with this opinion, Haugh, (2014) explains that interactional practices in which someone implies something and thus cause impoliteness, it can be referred to as impolite implicatures. Implicatures of impoliteness may seem “unintentional”, but one can identify them as “genuine” impoliteness. Based on this, Kasper (1990) proposed a classification of impoliteness into two types, namely unmotivated impoliteness and motivated impoliteness. This unmotivated impoliteness refers to a person's failure to follow the rules of politeness due to his ignorance. Unlike the previous types of impoliteness which were caused by ignorance, motivated impoliteness is done intentionally. In this case, the speaker consciously wants his speech to be interpreted as impolite.

Talking about human social interaction, the COVID-19 pandemic that erupted in early 2020 around the world had a major impact on human life. Transmission through small droplets from the mouth and nose makes the risk of transmission to others easier. If seen from this, the basic prevention that can be done is to always maintain cleanliness and carry out physical distancing. The existence of this physical distance gives rise to social restrictions, because humans as social beings always carry out social activities, which always interact with other humans to meet their needs. Therefore, social restrictions can be interpreted as urgent actions that must be taken by formal leaders to stop or slow down the speed of a highly contagious disease, in this case the corona virus (COVID-19) (Kemenkes, 2020). highly contagious disease, in this case the corona virus (COVID-19) (Ministry of Health, The actions taken can minimize sick people having contact with healthy people so that their spread can be minimized.

One of the impacts of this change in the COVID-19 pandemic is a change in the learning process. In Indonesia, most of the learning in schools uses the face-to-face method in the process. However, the covid-19 pandemic requires teachers and students to switch to other methods, other than face-to-face because these methods have a high risk of spreading the corona virus. For this reason, the Indonesian government recommends the learning process using online methods. With today's technological sophistication, learning can still be done without face-to-face methods. Utilizing internet-based technology, teachers and students can still do learning even without face to face. Various popular platforms are used for online learning such as *Zoom*, *Google Classroom*, *Google Meet*, *Youtube*, to *WhatsApp*. Learning in this network shows how the language behavior of students in using social media is. However students not infrequently violate a lot of politeness in language even according to linguistic rules (Hadi & Nandari, 2020; Masyhuda, 2021). Whereas according to Chaer (2014: 63) explaining that following all grammatical rules is not enough, the use of language may not be accepted by society.

This phenomenon is motivated because digital communication (social media) which a new technology for humans, so that adults and children still do not understand fully about the new technology. For children, social media is considered as a world separated from the real world which is bound by norms, so that they are free to commit violations which are bound by norms in the real world. For adults, social media is a true-completely new thing, so an understanding of the impact-the negative impact that will occur because social media is still lacking. In fact, social media is the same as the real world that applies societal norms (Carolus, Muench, Schmidt, & Schneider, 2018; Savic, 2018). Locher, Bolander, & Höhn (2015) assert that interactions in digital and face-to-face communication are not even completely separable at a point because in many cases we cannot clearly separate the norms that interaction brings to the keyboard with emerging norms in online interactions.

This study examines the forms of language impoliteness of junior high school students in online learning. In this case the media in the network used is the *WhatsApp* short message application *WhatsApp* application has become the most common communication tool to reach people. As the most widely used

mobile instant messaging application, its use has spread all over the world. With the nature of synchronous and high-level multimodality, where users can not only send messages privately or in groups, this feature is also available to make calls or video calls, update status, comment on other people's status as well. This application is not only used for personal communication but has also become an alternative tool for communication in formal environments such as academics and business, in addition to e-mail (Pratama, 2019). This study uses a cyber-pragmatic review in its assessment. Yus (2011) explains that cyber-pragmatic are interested in analyzing how information is produced and interpreted in the internet environment, as well as how users access contextual information to fill the informative gap between what users type on the keyboard and what they actually want to communicate. The theory used to analyze impoliteness is Culpeper & Hardaker (2017). Culpeper proposes a politeness strategy, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, withhold politeness, and sarcasm or mock politeness

The relevant research was conducted by Flores-salgado & Castineira-benitez, (2018) with the title *The Use of Politeness in WhatsApp Discourse and Move "Requests"*. The purpose of the study was to analyze the verbal means of selecting politeness strategies in the speech act of asking, including its sequential position in *WhatsApp* chats used by Mexican Spanish speakers. The results of the study indicate that data analysis appears to be orienting towards independence rather than involvement. The independence strategy is realized by conventional indirect strategies, through the use of *poder modal* (can), second person plural, conditional, use of opening and closing, and structured alternation during interaction. Moreover, it implies the use of expected rules of social behavior that are appropriate for this digital community. This observation supports Watts (2003)'s notion of political behavior, which states that prior experience enables appropriate performance in examples of social practice. In other words, the members of this group establish communication norms to maintain social relations and achieve communicative goals.

Another relevant research is the research conducted by Samosir (2019) entitled *Politeness of the WhatsApp Language of Students to Lecturers of Indonesian Language Education Study Program at Indraprasta University, PGRI*. This study aims to analyze student *WhatsApp* messages to students who apply the principle of politeness and violate the principle of politeness, analyze based on the maxim of wisdom, maxim of generosity, maxim of appreciation, maxim of humility, maxim of consensus, maxim of sympathy. Next, interpret each application and violation of the principle of courtesy. The results of the study indicate that students of Indraprasta University PGRI in communicating with lecturers have used the principle of politeness by applying the six maxims that have been explained.

Research Method

This study uses a qualitative approach to find out behavior, perspectives, and impolite actions by students through *WhatsApp*. Qualitative research collects data by examining documents, observing behavior or interviewing participants (Creswell, 2014). The qualitative approach in this study is represented in the interpretation analysis. The analysis was conducted based on the author's interpretation and combined with five impoliteness strategies by Culpeper & Hardaker (2017). This study uses documents which are messages sent by MTS students Ma'arif Andong in the class *WhatsApp* group during online learning. The data in this study is the impolite language used in student communication with the teacher during the learning process in the *WhatsApp* group. The data source in this study is the language used by students when sending messages in the class *WhatsApp* group. The data validity technique uses data source triangulation, source triangulation is used to test the credibility of the data by checking the data that has been obtained through several sources (Sugiyono, 2012). The analytical technique used in this study is an interactive model belonging to Miles, Huberman, dan Saldana (2014: 7) explaining that the steps in analyzing data with an interactive model can be carried out through four stages, namely "data collection, data reduction, presentation". data, and the last stage is to verify and draw a conclusion.

Results and Discussion

Based on the messages sent by students in the class *WhatsApp* group, results and discussions were obtained regarding the findings of data in language that was not polite to students in their communication with teachers during online learning. The findings of the data are ten data which are explained as follows.

Bald on Record Impoliteness

This model of impoliteness is the rudest and frank in showing impoliteness. In this model, the face threatening act (FTA) is carried out in a direct and clear way. Culpeper (2005) explains that in this mode the FTA is carried out in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise manner in circumstances where faces are irrelevant or minimized.

Data (1) MA: ?? G g g g paham dah gua (I don't know)

The context of the MA message is to comment on the introduction of someone who has just entered the class *WhatsApp* group. MA clearly said that he did not understand using very impolite language. Whereas in classroom learning situations, students must use polite language because the situation is formal. In this case, MA's impoliteness is shown in the use of question marks twice in starting 'the sentence, and the writing of the word 'g', the word means 'no' which is an abbreviation of the word 'nope' which is often used in adolescent slang. The use of the word 'gua' which means I is also an informal form of language because its use can only be used in casual situations. Especially in this case, the culture behind the students and teachers is Javanese culture which requires mentioning oneself to an older or respected interlocutor using pronouns in high-level languages (*eg kulo*). Although the language used is Indonesian, the use of the word 'gua' is not allowed in formal situations.

Data (2) A: *Aku ra mangkat bos eneng acara* (I didn't go bro! I have agenda)

In order to understand A's utterance which clearly tells that he deliberately does not participate in an activity, it is necessary to know the context first. The context that accompanies A's speech is that a direct collection of assignments is held at one of his friends' houses. In this case, as a student, collecting schoolwork is a top priority. In online learning, the only thing missing is their physical presence, so their obligations as students to take part in learning, do assignments, and collect assignments are still there. Physical absence directly at school does not mean a holiday. Based on A's speech, it can be seen that A consciously participates in other activities compared to collecting his assignments. It has exposed impoliteness in a very clear way.

Positive Impoliteness

The next model of impoliteness is positive impoliteness. The aim of this strategy is to undermine the wishes of the recipient's positive face. In this case the concrete forms that are done to damage such as ignoring others, excluding others from an activity, not being interested, not caring, being unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, using unclear or secret language, seeking disapproval, using words - taboo words, calling other names (Culpeper, 2005).

Data (3) M: *Sebelumnya maaf ya pak kalau kasih pertanyaan daring jangan terlalu banyak. Beda tatap muka sama daring. Karena pelajaran lainnya juga ada* (Sorry Sir before, if you give questions, do not give too much questions. It is different between online learning and offline school, there are another subjects)

Based on M's speech, it found the interesting things from him because there is one participant who shows his disapproval of the other participants. The context in M's speech is the response given after the teacher gives assignments to students. The reason given by M does not make sense, M as a student does have the right to file a complaint with the teacher if something happens, for example regarding the

value of the test results that are not appropriate. However, in this case, M filed a complaint about the number of assignments given too much and could not be equated with face-to-face learning directly. Again, in online learning only physical presence is absent, while other aspects such as assignments, learning, and teaching remain and are not greatly affected. M's argument stating that there are too many assignments when learning online may be a natural thing to complain about, but it is considered inappropriate. The second argument of M which states that other lessons also have assignments is also illogical, because under normal circumstances (not in online learning) other lessons also continue to provide assignments because they are part of the learning process.

Data (4) *MM: Durung garap salong Bu ono sing bolong* (I haven't finished it yet Mam, there are blank answers)

MM's statement above is also a form of response to other participants. In the context of this MM speech, it is when a teacher reminds him of the tasks that must be done and the time of collection. Based on the MM speech, it shows an act of neglect or not caring. The utterance is considered positive because MM has responded to the speech of the interlocutor, but the content of the speech is considered impolite because it means ignoring the speech of the interlocutor, MM's speech also has a double meaning. Besides MM giving a response to the interlocutor so that it seems to pay attention, on the other hand the speech also ignores the speech of the interlocutor.

Negative Impoliteness

This model of impoliteness also aims to undermine the wishes of the recipient's positive face. Based on the opinion of Culpeper (2005), behaviors that can be viewed as negative impoliteness are to frighten, demean, ridicule or laugh at, insulting, not treating others seriously, belittling others, invading other people's space (literally or metaphorically), literally explicitly associating others with negative aspects, and noting the debts of others.

Data (5) *Y: Urung tangi tolol! Tangiku jam 11 nek ora jam 12* (I haven't woken up stupid! I woke up around 11 or 12)

The context of message Y is to answer someone's suggestion regarding a set meeting time to collect assignments. Y's utterance can be identified easily as impoliteness, it is shown in the use of the word 'stupid' which is a form of insulting. So that Y's speech can be classified as negative impoliteness. The behavior of insulting someone using harsh words can interfere with social relations between individuals. In fact, if you look at the conversations that occur, the suggestions put forward by the interlocutor are not bad because they suggest 9 o'clock, which in Indonesian perception is a reasonable time to start an activity. Through Y's speech, it can reflect that Y does not have an attitude of respect for (in this case his classmate). In addition, the use of harsh words in formal forums (schools) is an act of disrespect and violates the rules.

Data (6) *M: Kepruk ndasmu* (I broke your head)

M's speech is clearly very offensive. M's speech can be interpreted as a threatening act that aims to frighten. This behavior is no longer called impoliteness, but rude. The context that accompanies the speech is that there is someone who responds to the teacher's speech about the task by using language that is less polite. M personally disagreed with the move and expressed his disapproval with threats. Even though his interlocutor behaved impolitely, it did not justify M to reply to him with similar behavior, even worse. This can create conflict between the two and interfere with smooth communication going forward. In addition, acts of threat at a serious level can be considered a crime that can be subject to criminal law.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

This model is said to be unique because of its insincerity which does not indicate directly stating the true meaning. Mock in this strategy model is closer to sarcasm, which does not directly 'attack' like mocking in the negative impoliteness strategy. The difference between the two may be difficult to understand. In this strategy, the impoliteness that occurs is not shown clearly but rather refers to something that is indirect. The speaker seems to be saying something ordinary but actually the statement may have another meaning to attack the recipient indirectly. Culpeper (2005) also explains that FTAs are carried out using a politeness strategy which is clearly not sincere in its implementation, thus only being realized on the surface

Data (7) C: *Iyain dah. Ssstt... bu guru pak guru lagi bobok ngko nak diseneni* (Just say yes, sstt... Teachers are sleeping you'll be scolded)

The message that C sent superficially was seen as polite behavior telling his friends that the teachers were taking a break. The context that emerges from C's speech is that there is a debate in the class *WhatsApp* group regarding the gathering place for group study. C realized that the debate was not in the right place and time, so he quickly showed his agreement to stop the debate immediately. The object of C's sarcasm is his friends. The form of sarcasm is shown in the utterance in Javanese, namely "*bu guru pak guru lagi bobok ngko nak diseneni*" which means 'teachers are sleeping, you'll be scolded'. On the surface, C's utterance only conveys information about the teachers who are currently taking a break, but the implied meaning shows that his friends are too noisy and tell them to be quiet

Data (8) Z: *Assalamualaikum pak tek dereng enten tugas bahasa indonesia?* (Assalamualaikum Sir, why there is no Indonesian language assignment?)

At a glance, Z's utterance seems to have a positive meaning, namely asking the teacher for an assignment. Asking the teacher for assignments is a student's right and is considered polite behavior. However, if you look at the context, the real meaning can be seen clearly. The context that occurs in Z's speech is that time has entered for Indonesian language subjects, but teachers who are usually consistent in giving assignments, currently have not given assignments. The real meaning of Z's utterance is a satire to his Indonesian teacher who is late in giving assignments, even though they are usually punctual in that case. The utterance of Z can be traced to the possibility why it was spoken. Z may have been annoyed with his Indonesian teacher for his punctuality in giving assignments, which he did not expect and made him unhappy

Withhold Politeness

After conducting the research, the authors did not find any participants who did this strategy. A possible reason is that this strategy can only be used in spoken interactions. Politeness acts such as gratitude are not found in students' speech. This may be because the function of the class *WhatsApp* group is more task-oriented rather than relationship-oriented so this impoliteness model does not appear. Culpeper (2005) provides an example of this model, namely the absence of thanks when someone gets a gift. Based on this, it can be seen the basic difference between tasks and rewards. A gift is something that is given to someone for nothing with the intention of pleasing the interlocutor, while a task is a thing that is ordered to be completed. Apart from the rules of politeness, no one will thank you after being ordered (in this case doing or doing a task). Therefore, the students did not feel happy and did not find it necessary to say thank you for the assignments given by the teacher.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and data analysis that has been carried out, it can be concluded that the utterances of MTS Ma'arif Andong students in the class *WhatsApp* group during online learning show impoliteness in speech. This is evidenced by the fulfillment of the four impoliteness strategies. Politeness strategies that appear in the students' speech are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. While, the withhold politeness strategy is not found in students' speech because the class *WhatsApp* group is more oriented towards giving assignments so that students feel no need to show gratitude, basically they do assignments because of coercion or orders not based on their own volition.

References

- Carolus, A., Muench, R., Schmidt, C., & Schneider, F. (2018). Impertinent Mobiles-Effects of Politeness and Impoliteness in Human-Smartphone Interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.12.030>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design_ Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches-SAGE Publications (2013).pdf*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in The Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 35–72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp. 199–255). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7>
- Flores-salgado, E., & Castineira-benitez, T. A. (2018). The Use of Politeness in *WhatsApp* Discourse and Move “Requests.” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 133, 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.06.009>
- Hadi, M. S., & Nandari, R. (2020). Online Learning dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Kelas VIII C pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. In *Penguatan Kapasitas dan Kolaborasi Penelitian serta Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat pasca Pandemi Covid-19* (pp. 1–8).
- Haugh, M. (2014). *Im/Politeness Implicatures. Im/Politeness Implicatures*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110240078>
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 14(Issue 2), 193–218. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037821669090080W>
- Kecskes, I. (2015). Intercultural Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.023>
- Kemenkes. (2020). Apakah “social distancing” itu? Retrieved November 2, 2021, from <http://www.padk.kemkes.go.id/health/read/2020/03/19/15/apakah-social-distancing-itu.html>
- Lakoff, R. T. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your p’s and q’s. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.

- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Locher, M. A., Bolander, B., & Höhn, N. (2015). Introducing relational work in facebook and discussion boards. *Pragmatics*, 25(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.25.1.01loc>
- Masyhuda, H. M. (2021). Kesantunan Berbahasa Siswa Dalam Media Sosial Pada Pembelajaran Daring Bahasa Indonesia di Madrasah Aliyah NU Gondang Sragen. In *SEMANTIKS* (pp. 283–290).
- Pratama, H. (2019). *Linguistic Politeness in Online Communication*. Semarang: LPPM Universitas Semarang. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337153463>
- Samosir, A. (2019). Kesantunan Bahasa *WhatsApp* Mahasiswa Terhadap Dosen Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia di Universitas Indraprasta PGRI. *Akrab Juara*, 4(2).
- Savic, M. (2018). Lecturer Perceptions of Im/Politeness And In/Appropriateness In Student E-Mail ,Requests : A Norwegian Perspective *124*, 52–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.12.005>
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & d*. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated Communication in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).