Impoliteness Triggers and Strategies in Students' Complaints: A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis

Mark Aaron A. Dacalanio[1]✉, Shine M. Cani[2], Grachelle T. Osiba[3], Christian Jay O. Syting[4]
[1234] *College of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines*
✉ email: m.dacalanio.477831@umindanao.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This socio-pragmatic study aimed to unearth the impolite triggers and strategies used in students' complaints extracted from 100 online student complaints. Using Culpeper's Impoliteness Theory (1996, 2011, 2016), the study identified various impoliteness triggers, namely conventionalized and non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers. The former includes pointed criticisms, condescension, insults, unpalatable questions, dismissals, message enforcers, threats, silencers, negative expressives, redundant patterning, and fighting words. On the other hand, the latter involves non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, which involve form-driven and bald-on-record impoliteness, red herrings, convention-driven impoliteness, rhetorical questions, and inflammatory expressions. In terms of impoliteness strategies, the study found the use of bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness, with withhold impoliteness not observed in the online context. Understanding the linguistic patterns of impolite complaints in online contexts can help formulate strategies to mitigate conflict and promote more constructive interaction among students. This study may provide valuable insights for improving digital discourse and social interaction protocols.

Keywords: *complaints; impoliteness; social media; socio-pragmatic analysis, Philippines*

INTRODUCTION

Students expressing their complaints online is a common occurrence, yet many of these grievances are conveyed in an exceedingly impolite manner. These instances often involve the utilization of various illocutionary forces, including insults, fighting words, innuendo, pointed criticism, threats, sarcasm, and negative expressions, among others (Culpeper, 2016). These behaviors constitute negative discursive practices that have the potential to instigate the formation of negative social emotions and can lead to severe defamation. That is, someone else's personal dignity and social prestige and reputation are being compromised.

A study conducted by Wijayanto and Prasetyarini (2017) on EFL learners revealed that students express impolite complaints through insults, outrageous address

terms, swear words, direct criticisms, and threats. More so, Nikoobin and Shahrokhi (2017) in their study on Impoliteness in the Realization of Complaint Speech Acts among Iraninan EFL Learners found that students expressed complaints by using sarcasm, direct and unambiguous language, and positive-face threatening language.

Acheampong and Kwarteng's (2021) study highlighted the widespread use of bald-on-record and positive impoliteness strategies among students expressing complaints. These strategies, involving direct attacks through insults or offensive language, challenge established politeness frameworks (Wijayanto et al., 2017), reflecting a lack of consideration for maintaining the hearer's face or attending to others' interests. Additionally, the repetitive use of negative impoliteness strategies such as threats and unpalatable questions (Nikoobin & Shahrokhi, 2017) disrupts social harmony and civility expected in interactions, hindering constructive communication and problem resolution within educational settings. The reliance on impoliteness triggers like insults, dismissals, and condescension observed across different cultural contexts poses a significant challenge to effective student communication (Merzah & Abbas, 2020).

Furthermore, the utilization of unconventionalized impoliteness triggers such as red herrings or bald-on-record accusations (Merzah & Abbas, 2020; Xavierine, 2017) accentuates communication breakdowns among students. These triggers divert attention from core issues, resorting to direct accusations or logical fallacies, steering away from constructive dialogue. Moreover, the prevalence of form-driven impoliteness, witnessed in sarcasm or rhetorical questions (Nikoobin & Shahrokhi, 2017; Wijayanto et al., 2017), adds complexity to complaints, embedding passive-aggressive or indirect communication methods. This overreliance on impoliteness triggers and strategies impedes clear expression of grievances, undermining constructive discourse and conflict resolution within educational settings.

Despite the wealth of studies on impoliteness and complaints (Shahrokhi & Nikoobin, 2017; Wijayanto et al., 2017; Acheampong & Kwarteng, 2021), the context of social media remains largely unexplored. This study takes a unique approach by not only investigating impoliteness strategies but also delving into their associated triggers, a facet often overlooked in prior research. What sets this study apart is its inclusion of education agency announcements within the continuum of school-related complaints, enabling a thorough examination of diverse impoliteness triggers used by students, surpassing previous investigations. The urgency of this research stems from the prevalence of impolite language, such as insults, dismissals, threats, and condescension, which impede healthy communication among students, necessitating immediate interventions to foster a respectful dialogue within educational settings. Through its insightful analysis of impoliteness triggers, this study underscores the crucial need for interventions, signifying a significant step towards nurturing respectful communication among students.

Undoubtedly, the completion of this study sheds light on the instrumental role of discourse analysis in addressing real-world language use issues, particularly impoliteness in students' complaints, through pragmatic analysis. Its integration into

the curriculum signifies an evolution in approaches to resolving disputes and understanding language cues. Teachers and students are equipped with the means to unveil language clues, aiding in comprehending the sociolinguistic implications of impoliteness triggers and strategies used in complaints. Furthermore, this research illuminates various societal concerns such as aggression, abuse, bullying, and harassment, emphasizing their potential to cause emotional distress and, in severe cases, even lead to suicide. Culpeper (2016) underscores the multidimensional significance of this study, as its implications span across social psychology, sociology, conflict studies, history, media studies, and literary studies.

The primary purpose of this research was to conduct a pragmatic analysis to describe impoliteness within students' complaints. Specifically, the study aimed to characterize impoliteness triggers and associated impoliteness strategies prevalent in complaints. Through this investigation, the research sought to enhance understanding not only in the field of pragmatics but also from a sociolinguistic perspective, providing valuable insights into the language of complaints among students.

METHOD

In this section, the researchers outline the research design, materials, and data analysis.

Research design

This study employed a socio-pragmatic analysis. This concerns on the way people use language in the different social aspects (Culpeper, 2011). Similarly, Leech (1983) added that it can be studied in more general pragmatics meaning where it was found as the best way to study the features of language appropriately. In this study, the researchers focus on the impoliteness dimensions, and the analysis was conducted using Culpeper's (1996) Impoliteness Theory.

Research Data

The data were the 100 students' complaints on social networking sites in the Philippines. These complaints were culled from Facebook and Twitter, where the students mostly posted them. There was no restriction in terms of complaints, be it sourced from shitposts or official pages. The complaints were determined based on the nature of asking something from their teacher, staff, and the institution in general. Also, the complaints were taken starting in 2020.

Data Analysis

The impolite complaints collected were thoroughly examined based on Culpeper's impoliteness taxonomy. Subsequently, the identified impolite complaints underwent a two-fold process: [1] evaluation to determine the impoliteness triggers utilized and [2] further analysis of the impoliteness triggers to identify the specific impoliteness strategies employed. It should be noted that the researchers included

impoliteness formulae that were not explicitly stated in Culpeper's list. The researchers found it crucial to encompass other forms of impoliteness through pragmatic analysis, signifying the importance of these additional triggers in understanding the impoliteness spectrum. Without a doubt, the approach ensured a comprehensive understanding of the various impoliteness triggers, particularly those not explicitly articulated in existing literature, thereby highlighting their significance in impoliteness studies.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Impoliteness Triggers used in Students' Complaints

Based on the socio-pragmatic analysis conducted as shown in table 1, there were a number of impoliteness triggers found. The students used conventionalized impoliteness triggers, which involved pointed criticisms, condescension, insults, unpalatable questions, dismissals, message enforcers, threats, silencers, negative expressives, redundant patterning, and fighting words. On the other hand, non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers were also used, which involved form-driven impoliteness, accusation, red herring, convention-driven impoliteness, rhetorical questions, and inflammatory expressions.

Table 1. Impoliteness Triggers used in Students' Complaints

Impoliteness Triggers	Impoliteness Formulae	Utterances
Conventionalized impoliteness Triggers	Insult	You stupid and crazy man! [IC: STC2]
		Shame on you who did nothing but bully students in social media you are a disgrace to the society! You're an evil [IC: STC76]
		He (math teacher) is dumb, useless, and crazy!! but you even call yourself a teacher? tssk . [IC: STC82]
	Pointed Criticisms	There are no improvements in UM, the years passed, but your system remains the same [IC: STC14]
		What a bullshit school system! there are no updates at all then the students will be the one to adjust to your lapses?! [IC: STC49]
		If we only knew then, we would not have paid.it was unreasonably expensive. [IC:

		STC87]
	Unpalatable Questions	What the fuck! in this pandemic? still tuition fee increase? How can you have no shame, catholic school?" [IC: STC47]
		Where are the lies? How is our yearbook? We paid for it until now there is nothing. [IC: STC51]
		What is wrong with you? Who is at fault here? We paid a lot for this but this is still worthless. [IC: STC90]
	Condescension	It is okay, but please tell the guards that single-use plastics ONLY are not allowed. [IC: STC52]
		The guards are very alarming, inform them! Use your common-sense guard! [IC: STC53]
	Message Enforcers	Next time don't go live if you will just laugh at your students' problems regarding your contradicting announcement without explanation. Gets? [IC: STC57]
	Dismissals	Just fucking close your library and this school as well! [IC: STC48]
	Silencers	Don't tell me that ma'am. Your announcements are not consistent with the announcement from [institution] page. [IC: STC99]
	Threats	Let's just wait for you to be called by Brigada news so you can answer for that. [IC: STC61]
		You should pay attention to this or else you will be in Brigada or Tulfo. [IC: STC66]
	Negative Expressions	Fuck you! It only shows that you are greedy.

		[IC: STC35]
	Fighting Words	Fuck you! It only shows that you are greedy.[IC: STC35]
		Shame on you who did nothing but bully students in social media you are a disgrace to the society! [you are a] yawa!
		[IC: STC76]
	Redundant Patterning	My prof gave us instructions for the task and that is to make a video from larong Pinoy, to be submitted the next day. What the fuck! It makes me pressured, and I do not want to see myself being depressed because his subject is not major and nothing's more special with that subject. [IC: STC30]
		I just receive an email saying that we have a zoom with the deans and finance team of the school for a tuition fee increase. What the fuck! in this pandemic? still tuition fee increase? How can you have no shame, catholic school? [IC: STC47]
Non-conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Form-Driven	University of money! [IC: STC42]
	Accusation	I think [institution] should change their Grading System, because their grading system is connected with their billing system. [IC: STC97]
	Red-herring	Father, it's so embarrassing knowing it's under your custody. Motherfucker! Yet, you are the one who is very vocal to say that our president is a bully. Fuck you! It only shows that you are greedy. In fact, you don't have values and are not educated. [IC: STC35]
	Convention-Driven Impoliteness	"design courses" you mean condition students to adapt to your faulty, unwavering, and pretentious system [IC: STC38]
		Your responses are very one-

		sided sir. Amazing. [IC: STC58]
	Rhetorical Questions	Do you think parents and students are fools? [IC: STC71]
		Just admit that you can't handle the situation, do not give us false hopes. We paid everything and this is what you give us back? [IC: STC95]
	Inflammatory Expressions	The school is associated with excellence, but your initiative is stupid, ma'am and sir. Please, I think these ideas need to take another brainstorming.[IC: STC54]
		You have a lot of inconsistency in your system, you should have prepared ahead of time. This is very unfair! [IC: STC91]

Conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers. Impoliteness often arises from how frequently impolite words or phrases are used. These expressions, termed "conventionalized impoliteness," vary in intensity based on their offensiveness. They're considered impolite in specific situations and are widely understood by most language users, carrying significant impoliteness meaning. This concept links impolite words to impoliteness contexts, and these triggers were identified in the students' complaints analyzed below.

Insult. The use of insults in complaints is supported by Tedeschi and Felson (1994), who suggest that insults are intended to cause social harm. Tracy (2008) also identifies insults as a form of direct attack that displays significant disrespect and humiliation to the recipient (Wijayanto et al., 2017). In the study, complaints were formulated using insults such as "evil," "stupid," "crazy," "dumb," and "useless," aiming to insult and assail the recipient. These findings conform with the classical concept of impoliteness, characterized by an intentional assault on another's dignity through offensive language (Bousfield, 2007; Culpeper, 1996). Further supporting this notion, Wijayanto et al. (2017), Aditama (2017), and Perdana (2017) stated that insults, including personalized negative vocatives and assertions are used in complaints to disrespect, humiliate, and attack the addressee. Additionally, Kusevska (2019) emphasized the use of insulting words such as "dumb" to express severe disapproval along the continuum of incompetence and unreliability. This collective evidence underscores the deliberate use of insults in complaints to disrespect and severely express discontent.

Pointed Criticisms. This impoliteness trigger identified by Culpeper (2011) includes expressions of disapproval, fault, weakness, or disadvantage that directly undermine the dignity of a target. Phrases such as "what a bullshit school system" or "it was

unreasonably expensive" manifests strong disapproval aimed at attacking the recipient. This aligns with observations that students express complaints through pointed criticisms, displaying sharp disapproval potentially harmful to the recipient (Wijayanto et al., 2018). Additionally, in certain cultural settings, direct criticism is commonly used as a form of complaint, revealing weaknesses or expressing disapproval (Kim, 2008). Such findings suggest that individuals resort to criticism to convey dissatisfaction or highlight deficiencies, showcasing a common method to express discontent and assert disapproval.

Unpalatable Questions. This impoliteness trigger functions to convey something as unacceptable or unpleasant, often manifested in the form of a question aiming to challenge or provoke the addressee rather than seek a direct answer. The goal is to emphasize a point and potentially evoke guilt in the addressee for their actions. According to Ghani (2018), this trigger serves to intensify the problem's significance or to challenge the addressee. An example in the study includes the utterance "how can you have no shame?" which reflects disapproval. Ismail and Shanmuganathan (2019) and Wijayanto et al. (2017) further support this, stating that unpalatable questions are commonly used to express doubt and disapproval while making the addressee feel guilty about their actions. Ghani's (2018) research also highlights that unpalatable questions are utilized to challenge the addressee and evoke a sense of guilt for their conduct. The students' use of unpalatable questions in expressing complaints and conveying disapproval serves as an expression of impoliteness.

Condescension. As defined by Culpeper (2011), this involves employing patronizing behaviors such as belittling, ridiculing, and demeaning actions in communication. Impoliteness arises when an addresser treats the addressee in a patronizing manner, implying a sense of superiority or treating them as if they were a child or infant when they clearly are not. Merely belittling the addressee could serve as a trigger for impoliteness (Ghani, 2018). In the study, this impoliteness trigger is evident in instances such as the use of the phrase "Use your common sense, guard!" where a student belittles the guard by insinuating incompetence despite their role as a guard. Another study by Benabdellah (2018) highlights that condescension is utilized by the addresser to assert superiority while undermining the addressee.

Message Enforcers. These function to intimidate someone within a face-to-face interaction (Culpeper, 2011). They are utilized by the addresser to coerce the addressee into complying with an authoritative demand, often showcasing an egoistic and overbearing tone that infringes upon the addressee's negative face, leaving them little room for freedom from the sender's constraints. In the study, the use of the expression "gets?" (do you understand?) was intended to intimidate the addressee and assert a command. Similarly, Benabdellah's (2018) research highlighted the use of message enforcers as a means of fostering intimidation by the addresser toward the addressee. Additionally, Li's (2016) study revealed that message enforcers were the most frequently employed conventionalized device in communication.

Dismissals. The dismissal approach, as described by Culpeper (2011), serves to exclude the receiver from a conversation or dispute by dismissing them in an

unfriendly manner. According to Bousfield (2008), dismissing someone or their needs is a common strategy used to express impoliteness, intending to prevent their involvement in the interaction. In this study, expressions like "just close your library" are used to exclude the addressee through a hostile attack. These observations align with Acheampong and Kwarteng (2021), who assert that the use of such expressions aims to exercise authority, attack the addressee, and exclude them from the conversation. Moreover, Kariithi (2020) revealed that this approach is employed to silence the addressee, leaving them unable to respond to the addresser.

Silencers. The use aims to prevent the listener from further speaking or responding, essentially imposing a forced silence that serves as an aggressive form of impending speech (Culpeper et al., 2003). Jay (2000) supports this view, indicating that employing such tactics fosters insult, threat, and harm to the victim. In the study, instances like "don't tell me that, ma'am" suggest the addresser's intent for the addressee to refrain from further engagement in the conversation. Similar patterns were observed in Ghani's (2018) study, where such expressions were utilized to prompt the addressee to cease talking or participating in the conversation.

Threats. Threats are classified as commissive speech acts involving the speaker expressing future consequences for the recipient if a specific condition is met to dissuade the recipient from fulfilling that condition (Culpeper, 1996). Culpeper et al. (2017) note that threats often involve intimidation and illustrate potential negative outcomes concerning the speaker's property for the addressee. Ghani (2018) and Wijayanto et al. (2017) further describe threats as verbal tactics to instill fear or control others. For instance, the mention of Brigada, a local news provider known for public service and dispute resolution, threatens the addressee by implying public exposure and reputational risk if reported. Similarly, referencing Tulfo, a national news personality known for delivering swift justice and public criticism, reinforces the threat of public ridicule and damage to one's reputation, thus serving as a powerful deterrent.

Negative Expressions. According to Culpeper (2016), this impoliteness trigger often involves the use of swearing, taboo, and profane language intended to harm the addressee. These expressions, such as "fuck you," belong to semantic territories like being inconsiderate, impolite, aggressive, inappropriate, harmful, and taboo. Further, Culpeper et al. (2017) support this by indicating that utterances like "I'm a fucking DOUGLAS, so don't you fucking fuck with me" are destructive and improper. Aydınoğlu (2013) found similar use in plays, with phrases like "They are scum bastards" and "Holy fucking Jesus, you didn't!?" showing harsh emotions and impoliteness.

Fighting Words. According to Shuy (2010), taboo language refers to words typically situated at the negative end of the semantic continuum. Rosen and Rosenberg (2002) further elaborates that such words, due to their construction and acceptability, are considered insults, potentially leading to violence and disruptions in societal harmony. The complaints made by students showcase the utilization of highly provocative insults, evident in phrases like "Fuck you! It only shows that you are greedy, and you are a disgrace to society!" which, as noted by Gard (1980), possess the

propensity to violate and offend the receiver. These findings align with Terkourafi et al.'s (2018) sociopragmatic analysis on impoliteness in Twitter, where the use of fighting words such as "You are an awful human being!" were employed to insult the addressee. Furthermore, the use of fighting words falls within the impolite category, characterized by insults directed at an individual's social and personality attributes, as identified in Culpeper's (2016) research. In essence, the findings reveal that employing fighting words in online complaints was aimed at insulting and defaming the addressee.

Redundant Patterning. Redundant patterning observed in students' complaints functions to underscore specific details, enhancing clarity and credibility within their grievances. For instance, when critiquing an assignment's tight deadline related to Filipino games, students not only highlight the task's difficulty but also implicitly criticize the subject's perceived insignificance. Similarly, questioning the rationale behind a school's tuition fee increase during a pandemic involves using rhetorical questions and specific details to bolster the argument against the hike. This amplification strategy, as delineated by Arndt and Janney (1987) and supported by Bavelas and Chovil (2000), aims to reduce message obscurity by eliminating ambiguity. It's not a redundancy but a deliberate technique employed to fortify complaints, adding weight and conviction to the students' assertions, aligning with Ziegele's study (2016) that suggests negative responses are often triggered by comments lacking coherence or credibility.

Non-Conventionalized Impoliteness Trigger. The notion of non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, according to Sperber and Wilson (1986), involves implicatures that rely partially on relevant judgments and the psychological constructs formed from listeners' assumptions. Culpepper (2016) outlines how such triggers are manifested, including marked semantic content or surface structure, linguistic cues creating context mismatches (internally or externally), and the occurrence of unconventional or absent behavior causing contextual incongruities. In the context of complaints, these triggers manifest in various forms, which will be thoroughly discussed below.

Form-Driven Impoliteness. The non-conventionalized impoliteness trigger, defined by Culpeper (2016), manifests in actions with marked surface forms or semantic content, encompassing various behaviors like insinuations, aspersions, sarcastic comments, and more. In the context of the study, form-driven impoliteness is evident in expressions like "University of Money," which indirectly implies that the institution prioritizes monetary gain over other aspects, potentially tarnishing its reputation with negative connotations. Similar patterns were observed in Aydınoğlu's (2013) study, where form-driven impoliteness used innuendos like "worshipping a rodeo clown" to convey implicit messages. Nieto's (2020) research also highlighted non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers such as insults, innuendos, and allusions that incite negative social emotions. In this study, the use of innuendo as a form of impoliteness reveals how implicature emerges from formal surface or semantic

features, impacting individuals negatively. This distinction shows that the social aspects of form-driven impoliteness differ from the logical properties of implicature.

Accusation. An accusation, as defined by Shuy (2010), involves directly claiming that someone has misrepresented facts without using indirect or softened language to lessen its impact. This direct and confrontational nature aligns with non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, known for their straightforwardness without employing softening linguistic cues or customary behaviors. According to Culpeper (2016), these triggers are characterized by marked semantic content or direct surface structure, leading to potential contextual incongruities. In a complaint such as "their grading system is connected with their billing system," the impolite belief and assertion intending to cause damage reflect this straightforward accusation. Jane Xavierine's (2017) findings support this, indicating that accusations are aimed at insulting and attacking the addressee.

Red Herring. The fallacy of red herring, diverting attention from the main issue by focusing on something with only superficial relevance, misguides individuals into drawing false conclusions. In the context of complaints, this non-conventionalized impoliteness trigger manifests as seen in an utterance where the issue of bullying is sidetracked by an attack on the addressee, a priest in this case. The complainant, instead of addressing the priest's accountability, resorts to personal attacks and false accusations, using derogatory language like "motherfucker" and attributing false traits to the priest. This diversion away from the main issue portrays the use of the red herring, resulting in a misleading and tangential argument that undermines the primary concern. Furthermore, Merzah and Abbas (2020) revealed that the employment of red herring was used to divert from the topic under scrutiny; the addresser attacks the opponent to achieve that goal. Bull (2003) (as cited in Schröter, 2013) adds that attacking the opponent, the interviewer, or the rival group can be ways of evading answering questions. According to this viewpoint, impoliteness, self-impoliteness strategies, and the maxim of relevance and/or quantity can all be used to divert attention or distract others. This means that the emergence of a red herring is always accompanied by the emergence of a macro strategy of information concealment.

Convention-Driven Impoliteness. This form of impoliteness merges characteristics suggesting a polite interpretation with elements indicating impolite undertones, encompassing sarcasm, taunting, or biting humor, which might intersect with sarcasm or feigned politeness (Culpeper, 2011). Sarcasm, considered a facet of humor (Loewen, 2016), can serve as a means to express dissatisfaction in a less acerbic manner. In the context of complaints, this impoliteness trigger was observed when a student made the statement "your responses are very one-sided…amazing," manifesting a clear portrayal of sarcastic behavior. Despite appearing polite on the surface, the remark is insincere, indicating an impolite interpretation. This aligns with the findings of Nikoobin & Shahrokhi (2017), which suggest that learners utilize sarcasm as a means of conveying impolite complaints.

Rhetorical Questions. The concept of rhetorical questions refers to utterances whose form contradicts their purpose. Shuy (2010) defines rhetorical questions as persuasive

tools that imply an answer and are often employed to persuade an audience without expecting a direct response. In the context of complaints, this impoliteness trigger is evident in statements like "Do you think parents and students are fools?" despite being phrased as a question, the intention is not to seek an answer but to assert that parents and students are not foolish. This aligns with the findings of Wijayanto et al. (2013), emphasizing the use of rhetorical questions to express annoyance toward the addressee and link to social actions such as accusations, challenges, or complaints. Additionally, Koshik (2005) notes that rhetorical questions are crafted to convey assertions rather than to gather new information. Moreover, Rohde (2006) emphasizes their use as redundant interrogatives meant to signal that the answer should be readily deduced from the context, despite their structural format as questions. Therefore, in the study, rhetorical questions operate as assertions rather than genuine queries, regardless of their interrogative structure.

Inflammatory Expressions. Inflammatory expressions, as explained by Shuy (2010), entail using malicious language containing phrases that provoke emotions or anger, primarily aiming to inflame. Culpeper (2016) notes that such negative expressions can fall into various semantic domains, including being inconsiderate, impolite, aggressive, improper, hurtful, or taboo, depending on their usage. These expressions were manifested in the study through utterances like "The school is associated with excellence, but your initiative is stupid, ma'am and sir," and "You have a lot of inconsistency in your system, you should have prepared ahead of time. This is very unfair!" In the first example, the word "stupid" implies a lack of thoughtfulness in the school's initiative despite its association with excellence, provoking a negative depiction of the institution's efforts. Similarly, in the second example, terms like "inconsistency" and "unfair" contribute to a portrayal of the school as erratic and unjust, creating an accusatory and injurious tone. These expressions serve to create negative implications about the institution's actions or decisions. This finding resonates with Ibrahim's (2020) socio-linguistic analysis on impoliteness in political tweets, where words like "assholes," "idiot," and "disgrace" similarly conveyed malice or ill-will to produce negative implications against the target, emphasizing the intent to inflame and hurt through such language.

Impoliteness Strategies used in Students' Complaints

In Table 2, impoliteness triggers were categorized based on their strategies, encompassing bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness. The bald-on record impoliteness strategy encompassed both conventionalized and non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers such as insults, pointed criticisms, bald-on record accusation, and inflammatory expressions. Negative impoliteness, as a strategy, involved conventionalized triggers like unpalatable questions, condescension, silencers, threats, and redundant patterning. The positive impoliteness strategy featured conventional impoliteness triggers such as message enforcers, dismissals, negative expressives, and fighting words, alongside non-conventionalized triggers like form-driven impoliteness,

red herring, and rhetorical questions. Lastly, sarcasm or mock politeness strategy encompassed non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, including convention-driven impoliteness and inflammatory expressions.

Table 1. Impoliteness Triggers used Based on The Impoliteness Triggers used in Students' Complaints

Impoliteness Strategies	Impoliteness Triggers	Impoliteness Formulae
Bald-on Record Impoliteness	Conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Insults
		Pointed Criticisms
	Non-conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Bald-on Record Accusation
		Inflammatory Expressions
Negative Impoliteness	Conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Unpalatable questions
		Condescension
		Silencers
		Threats
		Redundant Patterning
Positive Impoliteness	Conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Message Enforcers
		Dismissals
		Negative Expressions
		Fighting Words
	Non-conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Form-driven Impoliteness
		Red-herring
		Rhetorical Questions
Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	Non-conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Convention-driven impoliteness
		Inflammatory Expressions

Bald-On Record Impoliteness. This impoliteness strategy comprises two distinct forms: insults and pointed criticisms as conventionalized impoliteness triggers (Culpeper, 2011), and bald-on record accusation along with inflammatory expressions as manifestations of the bald-on record impoliteness strategy (Culpeper, 2016). Insults, such as using words like stupid, crazy, dumb, or useless, directly attack the addressee and fall under the conventionalized impoliteness triggers category (Culpeper, 2011). Pointed criticisms involve expressing disapproval and fault statements in complaints, also falling within the realm of conventionalized impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011). On the other hand, bald-on record accusation occurs when impolite beliefs and assertions are

directly and straightforwardly used to accuse the addressee, representing a form of the bald-on record impoliteness strategy (Culpeper, 2016). Similarly, inflammatory expressions, utilizing taboo or profane language, constitute a direct and unambiguous attack and align with the bald-on record impoliteness strategy (Culpeper, 2016). These impoliteness triggers, whether conventionalized or bald-on record, serve to execute the face-threatening act in a clear, direct, and often emotionally charged manner (Banguis et al., 2023).

Negative Impoliteness. The negative impoliteness strategy encompasses various techniques, namely unpalatable questions, condescension, silencers, threats, and redundant patterning, which are conventionalized impoliteness triggers aimed at damaging the addressee's negative face wants (Culpeper, 2011). Unpalatable questions are used to attack the addressee rather than elicit information, while instances of condescension aim to make the addressee feel inferior or belittled. Silencers are manifested through statements that shut down the possibility of response, such as dismissive phrases like "Don't tell me that, ma'am." Threats are made to cause harm or damage if certain actions are not taken by the addressee, as seen in expressions like "You should pay attention to this or else you will be in Brigada or Tulfo." Additionally, redundant patterning involves detailing complaints to avoid ambiguity, often presented in narrative form to express the complaint clearly. This form of negative impoliteness aims to be rude or disrespectful to the addressee, damaging their negative face wants (Culpeper, 2011).

Furthermore, Wijayanto et al.'s (2017) study on EFL learners revealed the prevalent use of unpalatable questions and threats as negative impoliteness strategies in complaints. Nikoobin and Shahrokhi (2017) also found that negative impoliteness strategies were frequently used in both low social distance situations by Iranian EFL participants and by native English speakers in complaints. These strategies seemingly breach Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theories, such as positive politeness (seeking agreement), negative politeness (minimizing imposition), and bald-on record politeness (disregarding the maintenance of the hearer's face), as they do not seek agreement, minimize imposition, or care about the addressee's face, but rather aim to scorn, condescend, threaten, or silence the addressee (Culpeper, 2011).

Positive Impoliteness. Positive impoliteness strategies, both conventionalized and non-conventionalized, aim to inflict harm on the addressee's positive face. Conventionalized triggers like message enforcers, dismissals, negative expressives, and fighting words cause harm by asserting authority, disregarding the addressee's actions, expressing curses, or provoking a strong response. These actions are intended to disrespect or offend, causing emotional harm and undermining the addressee's dignity or self-esteem. Non-conventionalized triggers such as form-driven impoliteness, red herring, and rhetorical questions also cause harm by employing innuendo, diversion, or assertive statements. These strategies aim to indirectly attack or divert from the main issue, aiming to make the addressee feel inferior, confused, or insulted, further damaging their positive face. Studies by Wijayanto et al. (2017), Wijayanto (2018), Nikoobin and Shahrokhi (2017) support these observations, indicating that positive

impoliteness strategies in complaints are used purposefully to cause harm to the addressee's positive face, often by employing offensive or disrespectful language and undermining their social standing.

Sarcasm Or Mock Impoliteness. Non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, including convention-driven impoliteness and inflammatory expressions, are part of the sarcasm or mock politeness strategy outlined by Culpeper (2016). This strategy involves conveying impoliteness by using insincere or artificial politeness, often through verbal statements that contradict the speaker's true intention. Convention-driven impoliteness is apparent in the use of humor or bitter jokes, where the speaker's tone or statements intentionally differ from the underlying message. Inflammatory expressions employ malicious or offensive language to injure or depict the addressee negatively. These forms of impoliteness are perceived as sarcastic or insincere politeness, using polite language that contradicts the actual message. Studies by Nikoobin and Shahrokhi (2017) and Jane Xavierine (2017) illustrate the use of sarcasm or mock politeness to indirectly assert anger or insult while appearing polite, especially in online interactions.

Additionally, Acheampong and Kwarteng's (2021) findings revealed the use of mock impoliteness to imply a request that should have been understood implicitly, avoiding direct articulation. These forms of impoliteness closely align with Leech's (1983) notion of irony, allowing speakers to convey impolite messages indirectly, creating implicatures that convey the offensive point. The use of sarcasm or mock politeness in complaints contradicts Brown and Levinson's (1987) off-record politeness strategy of giving hints, as speakers do not explicitly state their intentions but expect the addressee to discern the implied meaning.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight the importance of analyzing students' expressions of impoliteness on social media. The implications for educational procedures include students' impoliteness toward the instructors, staff, and educational institutions, providing information on real-life events. These implications comprise methods for applying linguistic knowledge and features to avoid problems in the real world context.

In student complaints, several impoliteness triggers is observed, including insult, pointed criticism, unpalatable questions, condescension, message enforcers, dismissals, silencers, threats, negative expressions, fighting words, redundant patterning, form-driven, accusation, red-herring, convention-driven, rhetorical questions, inflammatory expressions. This number of impoliteness triggers emphasize the importance of discourse analysis in educational practices, which strengthens students' ability to interpret language clues, fostering a deeper understanding of how speech acts structure communication, and contribute to meaning.

On the other hand, politeness strategies include bald-on record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness. By delving into varied impoliteness triggers and strategies employed by students, educational

institutions can proactively address issues related to aggression, abuse, bullying, and harassment, fostering a more respectful online discourse.

The study may help in substantial ways. It demonstrates how students express themselves during conflicts, which aids us in better comprehending their behavior and interactions. The study elucidates why students become impolite, which gives us an understanding of their feelings and how language use substantially influences their relationships and emotional well-being. These findings could be used to manage conflicts better and enhance students' communication skills. The study also accentuates the significance of social context when comprehending how language impacts students' mental health, which may better improve psychological aid and interventions for them. In addition, the insights implied by the study benefit the general populace; it encourages sounder communication strategies and conflict resolution tactics, thereby realizing healthier interactions in myriad social settings.

REFERENCES

Acheampong, D. O., & Kwarteng, M. (2021). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in selected Ghanaian social interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3(*3), 32-40. https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.3.5

Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1987). Intergrammar: Toward an Integrative Model of Verbal, Prosodic and Kinesic Choices in Speech (Studies in Anthropological Linguistics 2). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aydinoglu, N. (2013). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies: An Analysis of Gender Differences in Geralyn I. Horton's Plays. Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 83, 473-482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.093

Banguis, J., Divino, P. F., Syting, C. J. O., & Maintang, K. C. (2023). Students' E-complaints on the Promises and Pitfalls of Blended Learning: A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature, 3*(2), 205-221. https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v3i2.225

Bavelas, J., & Chovil, N. (2000). Visible acts of meaning: An integrated message model of language in face-to-face dialogue. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*, 163-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x00019002001

Benabdellah, F. (2018). Impoliteness strategies and gender differences among Disney Modern protagonists. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3*(4), 40. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v3i4.p40-50

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Culpeper, J. (2011). Politeness and impoliteness. Pragmatics of Society. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214420

Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work, and power. De Gruyter Mouton.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25, 349-367.

Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of pragmatics, 35*(10-11), 1545-1579.

Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness strategies. *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society*, 421-445.

Gard, S. W. (1980). Fighting words as free speech. Wash. ULQ, 58, 531.

Ghani, N. (2018). Online Animosity: Impoliteness Strategies and Triggers of Hostility in a Social Networking Site in Brunei.

Ibrahim, A. H. (2020). A Socio-Linguistic Analysis of Impoliteness in Political Tweets. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11*(1), 64-79.

Ismail, I. N., & Shanmuganathan, T. (2019). Face Threats in Threads: Assessing the Responses to Impoliteness in Facebook Comments on 1MDB. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 25*(4).

Jane Xavierine, M. (2017). Impoliteness strategies in the social media comments on the Low Yat plaza incident. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).

Kariithi, F. (2020). Aspects of Impoliteness during 2007 and 2013 Presidential Campaigns in Kenya.

Kim, D. Y. (2008). A study of complaint strategies for EFL college learners. 9(2), 58-70.

Koshik, I. (2005). Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction (Vol. 160). John Benjamins Publishing.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. USA: Longman Limited.

Loewen, S. C. (2016). Psychology of Sarcasm—Dealing With Sarcastic People. Retrieved
    from http://www.healthguidance.org/entry/15845/1/Psychology-of-Sarcasm--Dealing-With-Sarcastic-People.html

Merzah, S. K., & Abbas, N. F. (2020). Deception in Flynn's psychological thriller Gone Girl (2012): A pragma-stylistic analysis. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies, 3*(4).

Nieto, V. (2020). Defamation as a Language Crime: A Sociopragmatic Approach to Defamation Cases in the High Courts of Justice of Spain. *International Journal of Language & Law.*

Nikoobin, A., & Shahrokhi, M. (2017). Impoliteness in the realization of complaint Speech Acts: A Comparative study of Iranian EFL learners and Native English speakers. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 7(*2), 32. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n2p32

Rohde, H. (2006). Rhetorical questions as redundant interrogatives. San Diego Linguistics Papers, 2, 134-168.

Rosen, R. M., & Rosenberg, C. B. (2002). Suing anonymous defendants for Internet defamation. COMPUTER AND INTERNET LAWYER, 19, 9-13.

Schroter. (2013). Silence and Concealment in Political Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shuy, R. W. (2010). Terrorism and forensic linguistics Linguistics and terrorism cases. In The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics (pp. 586-603). Routledge.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition (Vol. 142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Syting, C. J. O. (2018). Politeness strategies in classroom interaction: a discourse analysis. Tin-aw, 2(1), 1-1.

Terkourafi, M., Catedral, L., Haider, I., Karimzad, F., Melgares, J., Mostacero-Pinilla, C., & Weissman, B. (2018). Uncivil Twitter: A sociopragmatic analysis. Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict, 6(1), 26-57. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00002.ter

Wijayanto, A., Prasetyarini, A., & Hikmat, M. H. (2017). Impoliteness in EFL: Foreign language learners' complaining behaviors across social distance and status levels. Sage Open, 7(3), 2158244017732816.

Wijayanto, A., Hikmat, M. H., & Prasetyarini, A. (2018). Impoliteness in English as a Foreign Language Complaints: Exploring Its Intentions and Motivating Factors. Online Submission, 12(1), 97-104.

Ziegele, M. (2016). Nutzerkommentare als Anschlusskommunikation. Theorie und qualitative Analyse des Diskussionswerts von Online-Nachrichten. [User comments as follow-up communication. Theory and qualitative analysis of the discussion value of online news.] Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.