AWKA JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERARY STUDIES (AJELLS)

Volume 10 Number 1
December, 2023

Impoliteness Strategies in Lecturer-Student Classroom Discourse

Chinwe V. Udoh
Department of English Language and Literature
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: vc.udoh@unizik.edu.ng

Nwaoboli T. Ugochukwu
Department of Language and Communication
Federal College of Education Tech, Asaba
thelmagreatness@gmail.com

Abstract

This study delves into the dynamics of lecturer-student classroom discourse in Delta State University Abraka, with a specific focus on the manifestation of impoliteness strategies and their impact on learning environments. This study is motivated by the need to understand and effect politeness strategies that can mitigate constant quarrel and misunderstanding in lecturer-student communication. Drawing on Jonathan Culpeper's theory of impoliteness model, this study employs a purposive sampling technique to generate 5 different natural occurring speech situations of lecturer-speech encounter. Data 1 reveals overt impoliteness strategies employed by a lecturer, leading to a hostile learning environment and potential long-term consequences for student attitudes and academic performance. In contrast, Data 2 illustrates a positive and respectful discourse, emphasizing that impoliteness is not universally present in educational settings. However, Data 3 paints a contrasting picture, highlighting the disruptive force of impoliteness and its potential to hinder effective communication and student engagement. Data 4 reveals that the lecturer utilizes bald on record and negative impoliteness, employing sarcasm and dismissive responses that may hinder student engagement and create a tense classroom atmosphere. Data 5 reveals a contrasting

scenario where the lecturer refrains from bald on record and negative impoliteness, fostering a positive learning environment through the encouragement of student participation and supportive communication. These findings underscore the need for educators to adopt communication styles that prioritise respect and inclusivity to foster positive learning environments.

Keywords: Impoliteness strategies, classroom dynamics, power dynamics, face threatening act, rapport management

Introduction

Impoliteness in lecturer-student classroom discourse constitutes a multifaceted phenomenon characterised by a variety of verbal and non-verbal strategies. These tactics, which often defy social norms and expectations, wield considerable influence over the broader learning environment (Noori, et al., 2020). Among the diverse impoliteness strategies observed in the context of lecturer-student interactions, interruption emerge as a potent force, introducing an element of disrespect or disinterest that permeates the classroom, fostering a hostile atmosphere. The deployment of interruptions, whether overt or subtle, further compounds the issue by curtailing students' opportunities to express themselves and actively participate in discussions (Mourad, 2021). Using sarcasm, even when meant to be humorous, can potentially disturb the learning environment, causing confusion or discomfort among students (Brummernhenrich, et al., 2021). Additionally, non-verbal cues such as eye-rolling or sighs contribute to the nuanced repertoire of impoliteness, further complicating the interpersonal dynamics within the classroom.

The immediate consequences of impoliteness on classroom dynamics are profound and multifaceted. Impoliteness and interruptions act as impediments to effective communication, disrupting the natural flow of ideas between the lecturer and students. Kecskes (2017, p.52) points out that sarcasm, coupled

with negative non-verbal cues, contributes to the creation of a toxic atmosphere that erodes the trust and respect pivotal for fostering a positive learning experience. These implications extend beyond the immediate interaction, exerting a pervasive influence on the overall classroom dynamics and shaping the quality of engagement between lecturers and students.

Impoliteness coupled with power dynamics play a pivotal role in their manifestation (Vasilou, Bekiari, & Hasanagas, 2020, May & Tenzek, 2018, Teitelbaum, & Ben-Ze'ev, 2023). Lecturers, positioned as authority figures, hold significant power that can be wielded responsibly or misused to assert dominance. Burić & Frenzel (2019). The emphasized that power imbalances can lead to the imposition of impoliteness strategies, such as condescension or patronizing language, thereby reinforcing hierarchical structures within the educational setting. Recognizing the influence of power dynamics becomes essential for creating a more equitable and respectful learning environment, where all participants feel valued and heard.

The long-term effects of impoliteness on students' attitudes and academic performance raise substantial concerns. Itzkovich et al (2020) underscore that persistent exposure to impoliteness can result in decreased motivation, heightened anxiety, and a negative perception of the learning environment. Students subjected to impoliteness may develop a reluctance to actively participate in class, impeding their ability to fully engage with course material and consequently affecting their overall academic performance. This enduring impact underscores the urgency of addressing impoliteness as an essential aspect of fostering a positive and respectful educational experience.

In considering impoliteness within the context of lecturer-student classroom discourse, it becomes evident that this complex phenomenon involves a diverse range of strategies with both

immediate and long-term consequences. The identification and categorisation of these strategies, drawing from Jonathan Culpeper's theory of impoliteness (2011), provide valuable insights into the intricacies of interpersonal communication within educational settings. The immediate consequences on classroom dynamics, influenced by power dynamics, highlight the imperative for educators to be cognizant of their language and behavior. Understanding the long-term effects on students' attitudes and academic performance underscores the importance of fostering a positive and respectful learning environment. In this context, effective rapport management emerges as a critical component, offering educators a strategic approach to cultivating positive relationships, promoting engagement, and mitigating the impact of impoliteness within the classroom. By actively addressing impoliteness and employing rapport management strategies, educators can contribute to a more inclusive, positive, and effective educational experience for all students.

Statement of the Problem

The dynamics of impoliteness in lecturer-student classroom discourse, as highlighted by Brummernhenrich et al. (2021), Burić, & Frenzel (2019), and May & Tenzek (2018), pose a critical and multifaceted problem within the educational system. The core issue stems from the inappropriate use of language and behavior, ranging from explicit verbal aggression to subtle non-verbal cues, disrupting the intended positive learning environment. This problem necessitates a comprehensive investigation into impoliteness strategies to understand their immediate consequences on classroom dynamics, analyze the impact of power dynamics, and explore potential long-term effects on students' attitudes and academic performance. Prior research has not sufficiently addressed this gap, and understanding the extent of impoliteness strategies remains incomplete, hindering the development of effective strategies to promote respectful and constructive communication in the educational setting.

Purpose of the Study

The broad objectives of this study were to examine the impoliteness strategies in lecturer-student classroom discourse. Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. Explore the frequency and contextual triggers of lecturers' utilisation of bald on record impoliteness in classroom discourse within the lecturer-student interaction dynamic.
2. Examine the patterns emerging in the application of positive impoliteness as an impoliteness strategy in lecturer-student classroom discourse and assess its impact on the communication dynamics.
3. Identify instances of negative impoliteness in lecturer-student interactions and analyse their contribution to shaping the overall communication climate within the classroom.
4. Investigate the manifestations of sarcasm and withholding politeness in lecturer-student classroom discourse, and assess their implications on student engagement, comprehension, and overall learning outcomes.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. To what extent do lecturers employ bald on record impoliteness in classroom discourse, and what specific situations or contexts prompt its use in interactions with students?
2. In the context of lecturer-student classroom discourse, what patterns emerge in the utilisation of positive impoliteness as an impoliteness strategy, and how does it impact the dynamics of communication?
3. What instances of negative impoliteness are observed in lecturer-student interactions, and how do these instances contribute to the overall communication climate within the classroom?

4. How does the use of sarcasm and withhold politeness manifest in lecturer-student classroom discourse, and what implications do these impoliteness strategies have on student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes?

Conceptual Framework

Culpeper (2011, p.36) define impoliteness as a negative attitude towards particular behaviours that take place in particular settings. Bousfield and Locher (2008, p.105) see impoliteness as a face-aggravating behaviour in a certain environment is referred to as impoliteness. When someone acts rudely, they fail to use civility techniques when they should, making it difficult to understand their words other than as deliberately hostile and aggressive (Lakoff, 1989, p. 124). According to Beebe (1995, p.156), rudeness is characterised as a face-threatening act (FTA) or a face-threatening act component (like intonation) that deviates from a socially acceptable interaction standard in the social setting in which it takes place. Incivility and face-attacking communication tactics can lead to social discord and conflict (Culpeper et al., 2003, p. 1547).

Culpeper (2005, p. 37) states that when a speaker uses an expression that is not appropriate for the situation, it is considered marked rudeness or rudeness proper. The addressee's face is threatened once the hearer realises that the speaker is trying to offend them. When an expression is used that is not appropriate for the situation and endangers the person receiving it, it is considered disrespectful. However, the hearer does not attach any intention of face-threatening to the speaker (Terkourafi, 2008; Bousfield, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

Jonathan Culpeper's theory of impoliteness, outlined in his seminal 2011 book "Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence," offers a comprehensive framework for understanding and

analyzing impoliteness in human interaction. Building upon previous work on politeness, Culpeper defines impoliteness as "a negative attitude towards specific behaviors occurring in specific contexts" (Culpeper, 2011, p. 23). This definition emphasizes the contextual and relational nature of impoliteness, recognizing that what is considered impolite varies depending on the social situation, the identities of the interactants, and the shared expectations and norms of the community.

Culpeper's theory identifies five super strategies of impoliteness:

1. Bald on record impoliteness: This involves directly and openly expressing negative face wants, such as disapproval, criticism, or insult. Examples include "You're talking nonsense!" or "You're such an idiot!"
2. Positive impoliteness: This strategy involves feigning politeness while simultaneously expressing negative face wants. It often employs sarcasm, irony, or mock politeness to convey disapproval or insult. Examples include "Oh, you think you're so clever, don't you?" or "Sure, I'll help you with that, since you're clearly incompetent."
3. Negative impoliteness: This strategy involves expressing negative face wants indirectly, often through vague or suggestive language. It can be used to criticize, belittle, or exclude others without explicitly stating the offense. Examples include "I'm not sure I'd trust your judgment on that matter" or "I'm afraid I don't have time for your nonsense today."
4. Sarcasm or mock politeness: This strategy involves using language ironically or sarcastically to express negative face wants. It can be used to convey disbelief, disapproval, or mockery. Examples include "Oh, great, now you've decided to show up" or "I'm so impressed by your brilliant insight."
5. Withhold politeness: This strategy involves failing to fulfill expected politeness norms, often by being abrupt, dismissive, or unresponsive. It can be used to convey disrespect, disinterest, or annoyance. Examples include ignoring

someone's question, interrupting them mid-sentence, or giving curt, one-word responses.

Culpeper's theory emphasises that impoliteness is not simply a matter of violating social norms or failing to be polite. Rather, it is a strategic communicative act that is used to achieve specific social goals, such as expressing negative attitudes, asserting dominance, or maintaining social distance. The choice of impoliteness strategy depends on a range of factors, including the relative power and status of the interactants, the nature of their relationship, and the context of the interaction.

Culpeper's theory has been widely influential in the field of pragmatics, providing a valuable framework for understanding and analysing the complex phenomenon of impoliteness in human communication. His work has helped to shed light on the motivations behind impoliteness, the range of strategies employed, and the social consequences of impolite behavior**.**

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design to delve into the complexities of lecturer-student classroom discourse. Qualitative methods are well-suited for exploring the nuanced nature of communication, allowing for an in-depth analysis of impoliteness strategies and their impact on the learning environment.

Three sets of data were selected to represent different communication scenarios in lecturer-student interactions. These datasets were chosen to provide diverse insights into the manifestation of impoliteness strategies and their consequences. The data were transcribed to facilitate a detailed analysis. The transcriptions capture both verbal allowing for a comprehensive examination of impoliteness strategies.

The transcribed data were subjected to content analysis, focusing on identifying impoliteness strategies outlined in Culpeper's theory. Categories such as bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm, and withholding

politeness were used to classify and analyze instances of impoliteness. A textual analysis was conducted to understand the broader situational factors influencing the use of impoliteness strategies. Power dynamics, relational aspects, and the nature of the educational context were considered in interpreting the impoliteness observed.

Data Presentation

Data 1

Lecturer: (impatiently) Okay, listen up, everyone. Today, we discussing an archaic Shakespeare's sonnets. I hope some of you bothered to read them. Any questions?

Student 1: Dr, …. I

Lecturer: (Shut up). Like seriously, so you don't know that am now a professor!

Student: Sorry ma. I found the language a bit challenging. Can you clarify the meaning of Sonnet 18?

Lecturer: (sighs) Seriously? It's not that hard. Sonnet 18 is about the immortality of poetry. Did you even read it, or am I wasting my time here?

Student 2: Um, I had a question about the symbolism in Sonnet 73. Could you help?

Lecturer: (rolls eyes) Symbolism? It's all in the text. Can't you analyze it yourself? Maybe if you paid more attention in your previous classes, you wouldn't be struggling so much now.

Student 3: Prof, I was wondering about the historical context of Sonnet 29. Could you elaborate?

Lecturer: (sarcastically) Historical context? How original. Do I look like a history professor to you? Fine, it's about the old dude feeling sorry for himself. Happy now?

Student 4: (whispering to a friend) This lecturer is so rude.

Lecturer: (overhearing) If you've got something to say, say it to my face. I don't have time for your nonsense.

Lecturer: (angrily) I heard what you said. Now get out of my class. Olodo! (dullard)

Data 2

Lecturer: Good morning, class. Today, we'll be exploring the role of religion in literature. I appreciate your diverse perspectives, so please feel free to share your thoughts and experiences.

Student 1: Hi, I've noticed various religious themes in the literature we're studying. Can you provide more insight?

Lecturer: Of course! Religious themes are a fascinating aspect of literature. Let's delve into that together. Who else has observations or questions?

Student 2: I've read a novel with a character who goes through a religious transformation. How does that contribute to the overall theme?

Lecturer: Great observation. The character's religious journey indeed plays a crucial role in shaping the broader theme. Let's analyse how it influences the narrative. Anyone else?

Data 3

Lecturer: (disapprovingly) Seriously, guys, can we not talk about religious nonsense today? Some of you need to learn some basic decency.

Student 1: I was just curious about how religion is portrayed in literature.

Lecturer: (mocking) "Curious"? If you bothered to read anything beyond fashion and porn magazines, you might get a clue. This isn't a place for unserious students.

Student 2: I wanted to discuss the religious transformation of a character in the novel we're studying.

Lecturer: (angrily) Are you purposely trying to annoy me with your ridiculous questions? Who cares about a character's so-called "transformation"? Save it for your exam day.

Lecturer: (impatiently) Alright, let's get this over with. Today, we're diving into complex philosophical concepts in literature. Brace yourselves. Anybody bothered to prepare?

Student 1: Professor, I...

Lecturer: (interrupting) Spare me the details. If you're not ready, it's your problem. What's your question?

Student: I was hoping for some clarification on existentialism in the assigned readings.
Lecturer: (exasperated) Existentialism? Seriously? It's not rocket science. It's about the individual's freedom and responsibility. Read between the lines. Next!
Student 2: Um, I find the symbolism in these texts a bit confusing.
Lecturer: (sarcastically) Symbolism again? It's like you people can't grasp the basics. Figure it out yourselves. Maybe take a literature class for beginners.
Student 3: Professor, could you provide insights into the cultural context of the pieces we're studying?
Lecturer: (mocking) Cultural context? Are we in a history lesson now? Look it up if you're so curious. I'm here to teach literature, not history.

Data 5

Lecturer: (enthusiastically) Good day, everyone! Today's topic is creativity in poetry. I'm eager to hear your thoughts. Any brave souls with questions?
Student 1: Hi, I'm curious about the use of metaphors in the assigned poems.
Lecturer: (appreciative) Excellent question! Metaphors are a powerful poetic device. Let's explore how they enhance the meaning together. Well done!
Student 2: I've noticed a recurring theme of nature in these poems. Can you elaborate on its significance?
Lecturer: (encouraging) Great observation! Nature holds profound symbolism in poetry. Your insight will lead us to a deeper understanding. Who else has thoughts to share?

DATA ANALYSIS

Research Question 1: To what extent do lecturers employ bald on record impoliteness in classroom discourse, and what specific situations or contexts prompt its use in interactions with students?

Bald on record impoliteness is prevalent in Data 1 where the lecturer's communication style is marked by impatience, dismissiveness, and criticism. In the given interactions, the lecturer uses direct and confrontational language, creating an environment that may be perceived as disrespectful. For instance, when Student 1 attempts to speak, the lecturer sharply interrupts, stating, "Shut up. Like seriously, so you don't know that am now a professor!" This blunt and unambiguous response exemplifies the bald on record strategy, as the lecturer openly expresses dissatisfaction and asserts their authority.

The impoliteness escalates as students seek clarification on the literature. When a student asks about the meaning of Sonnet 18, the lecturer sighs dismissively, questioning the student's competence: "Did you even read it, or am I wasting my time here?" In this context, the lecturer employs bald on record impoliteness to express frustration and criticize the perceived lack of effort from the student. The same pattern repeats when another student inquiries about the symbolism in Sonnet 73 and the historical context of Sonnet 29. The lecturer's eye-rolling, sarcastic remarks, and condescending responses contribute to an atmosphere of tension and discomfort.

Moreover, the lecturer's reaction to the student's private comment and subsequent expulsion from the class ("Now get out of my class. Olodo!") reflects a high level of bald on record impoliteness. This aggressive response stems from the lecturer's perceived insult, showcasing the immediate and assertive nature of this impoliteness strategy. Bald on record impoliteness is prominently featured in

Data 1, as the lecturer consistently uses direct and confrontational language in various situations. The context triggering its use includes student queries, perceived challenges to the lecturer's authority, and instances where the lecturer feels disrespected.

In Data 4, the lecturer extensively employs bald on record impoliteness. The direct and confrontational responses to students' questions indicate a low tolerance for what the lecturer perceives as basic knowledge. Interrupting Student 1 and responding to questions on existentialism and symbolism with phrases like "Figure it out yourselves" showcases a disregard for students' inquiries. The lecturer's immediate and curt responses create an environment where students may feel hesitant to ask for clarification or engage in discussions, aligning strongly with the characteristics of bald on record impoliteness.

Conversely, Data 5 presents a scenario without the use of bald on record impoliteness. The lecturer's responses are positive, encouraging, and devoid of direct confrontation. There is no dismissiveness or interruption, creating an environment where students feel more comfortable seeking clarification and actively participating. The absence of bald on record impoliteness in Data 5 contributes to a positive and constructive communication climate, presenting a stark contrast to the confrontational style in Data 4. While Data 4 exemplifies a high degree of bald on record impoliteness, Data 5 serves as a contrasting example with an absence of such impoliteness. The comparison highlights how lecturers' communication styles significantly impact the use of bald on record impoliteness, influencing the overall dynamics of the classroom.

Research Question 2: In the context of lecturer-student classroom discourse, what patterns emerge in the utilisation of positive impoliteness as an impoliteness strategy, and how does it impact the dynamics of communication?

Data 2 provides a striking contrast to Data 1, showcasing a positive and inclusive communication style. The lecturer employs positive impoliteness strategies, fostering a collaborative learning environment. When addressing the role of religion in literature, the lecturer appreciates diverse perspectives, stating, "I appreciate your diverse perspectives, so please feel free to share your thoughts and experiences." This positive impoliteness strategy seeks to create a welcoming atmosphere and encourage student participation.

In response to student inquiries about religious themes and a character's transformation in literature, the lecturer consistently expresses enthusiasm and validation. For example, when Student 1 notes various religious themes, the lecturer encourages further exploration: "Religious themes are a fascinating aspect of literature. Let's delve into that together." This positive impoliteness strategy acknowledges the students' contributions and emphasizes a collaborative approach to learning.

Furthermore, the lecturer's response to a student's observation about a character's religious journey reinforces positive impoliteness. The lecturer acknowledges the significance of the student's observation and encourages collective analysis: "The character's religious journey indeed plays a crucial role in shaping the broader theme. Let's analyze how it influences the narrative. Anyone else?" This approach promotes a positive dynamic in the classroom, enhancing student engagement and the overall learning experience.

In summary, Data 2 illustrates a pattern of positive impoliteness strategies, where the lecturer employs language and behavior

aimed at fostering a positive classroom atmosphere. The impact of these strategies is evident in the collaborative and engaging dynamics of communication, contributing to a positive learning environment.

Data 4 presents a communication scenario dominated by negative impoliteness, with a clear absence of positive impoliteness. The lecturer fails to acknowledge students' efforts or curiosity, creating a communication dynamic devoid of encouragement or support. The absence of positive impoliteness contributes to an environment where students might feel discouraged from actively participating, impacting the overall classroom dynamics negatively.

In Data 5, positive impoliteness strategies are prevalent. The lecturer actively acknowledges and appreciates students' questions, fostering a positive and inclusive atmosphere. Responses like "Excellent question!" and "Great observation!" showcase a communication style that encourages student engagement and participation. This positive impoliteness contributes to an open and supportive learning environment, positively impacting the dynamics of communication in the classroom. The comparison between Data 4 and Data 5 underscores the significance of positive impoliteness in shaping the communication climate within the classroom. While Data 4 showcases a lack of positive impoliteness contributing to a negative environment, Data 5 exemplifies how its presence fosters a positive and engaging classroom atmosphere.

Research Question 3: What instances of negative impoliteness are observed in lecturer-student interactions, and how do these instances contribute to the overall communication climate within the classroom?

Negative impoliteness strategies are prominently displayed in Data 1, creating a communication climate characterised by tension and discomfort. The lecturer's disapproving and mocking tone when

addressing topics related to literature and religion contribute to an environment where students may feel discouraged from active participation.

For instance, when Student 1 expresses curiosity about how religion is portrayed in literature, the lecturer responds negatively, stating, "If you bothered to read anything beyond fashion and porn magazines, you might get a clue." This example illustrates negative impoliteness as the lecturer dismisses the student's question and employs mocking language, conveying a lack of respect for the student's interests.

Similarly, when Student 2 wants to discuss the religious transformation of a character, the lecturer responds angrily: "Are you purposely trying to annoy me with your ridiculous questions? Who cares about a character's so-called 'transformation'? Save it for your exam day." Here, the lecturer's negative impoliteness strategy involves expressing annoyance, belittling the student's questions, and dismissing their academic inquiries as irrelevant.

The overall communication climate within the classroom, as influenced by negative impoliteness, is one of hostility and discouragement. Students may feel hesitant to engage in discussions or seek clarification due to the lecturer's dismissive and critical responses. The impact of negative impoliteness in this context is detrimental, hindering constructive dialogue and creating a learning environment where students may be reluctant to actively participate.

Data 4 vividly illustrates instances of negative impoliteness through the lecturer's dismissive and sarcastic responses. Phrases like "spare me the details" and "Figure it out yourselves" convey a lack of regard for students' inquiries, creating tension and discomfort. The negative impoliteness strategies employed by the lecturer hinder constructive dialogue, potentially impacting the overall learning experience for students.

Negative impoliteness is notably absent in Data 5. The lecturer refrains from dismissive or critical responses, contributing to a communication climate free from tension or discomfort. By avoiding negative impoliteness strategies, the lecturer promotes a more encouraging and open environment where students feel comfortable asking questions and engaging in discussions. Comparing Data 4 and Data 5 emphasizes the impact of negative impoliteness on the communication climate within the classroom. While Data 4 exemplifies a tense environment created by negative impoliteness, Data 5 illustrates a positive atmosphere facilitated by its absence.

Research Question 4: How does the use of sarcasm and withholding politeness manifest in lecturer-student classroom discourse, and what implications do these impoliteness strategies have on student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes?

Sarcasm and withholding politeness are prevalent impoliteness strategies in Data 1, significantly impacting student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes. The use of sarcasm is evident when the lecturer responds to student questions with disdain and irony. For instance, when a student seeks clarification on Sonnet 18, the lecturer sighs and questions the student's effort: "Did you even read it, or am I wasting my time here?" This sarcastic response conveys a lack of patience and willingness to assist, potentially hindering the student's understanding of the material.

Similarly, when a student asks about the historical context of Sonnet 29, the lecturer responds sarcastically: "Do I look like a history professor to you? Fine, it's about the old dude feeling sorry for himself. Happy now?" This sarcastic remark may discourage students from seeking further clarification on historical contexts, impacting their understanding of literature within its broader historical framework.

Additionally, the lecturer's withholding of politeness is evident in responses like "Can't you analyse it yourself?" and "Do I look like a history professor to you?" These instances illustrate the impoliteness strategy of withholding information or assistance, creating an environment where students may feel unsupported and reluctant to engage in academic inquiries.

The implications of these impoliteness strategies on student engagement are negative, as students may become hesitant to ask questions or participate actively in class discussions due to the fear of receiving sarcastic or dismissive responses. This reluctance to engage may lead to a diminished understanding of course material and hinder the overall learning experience.

In Data 4, sarcasm is prevalent in responses to questions about existentialism and symbolism. The lecturer's sarcastic remarks create an environment where students may feel ridiculed for seeking clarification, potentially hindering their understanding of complex literary concepts. The withholding of politeness is evident in phrases like "Look it up if you're so curious," further diminishing the supportive learning environment. These impoliteness strategies can negatively impact student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes by discouraging active participation and creating a less conducive learning environment.

Data 5 presents a scenario without the use of sarcasm or the withholding of politeness. The lecturer responds to students' questions with genuine enthusiasm and willingness to engage in discussions. The absence of these impoliteness strategies contributes to a positive learning environment, where students are likely to feel more engaged and encouraged to participate. The implications on student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes are positive, as the absence of sarcasm and withholding politeness fosters a supportive and conducive learning

atmosphere. The contrast between Data 4 and Data 5 highlights the detrimental impact of sarcasm and withholding politeness on student engagement and understanding. While Data 4 exemplifies potential hindrances created by these impoliteness strategies, Data 5 illustrates the positive outcomes facilitated by their absence. The use of sarcasm and withholding politeness in Data 1 negatively impacts student engagement, understanding, and learning outcomes. The impoliteness strategies employed by the lecturer create a challenging learning environment, potentially hindering students' academic progress and diminishing the quality of their educational experience.

Discussion of Findings

In Data 1, impoliteness strategies were overtly present in the lecturer-student interaction, creating a hostile learning environment. The use of dismissive language, sarcasm, and condescension by the lecturer hindered effective communication and eroded the trust between educators and students because effective response that will build mutual understanding is not achieved. The immediate consequences were evident in the reluctance of students to actively participate in class discussions and the overall deterioration of the learning atmosphere. This data highlights the significant impact impoliteness can have on classroom dynamics, emphasizing the need for a more respectful and inclusive approach to communication in educational settings.

Conversely, Data 2 presented a stark contrast, showcasing a positive and respectful discourse within the classroom. The lecturer's inclusive language and encouragement of diverse perspectives contributed to a collaborative learning environment. The absence of impoliteness allowed for open communication, constructive dialogue, and active student participation. This data suggests that impoliteness is not a universal feature of lecturer-student interactions and that fostering a positive learning

environment is achievable through intentional communication strategies that prioritize respect and inclusivity.

In Data 3, impoliteness strategies were once again prominent, resulting in a disruptive and negative impact on classroom dynamics. The lecturer's disapproving and mocking tone resulted to immediate demotivation and disengagement among students. This data underscores the disruptive force of impoliteness in the learning environment, emphasizing the need for educators to be mindful of their communication styles to maintain a conducive atmosphere for academic growth.

In Data 4, the lecturer employs bald on record impoliteness and negative impoliteness strategies, creating a confrontational atmosphere in the classroom. Sarcasm and dismissive responses to students' questions about literary concepts contribute to a communication climate marked by tension and discomfort. The lecturer's withholding of politeness and refusal to provide guidance may hinder student engagement and understanding, potentially impacting overall learning outcomes negatively. The use of impoliteness strategies in Data 4 reflects a communication style that may discourage open dialogue and collaborative learning.

Conversely, Data 5 presents a scenario without the use of bald on record impoliteness and negative impoliteness. The lecturer employs positive impoliteness strategies, actively encouraging student participation and fostering a positive learning environment. The absence of sarcasm and withholding politeness contributes to a supportive atmosphere where students feel comfortable asking questions and engaging in discussions. This positive communication climate in Data 5 likely enhances student engagement, understanding, and overall learning outcomes by promoting a collaborative and inclusive educational experience.

Conclusion

The collective analyses of the three datasets reveal the intricate relationship between impoliteness strategies and classroom dynamics. Impoliteness, when present, has the potential to hinder effective communication, diminish student engagement, and negatively impact the overall quality of education. On the other hand, the absence of impoliteness contributes to a more positive and inclusive learning environment. The findings underscore the importance of recognising and addressing impoliteness in educational settings to foster an atmosphere conducive to learning, collaboration, and the holistic development of students.

References

Beebe, L. M. (1995). Polite fictions: instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In Linguistics and the education of language teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistic aspects (pp. 154-168). Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press

Bousfield, D. (2010). Researching impoliteness and rudeness: Issues and definitions. *Interpersonal pragmatics*, *6*, 101-134.

Bousfield, D., &Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (21).

Brummernhenrich, B., Baker, M. J., Bietti, L. M., Détienne, F., &Jucks, R. (2021). Being (un) safe together: Student group dynamics, facework and argumentation. *Dialogue for Intercultural Understanding: Placing Cultural Literacy at the Heart of Learning*, 119-134.

Burić, I., &Frenzel, A. C. (2019). Teacher anger: new empirical insights using a multi-method approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *86*, 102895.

Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture, 1(1), 35-72.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence* (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.

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.

Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2012). Politeness and impoliteness in ethnic varieties of New Zealand English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(9), 1063-1076.

Itzkovich, Y., Alt, D., Dolev, N., Itzkovich, Y., Alt, D., &Dolev, N. (2020). Learning Environments as Precursors of Academic Incivility. *The Challenges of Academic Incivility: Social-Emotional Competencies and Redesign of Learning Environments as Remedies*, 79-90.

Kecskes, I. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *13*(1), 7-31.

Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. (1989). The limits of politeness: *Therapeutic and courtroom discourse.* 101-130.

May, A., &Tenzek, K. E. (2018). Bullying in the academy: understanding the student bully and the targeted 'stupid, fat, mother fucker' professor. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *23*(3), 275-290.

Mourad, L. (2021). Impoliteness and power dynamics in intimate interactions: An analysis of Joe Blann's 'Things We Had'. *Language and Literature*, *30*(4), 315-340.

Noori, A. Q., Said, H., Nor, F. M., &Abd Ghani, F. (2020). The relationship between university lecturers' behaviour and students' motivation. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(11C), 15-22.

Teitelbaum, M., & Ben-Ze'ev, A. (2023). Politeness, Respect, Care, and Bias in Social Interactions. In *Advancing (Im) politeness Studies: Cultural, Digital and Emotional Aspects* (pp. 73-92). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Terkourafi, M. (2008). Toward a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness and rudeness. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on Its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter*, 45-74.

Vasilou, A., Bekiari, A., & Hasanagas, N. (2020). Aggressiveness Networks in School Classes: Dynamic Analysis and Comparison of Structures. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Studies*, *15*(2).