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**INTRODUCTION**

Communication has an important role in human social life. Language politeness is the main basis for building harmonious relationships between individuals. However, in recent times, there has been an alarming phenomenon related to the deviation of language politeness among students. This phenomenon reflects a change in communication attitudes that can jeopardize social interactions and affect the quality of relationships between individuals in the school environment.

Students from different levels of education often engage in speech or behavior that does not adhere to the norms of language politeness. This happens to victims of bullying the detiksulsel daily reported that a student was bullied by his friend in three forms Verbal, social media, and physical (Bayu, 2023). Not only that, data on bullying victims are shown in the PISA report that 2 out of 3 girls or boys aged 13-17 years have experienced at least one type of violence during their lifetime, and 3 out of 4 children and adolescents who have experienced one or more types of violence report that the perpetrators of violence are friends or their age (Unicef, 2017). The data shows that bullying cases are already at an alarming stage. In addition, the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) reported that there were 4,124 complaints related to child protection cases during January-November 2022. This number decreased by 30.7% compared to 5,953 complaints in 2021 (Ayu, 2022).

Based on the data above, it can be obtained that the neglect of politeness norms can manifest in the use of abusive language, mockery, intimidation, or other inappropriate behavior. The impact of this phenomenon raises concerns because it can damage social structures and disrupt a conducive learning atmosphere. The existence of language politeness deviations among students can be influenced by various specific factors. The advancement of information technology and the use of social media also contribute to the spread of impolite speech among students. In addition, social environment, popular culture, and peer association also influence students' communication behavior.

The deviation of language politeness not only hurts the victimized students but also influences the whole school environment. Such impacts include conflict, decreased motivation to learn, impaired emotional well-being, and losses in the formation of personality and social values. Therefore, it is important to recognize students' language politeness deviation as a problem that requires serious attention. With a deeper understanding of this phenomenon, appropriate preventive and intervention measures can be taken to improve students' communication behavior, promote a positive culture of language politeness, and create a safe, inclusive, and harmonious school environment.

Research on language politeness deviations has been done. Anwar (Anwar, 2018) on the form of impoliteness is followed by the perspective of impoliteness (Hamidah, 2020). Prasetya found 17 violations of the principle of language politeness committed by students against teachers in Balikpapan City (Prasetya et al., 2022). This research is similar to Husni's research, with the subject of research on Dayak ethnic youth (Syafutri et al., 2023). Adib (Kharisma, 2023) examined the misconduct in e-news social media comments. The purpose of this study was to look at the incivility in the comments section of E-News social media by using Culpeper's theory. This theory was also used in Saz's research (Saz-rubio, 2023) to analyze impoliteness. Hermawan analyzed the forms of impoliteness in Javanese and Batak languages (Hermawan, 2022), Hadi politeness, and impoliteness in movies (Hadi et al., 2022). Umair examines the speech of former Muslims on social media in the form of speech that contains language politeness deviations (Hashmi et al., 2022). Language impoliteness in social media (Teneketzi, 2022), and examines the strategy of impoliteness in films (Rudianto et al., 2023). The most recent research in 2023 on impoliteness is research on creative impoliteness researched by Marta (Andersson, 2023).

The purpose of this study is to describe the strategies and phenomena of students' language politeness deviation in Makassar. The benefit of the research is that with a better understanding of the phenomenon of violations of students' language politeness, it is hoped that appropriate preventive and intervention measures can be taken to minimize forms of language impoliteness. The formulation of the problems in this study are 1) how is the strategy of deviation of students' language politeness; and 2) How is the phenomenon of students' language politeness deviation strategy?

Every communication interaction between writers and readers expects fluency in communication. The fluency of communication does not only depend on structural linguistic elements but also must pay attention to the principles of language use by writers and readers. By paying attention to the principles of politeness in language use, the intended message can be easily received by the interlocutor. However, along with the development of science, criticisms of language politeness began to arise, forcing experts to expand the horizons of this study. Therefore, the postmodern approach of politeness theory emerged (Djalilova, 2023). Politeness theory was developed by experts, one of whom is Culpeper. Culpeper's theory is the opposite of politeness theory (Hassan et al., 2023).

According to Anwar, impoliteness is related to the emotions of speakers and interlocutors (Anwar et al., 2020). The emotions of speakers and interlocutors can affect the quality of one's language. As also explained by Culpeper. According to Culpeper, impoliteness can be defined as communication behavior intended to attack the target's face or make the target feel that way (Jonathan, 2008). This definition emphasizes that the act of impoliteness depends on the speaker's intention, the understanding of the speech partner, and the relationship between the two. In other words, an action can be considered impolite if the speech partner feels that the speaker has damaged or lost their face and shows a threatening action. Also added by Culpeper (2011: 38), threats to face will naturally be retaliated against, and the person whose face is attacked will feel justified to counterattack, which can be seen as a "reciprocal" impoliteness among the interactants (Gao & Liu, 2023).

In communication, there is a close relationship between the concepts of impoliteness and politeness that cannot be separated. Thompson & Agyekum Impoliteness is not only the opposite of politeness but also reflects uncooperative attitudes, disagreement, and reciprocal antipathy through certain communicative actions that show a lack of respect (Acheampong et al., 2021). This impoliteness in question is the existence of language politeness deviations. In other words, a good understanding of incivility will also help speakers understand the concept of politeness. Incivility only arises when speakers violate the principles of politeness in communication (Suwignyo et al., 2021). Impoliteness is an act of breaking the rules that have been applied in society in social behavior (Gustiani et al., 2022).

Also added by Bousfield (2008: 72), impoliteness is a form of unreasonable communication that is intentionally carried out and results in verbal conflict that threatens personal integrity. Bousfield also states that incivility can be considered impoliteness if the speaker's intention to "offend" or damage must be understood by the party in the role of the recipient. The term "face" or "face" can be interpreted as an individual's feelings about self-esteem or self-image (Bousfield, D., 2008). This is in line with Brown and Levinson's interpretation of "face" arises thanks to the use of this term introduced in the 1980s and 1990s, which at the time was pioneering in the thinking of linguists and pragmatists. Their theory of politeness had a significant impact, and as of the writing of this article, the most commonly used way of understanding the concept of face is still tied to the theoretical framework they developed (O’Driscoll, 2017).

According to Rohmadi (2010:126), sometimes a writer or speaker deliberately violates the principles of language use. Violation of the principles of language use indicates a certain intention that the speaker wants to achieve. If the speaker does not have a specific purpose or purpose for the violation, then the communication between the speaker and the interlocutor will experience obstacles. The principle of politeness generally regulates the way the speaker interacts to appreciate or respect the interlocutor. Several maxims must be considered by the speaker, such as the maxim of discretion, the maxim of compatibility, and the maxim of sympathy. Speakers who do not comply with the principle of politeness can be said to violate the maxims contained in the principle of politeness.

Culpeper categorizes impoliteness strategies into several categories. These categories are based on the concept of "face" in politeness theory proposed by Brown & Levinson (Culpeper, 1996). The following are some of the strategies included in the classification. First, there is the strategy of "Bald on record impoliteness" which is seen when the speaker deliberately attacks the face of the interlocutor without caring about the face or social relationship between the two. There is also the strategy of "Positive impoliteness" which is used when the speaker deliberately damages the positive face of the interlocutor. This strategy relates to the speaker's desire to be respected, appreciated, and prioritized. Furthermore, there is the "Negative impoliteness" strategy which is used to attack the negative face of the interlocutor. In this context, the speaker disturbs the interlocutor's comfort with actions such as insulting, criticizing, scaring, and the like. Then, there is the "Mock politeness" strategy which is a form of false politeness. The politeness shown is only an insinuation or insult to the interlocutor. Finally, there is the "Withhold politeness" strategy which occurs when the speaker intentionally or unintentionally does not show politeness in actions that should be done, such as not saying thank you when receiving something.

Bousfield defines incivility (Holmes & Schnurr, 2017). He explains that incivility refers to intentionally unplanned communication and face-threatening actions through deliberate verbal confrontation without specific boundaries, and/or with deliberate aggressive intent, a focus on the speaker's intention or intentionality is considered important in this context. The perspective we use to understand this relates to the speaker's intentional perception. Culpeper's definition of incivility considers both the speaker's and listener's perceptions of intentionality: Incivility occurs when: (1) the speaker intentionally communicates to attack the face, or (2) the hearer perceives the behavior as a deliberate attempt at attacking the face, or it could be a combination of (1) and (2). However, there is another approach to incivility that does not rely entirely on intentionality.

Culpeper's updated definition can be explained as follows: Incivility refers to a negative attitude towards certain behaviors that occur in certain contexts. These attitudes are rooted in expectations, desires, and/or beliefs about social order, including how a person's or group's image is affected by interactions with others. Behavior is considered negative - called 'disrespectful' - if it conflicts with behavioral expectations, behavioral aspirations, and/or views of what is considered appropriate behavior. Such behavior always elicits or is perceived to elicit an emotional reaction for at least one of the participants involved, that is, it triggers or is perceived to trigger feelings of annoyance. This definition is designed to avoid the mistakes of previous definitions that focused too much on the speaker's views and the role of intention. However, the weakness of this definition is that it is very broad and does not provide a deep understanding of the variation within the phenomenon being described.

Culpeper states that impoliteness is the opposite of politeness. Impoliteness can arise from several factors that influence it, namely (1) the social relationship between speakers, (2) the social power of speakers, and (3) the intention of speakers. In the context of the social relationship between speakers, the closer the relationship between the two, the higher the possibility of impoliteness. Judging from social power, speakers with greater social power tend to be impolite towards speakers who have weaker social power. In terms of speakers' intentions, impoliteness occurs because there is an intention not to defend the face of the speech partner.

The function of incivility does not have a very clear definition. Culpeper has proposed three main functions of incivility: affective incivility, coercive incivility, and entertaining incivility (Culpeper, 2011). Affective incivility refers to the expression of strong emotions during a conversation. This can include emotional outbursts such as anger that aim to trigger negative feelings in the interlocutor.

Affective incivility is when a person explicitly conveys his or her anger to another person, using abusive and demeaning expressions. It damages the relationship and creates a negative emotional atmosphere between the speaker and the listener. It should be noted that incivility has an impact that can be very significant on social interaction and communication between individuals. For example, in the following example, a girl expresses her anger to a boy:

Girl: "Why did you do that to me, you're not as nice as you used to be?"

Boy: "I have to do this job until it's done."

In this situation, the girl uses an impolite expression to show her anger and dissatisfaction towards the boy.

Second, Coercive Impoliteness. The function of coercive impoliteness is the second. It is distressing to reconstruct the values between the providing party and the destination party, where the party making the good gets more or is reinforced, and this is hidden behind benefit (Culpeper, 2011). The terms provisioning party and destination party do not only apply to individuals but can also refer to specific groups or organizations. It is unexpected that although it seems to hurt or incite someone's anger, it can provide pleasure. Unlike other pragmatic experiments involving speakers and listeners, impoliteness can be organized similarly for both the listening audience and the intended audience.

For example:

Director: I need you to review this proposal in fifteen minutes.

Manager: I'm still reading the proposal you gave me yesterday.

Director: Didn't you hear me? Read the proposal I instructed you to now!

The impoliteness shown by the director is to reinforce his position as the superior in this example. As he has a higher position compared to his manager, he pressures his manager to submit to his orders by using his power."

Third, the incivility of entertaining. One of the main roles of incivility is to provide entertainment. The purpose or intent that an act of incivility, including the aspect of entertainment, may contain is to manage the role of the incivility. The victim or potential victim often has to interact with this incivility wholeheartedly. In the context of entertaining incivility, the recipient of such behavior creates entertainment for the listener and feels satisfaction in experiencing it. It is amazing that even though it may sometimes seem like it hurts or provokes others' emotions, incivility can provide a sense of pleasure. Different from other pragmatic experiments involving speakers and listeners, incivility can be directed similarly to both the listener and the target audience.

The following example displays humorous impoliteness. In a crowd, Girl A sarcastically comments on the dress worn by Girl B:

Girl A: You look stunning in your dress tonight.

Girl B: Thank you, very nice. I made it myself, you know.

Girl A: Right, right? I want something similar for my cat. I want to have one...

Overall, these three types of impoliteness share the conflicting functions of interpersonal relationships, identity, and social norms.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research is qualitative research with a descriptive research method. The researcher focuses on students in Makassar as the research subject. The research data is in the form of students' speech. The focus of this research is on impolite speech which is studied by sociopragmatic study using Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategy. The first step is to trace the phenomenon of violation of students' language politeness through literature review and case analysis. After the data is collected, a data analysis or compilation process is needed. Data analysis is the process of organizing data so that it is arranged systematically so that it can be interpreted. Activities in data analysis include data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing/verification.

**Research Design**

In this study, the phenomenological method was used as the main approach. Phenomenology is an approach that follows systematic, logical, and critical steps and tries to avoid prejudice. The main objective of this research is to develop and acquire new knowledge through the methodological process of phenomenology. This process consists of several stages, including observation of the politeness phenomenon, formulation of the research problem, data collection, data analysis, and preparation of the results report.

The first stage in the phenomenological method is to observe speech acts to understand the phenomena or symptoms that arise. Then, the second step involves formulating research problems based on the results of these observations. After that, researchers collect data through various methods, such as direct interaction with participants in speech events, interview techniques, and recording. Interviews were used to gain a deeper understanding of the speech act phenomenon from the speakers' point of view.

The researcher designed the steps of the research procedure as follows. First, the researcher identified the phenomenon to be studied, namely speech events in Indonesian schools. The researcher directly observed the social phenomena that occurred in the school. Second, based on the observation, the researcher formulated relevant research questions. Furthermore, data on students' speech acts were collected through interviews and tapping techniques using interview instruments. After the data were collected, they were transcribed and analyzed. The researcher identified the forms and phenomena of politeness from the collected speech event data. Data validity and reliability were verified to ensure the accuracy of the research results. Finally, the research results are summarized in the final report.

**Instrument**

The research instrument used in this research is the researcher as the main instrument. This is because the researcher as a tool is sensitive and can react to any environmental stimulus that must be estimated to be meaningful or not for research. Because the data is to be taken in the form of speech from the results of student conversations, the research instruments are in the form of interview guidelines, interview guidelines, recording devices, cameras, and stationery.

**Data analysis**

The data analysis process involves data sorting activities. Sorting is done to ensure that the data is obtained accurately. The next step is the organization of the selected data. The data is organized according to the context of speech and time. The data is then synthesized with theoretical concepts, looking for important patterns, and exploring information that can be conveyed to others. In the data analysis stage, researchers also need to include their experiences during the data collection process (horizontalization). Through reflection on this experience, the researcher recognizes her reflection. Next, the researcher provides a detailed explanation of the statements in the experience by summarizing them into clusters of meaning.

This clustering process consists of two stages, namely the textual description stage and the structural description stage. In the textual description stage, the explanation focuses on the individual experience, while in the structural description stage, the researcher explains how the phenomenon or speech event is experienced by the individual. At this stage, the researcher analyzes the deeper meaning of the phenomenon, taking into account various factors, including social aspects. The final step involves presenting the research results by following a standard scientific writing format.

The process of compiling the analysis involves several steps, namely: 1. presenting a description of personal experiences related to the phenomenon under investigation; 2. listing statements that are considered important; 3. selecting these important statements and grouping them into units of meaning or themes; 4. developing a textual description (describing what was experienced) of the participant's experience; 5. presenting a structural description (how the experience occurred).

 **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Research Findings**

Based on the data collected, it was found that students used three impoliteness strategies, namely direct impoliteness (bald on record impoliteness), positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness.When the author(s) needs to present tables or figures, please see Table 1 and Figure 1.

Table 1

Findings of Students' Language Impoliteness Strategies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Form of speech** | **Result** | **Pattern** |
| 1. | Bald on record impoliteness | The speaker intends to mock or satirize the interlocutor. | 1.1 |
| 2. | Positive impoliteness | Ignoring the other person and lacking sympathy | 2.1 |
| 3. | Negative impoliteness | Scaring the other person | 2.2 |

**Discussion**

1. Direct Impoliteness (bald on record impoliteness)

The first impoliteness strategy is Bald on record impoliteness or what is called direct impoliteness and is deliberately used to attack speech partners because speakers do not maintain speech partner relationships. The strategy used is that the speaker intends to mock or satirize the interlocutor.

(1) Student A: See who's coming?

(2) Student B: It's your subscription!

This situation occurs in class when entering the first lesson hour. In data (1) Student A sees the arrival of his friend who comes late to class. He wanted to reprimand his friend by asking in speech 1, even though he already knew who was often late for class. Then this direct impoliteness was reinforced by student B who told his friend who came that he was regularly late. This indicates that student B delivered his speech directly in front of the interlocutor without paying attention to the face of the student who was late.

2. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is most often used in students' speech. The action taken is by ignoring the interlocutor and not having sympathy.

(3) Student A: "My assignments are not finished yet?"

(4) Student B:" Leave it alone!

In data (3), there is a marker of language politeness deviation, namely positive impoliteness. The location is in the garden in front of the class during break time. Student A said that his assignments had not been completed. The intention is that the speaker wants the interlocutor to help complete his assignments. However, the interlocutor shows impoliteness by ignoring the speaker's intention. This shows that the interlocutor uses impoliteness that makes the speaker offended or does not want to expect to be helped by the interlocutor.

(5) Student A: Did you see him today?"

(6) Student B: Who are you? Most painful!

Data (6) shows the presence of positive impoliteness markers by ignoring the speaker by ignoring the speaker's intention. Student B said "Most painful". This utterance intends for the interlocutor to ignore his friend. Student B thinks that the word "he" in data (5) is often absent from class because he often makes a lot of excuses and does not go to class.

(7) STUDENT A: Tomorrow there is a morning run, come along!

(8) STUDENT B : Lazy ah, better I sleep

Data (8) indicates positive impoliteness by ignoring the interlocutor's intention. This is reflected in the word "lazy ah" which means not accepting the invitation of the interlocutor with words that can offend the interlocutor.

3. Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is characterized by committing impoliteness by offending the interlocutor. Deviations of politeness found based on student speech data are obtained in two forms, namely impoliteness by scaring the interlocutor Student A: Let's finish it right away!

Student B: Later, the deadline for submitting the assignment is still long

Student: Don't you want to come? If not we'll just be the two of us

The location of the speech event occurred in the school library. There were three students. At that time the group leader was working on a group assignment. Student A is inviting Student B to immediately do the group assignment with him. However, student B refused the class leader's invitation by saying that the task collection was still long. The impoliteness lies in data (11), the speaker frightens the interlocutor by saying "If not we will only be alone". The meaning of the utterance is that if the interlocutor does not want to accept his order to do his assignment, then he is excluded from the group. Of course, this is a statement of student A's consequence if his order or invitation is not carried out which makes the interlocutor feel afraid. After the interview, student B was too lazy to do the assignment so the group leader gave the speech.

Chart 1.

Findings of the Phenomenon of Language Impoliteness



Based on chart 1 above, the phenomenon of students' language politeness deviation can be explained as follows. The phenomenon is found in the form of an impoliteness strategy realized directly in pattern 1.1. Speakers say their intentions without pleasantries or do not intend not to offend people. The speaker directly conveyed his intention which could make the interlocutor by saying "Your subscription". In pattern 2.1, it is explained that the speaker conveys his intention based on the age of the interlocutor. student B said that because student B considered the interlocutor to be the same age as him he freely released his speech. However, it is still considered offensive to the interlocutor. Pattern 2.2, the speaker conveys the meaning of the speech with a relaxed situation or atmosphere. The purpose of his speech is that he does not accept the invitation of the interlocutor to be invited to join the morning run. This means that impoliteness deviation can occur in a relaxed atmosphere. Pattern 3.1, speech findings were obtained in the library. The speaker and the interlocutor are talking about group assignments. The deviation of politeness when the speaker gives a threat to the interlocutor with the aim that the speaker's intention can be done by the interlocutor.

In the direct impoliteness strategy, students use speech that aims to tease or ridicule the interlocutor without regard to social relations. An example of this strategy is when student A asks, "Who's here?" and student B answers by saying, "Of course, you're the one who's often late!" Positive impoliteness is a common strategy used by students, where they ignore the interlocutor and show no empathy. For example, when student A expresses, "I haven't finished my assignments yet," and student B responds by saying, "Leave it alone!" This strategy shows that student B does not pay attention to student A's intentions and wishes.

Meanwhile, negative impoliteness is characterized by using speech that intimidates the interlocutor. For example, when student A invited student B to complete the assignment, student B refused by saying, "The assignment collection is still long, just wait. Do you want to come or not? If not, we'll do it together." This strategy makes interlocutors feel afraid because there is a threat of consequences if they do not follow the order or invitation.

Based on the results of the research on students' language politeness deviation, it can be seen in Table 1 and Chart 1 that various types of speech violate politeness, as well as patterns that appear in the strategy of impoliteness. For example, pattern 1.1 shows the use of direct impoliteness, pattern 2.1 shows impoliteness based on age difference, pattern 2.2 shows impoliteness in a relaxed atmosphere, and pattern 3.1 shows the use of impoliteness by using threats. Thus, this study provides an understanding of the various strategies and forms of impoliteness used by students in their speech acts which can be taken into consideration in the development of more polite learning and communication in the school environment.

The above presentation shows that there are three strategies used in students' impoliteness, namely directly, positively, and negatively. This research is inversely proportional to the study of impoliteness conducted on English language learners in Iraq (Ali Qassim & Fadhel Abbas, 2022). The result of this study is that English language learners in Iraq use the strategy of impoliteness indirectly. This shows that each country uses different impoliteness strategies in expressing its dislike for something or its interlocutors.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the discussion above, it is found that the student's language politeness deviation strategies are carried out using three strategies namely direct impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness strategies. The phenomenon found is the strategy of impoliteness by using four forms, namely delivering impolite speech directly, speech uttered based on consideration of the interlocutor, considering the location, and the situation of the conversation between the speaker and the interlocutor. With a better understanding of the phenomenon of violations of students' language politeness, it is hoped that appropriate preventive and intervention measures can be taken to improve students' language politeness..
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