

Exploration of Impoliteness Students' Utterances in Learning Activities during the New Normal Covid-19 Pandemic

by Chairil Faif Pasani

Submission date: 26-Apr-2023 08:44AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2075663264

File name: Artikel_Int_I_7_440-448.pdf (248.6K)

Word count: 6394

Character count: 34739

1
Rizky Amelia, Zamzani, Ali Mustadi, Chairil Faif Pasani, Zainuddin Hasan. (2022). Exploration of
Impoliteness Students' Utterances in Learning Activities during the New Normal Covid-19 Pandemic.
International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education (INT-JECSE),
14(1): 440-448. DOI: 10.9756/INT-JECSE/V14I1.221055

Received: 24.09.2021 Accepted: 09.12.2021

Rizky Amelia^{1*}
Zamzani²
Ali Mustadi³
Chairil Faif Pasani⁴
Zainuddin Hasan⁵

1
**Exploration of
Impoliteness Students'
Utterances in Learning
Activities during the New
Normal Covid-19 Pandemic**

Abstract

The research describes language impoliteness in learning during the Covid-19 pandemic at the Berau District Elementary School, East Kalimantan. This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive-qualitative type of research. The subjects of this research were elementary school students and teachers in Berau Regency, East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. Data collection does by recording technique and note-taking technique. The data analysis technique uses an interactive analysis model from Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014). The results showed violations of all maxims of politeness in the language in the learning process. A breach of the tact maxim is that students respond to the teacher's orders with an attitude that is not serious or joking. Violation of the generosity maxim is shown by the way students express their intentions or desires emotionally. Violation of the approbation maxim is students criticizes directly or openly. The violation of the modesty maxim carried out by the students demeaned the speech partner. Violation of the agreement maxim indicates students' attitudes who do not respect the teacher's orders using harsh diction. The form of a breach of the sympathy maxim is that students lose their empathy for friends who are having trouble.

Keywords: Language, Politeness, Learning, Pandemic Covid-19.

Introduction

Language is a system of arbitrary sound symbols used by humans as a tool to communicate. In simple terms, language can interpret as a tool to convey something that comes to mind. More broadly, language uses as a tool to interact or communicate, in the sense of a tool to convey thoughts, ideas, concepts, or feelings (Jingwei, 2013). Language allows everyone to adapt to the physical and social environment and learn each individual's habits,

culture, customs, and backgrounds (Lycan, 2018). The use of language is closely related to education. In the field of education, schools are the official learning providers. Many elements are involved in supporting the process to achieve educational goals. Language is an essential medium of communication (Batibo, 2014).

The use of language to socialize is inseparable from the determinants of communication actions, and the principle of politeness manifests in activities and communication (Bell & Gibson, 2011). In

Rizky Amelia^{1*}, Primary Education Program, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
Email: rizkyamelia.2020@student.uny.ac.id

Zamzani², Indonesian Language, Education Program, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Ali Mustadi³, Primary Education Program, Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Chairil Faif Pasani⁴, Mathematics Education Program, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, Indonesia.

Zainuddin Hasan⁵, School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia.

1
assessing language politeness, at least two things need to consider: how to speak and whom to speak. The essence of politeness is ethics in socializing with the use of language and good choice of words politely, by paying attention to where, when, to whom, and for what purpose (Hamrakulova, 2020). Supporting the above opinion, the Linguistic Politeness Research Group suggests that the forms of speech spoken by the speaker are motivated by specific goals and objectives (Group, 2011).

Politeness can show that someone is ethical, educated, and cultured and deserves to appreciate as a good human being (Zamzani et al., 2012). Linguistic politeness is interesting to study because of the interaction between educators and students in a long learning process (Haryanto et al., 2018). Determinants of communication acts and the principle of politeness are critical in realizing communication in schools. In a broader context, politeness refers to politeness and nonverbal aspects such as behavior, facial expressions, and tone of voice. Lakoff defines politeness as a treatment that reduces shifts in an interaction (Lakoff & Lakoff, 2004). It means that politeness aims to avoid conflict; politeness means being polite, kind, patient, and calm.

The expected context of language politeness is the use of language that does not cause anger and offense to listeners. Such a situation will create an atmosphere of a harmonious relationship between the speaker and the hearer. All parents always advise their children to speak politely to everyone, especially their teachers, parents, and friends (Nashruddin & Al-Obaydi, 2021). The suggestion intends so that the spoken speech does not negatively impact the speech partner.

Communication between the speaker and the speech partner is good if the speech partner understands the intent and purpose (Mahmudi et al., 2021). So, conveying ideas or messages to others must be spoken well and politely (Brown, 2020). In addition, to establish a good relationship between the speaker and the speech partner, a feeling of mutual respect and respect must be created so that in the communication process, a comfortable and polite atmosphere can be made (Brown, 2015).

Politeness is a common phenomenon in the use of language activities. The principle of politeness in Indonesian has colored various human language activities, both in spoken and written language. In the study of pragmatics, there are principles about how a human being speaks correctly, well, and politely. These principles are the principle of politeness or politeness Leech. Leech divides the principles of politeness into six in his theory of language politeness, namely: (1) the tact maxim, (2) the maxim of generosity, (3)

the maxim of respect, (4) the maxim of humility, (5) the maxim of consensus, and (6) sympathy maxim (Leech, 2016).

School is the right place to learn and practice the principles of linguistic politeness. Because, in schools, there are rules that require students to use polite language, especially to teachers (Karimnia & Khodashenas, 2017). However, when viewed and observed, student speech to the teacher often violates the principle of linguistic politeness. That can be seen from how students speak to teachers who ignore appropriate language to older people and deserve respect (O'Driscoll, 2017). Many students use casual speech and even be rude when communicating with teachers. When speaking with teachers, both outside and during learning, they often use speech methods such as sharing with their friends. The principle of politeness in the language is repeatedly violated by students when they bring habits from outside into the school environment (Muammar & Mustadi, 2019).

The more culture develops, the more students are less polite in speaking to offend the slang speech partners in the community. Students assess that they can accept their friends and have followed trends in their environment (Febriasari & Wijayanti, 2018). It has resulted in the erosion of the use of Indonesian correctly and adequately by students, especially when communicating formally, such as in class. In the school environment, students should be more able to control their speech. It happens because the school environment is where they study and form character. However, in the teaching process, some students still use language that is not polite to friends and even to teachers (Hamrakulova, 2020). Students' use of impolite language can be seen from speech, such as "anjay, stupid, anjir, lola (long loading)", and various types of animal names in high notes and not by the context such as "cricket, pitik, asu."

Problems like this invite a lot of fights and fights that occur between students and in the community. When speaking, they often use harsh language and hurt other people's feelings. In addition, many students mock and bully each other, so this behavior has dire consequences. A student died after being beaten up by his friends for copying and using dirty words (Peng et al., 2014).

Based on this background, the purpose of this study is to produce a description of the violation of Leech's (1993) politeness principle in learning at SD Berau Regency, East Kalimantan. The politeness principle is the violation of the tact maxim, the breach of the generosity maxim, the violation of the approbation maxim, the violation of the modesty maxim, the violation of the agreement maxim, and the violation of the sympathy maxim.

Method

This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive-qualitative type of research. Research procedures that can produce descriptive data in the form of written words and oral speech from people and observable behaviors or actions are qualitative research (Flick, 2018). The data in this study were collected by recording student speech when communicating with the teacher in the learning process in the classroom. The research

subjects were elementary school students and teachers in Berau Regency, East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. The data source of this research is the students' speech when communicating with the teacher in-class learning. Researchers selected schools purposively by considering various school accreditations such as A, B, and C accreditations. The following is a list of the primary schools studied, which are as follows.

Table 1.

List of Observed Schools

No	School	Address	School Accreditation
1	SDN 002 Tanjung Redeb	Jl. Mangga I Kelurahan Tanjung Redeb, Kec. Tanjung Redeb, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	A
2	SDN 020 Tanjung Redeb	Jl. Kemakmuran Kelurahan Karang Ambun, Kec. Tanjung Redeb, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	A
3	SDN 008 Tanjung Redeb	Jl. Gunung Panjang Kelurahan Gunung Panjang, Kec. Tanjung Redeb, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	B
4	SDN 001 Sambaliung	Jl. Raja Alam, Kelurahan Sambaliung, Kec. Sambaliung, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	B
5	SDN 001 Tumbit Dayak	Jl. Kedamaian RT 2 Kelurahan Tumbit Dayak, Kec. Sambaliung, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	C
6	SDN 001 Sukan Tengah	Jl. UPT III Sukan Tengah, Kec. Sambaliung, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	C
7	SDN 001 Labanan Jaya	Jl. Dara Mahkota Kelurahan Lebanan Raya, Kec. Teluk Bayur, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	B
8	SDN 001 Rinding	Jl. Marsama Iswahyudi, Kel. Rinding, Kec. Teluk Bayur, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	A
9	SDN 001 Tumbit Melayu	Jl. Kenangan, Kelurahan Tumbit Melayu, Kec. Teluk Bayur, Kab. Berau, Kalimantan Timur.	C

This research data are student utterances that contain violations of politeness principles in Indonesian language learning interactions. The data collection method used in this study is the recording technique and note-taking technique. The recording technique does by recording without the knowledge of students during the learning process. The note-taking procedure records data in utterances that violated the maxims of politeness obtained from recordings from September to October 2021. The data analysis technique used an interactive analysis model from Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (Miles et al., 2014). The validity of the data was analyzed using a triangulation technique of sources and data. Code S-01, S-02, S-03, etc. used to refer to student data in violation of the principle of linguistic politeness. Codes T-01, T-02, T-03, and so on are used to mention teacher data.

Results and Discussion

Linguistic politeness as part of the pragmatic discipline has received a lot of interest and attention in the last thirty-five years (Wardhana &

Noermanzah, 2021). Much has been written about the principles and theories of politeness. It's essential to explain why people so often convey what they mean indirectly. In the view of linguistic politeness, the face most often represents each individual's feelings about self-esteem or self-image. This facial expression can be influenced, maintained, or damaged through interacting with other people (Terkourafi, 2015).

The principle of courtesy maintains social balance and friendly relations in conversation. Only with such a relationship can we expect that the continuity of the discussion will be maintained so that in speaking, the principle of courtesy needs to keep the harmony of speech in social relations. Leech suggested that the principle of politeness can formulate into six maxims. The six maxims are (1) the tact maxim, (2) the generosity maxim, (3) the approbation maxim, (4) the modesty maxim, (5) the agreement maxim, and (6) the sympathy maxim. The following is a complete description of the six maxims of Leech's politeness (G. Leech, 2016).

1
1. Tact Maxim

This maxim contains the principle of making the loss of others as small as possible and making the benefit of others as significant as possible. This tact maxim refers to the speech partner. Leech in Rusminto stated that indirect illocutionary tends to be more polite than direct illocutionary.

2. Generosity Maxim

The generosity maxim contains the principle that you should make your profit as small as possible and make your loss as big as possible. Generosity maxim uses the same pragmatic scale as the tact maxim, namely the scale of profit and loss because the generosity maxim refers to the speaker's self. That is what causes the generosity maxim to differ from the tact maxim because there is no implied element of loss in the speaker.

3. Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim is to criticize the interlocutor as little as possible and approbation the interlocutor as much as possible. This maxim is more concerned with the negative aspect, namely 'don't say unpleasant things about other people, especially the speech partner to the speech partner.

4. Modesty Maxim

This maxim contains the principle of praising yourself as little as possible and criticizing yourself as much as possible. It means that praising oneself is a violation of the principle of courtesy. Conversely, blaming oneself is a polite act in conversation. The more the speaker criticizes him, the more polite the speech will be. More than that, agreeing and affirming other people's praise of oneself is also a violation of this modesty maxim.

5. Agreement Maxim

This maxim contains the principle that there is a minor disagreement between the speaker and the hearer as possible, and the agreement between the speaker and the speech partner occurs as much as possible. This agreement maxim stands alone and uses the scale of understanding as a basis for reference. It is due to the existence of a double connection which is the target of this maxim of agreement, namely two actors at the same time (speech partners and speakers). In a conversation, the speaker and the interlocutor try to show understanding about the topic being discussed. If that is not possible, the speaker should try to compromise by partly

disagreeing, because after all, partial disagreement is preferable to a complete clash.

6. Sympathy Maxim

Similar to the agreement maxim, the sympathy maxim does not pair with other maxims. This maxim uses the sympathy scale as the basis for reference. The target of this sympathy maxim is the speaker and the speech partner. The sympathy maxim contains the principle of reducing the feeling of antipathy between the speaker and the speech partner to as little as possible and increasing the sympathy as much as possible between the speaker and the speech partner. If the interlocutor gets luck or happiness, the speaker must congratulate him. If the interlocutor gets into trouble or misfortune, the speaker should convey his sorrow or condolences as a sign of sympathy (Leech, 2016).

The forms of violations of politeness in students' language in communicating with teachers in learning at elementary school Berau Regency, East Kalimantan, Indonesia are as follows.

a. Violation of the Tact Maxim

The violation of the maxim of wisdom is found in S-01's speech when asked by T-01 about the reason for not attending school without giving information. S-01 did not answer the reason clearly, which made T-01 feel disadvantaged by S-01's answer. As in data (1) below.

T-01: *Why don't you come to school? And no information?*

S-01: *Anu, Ma'am...*

T-01: *Next time, if you don't come in, please tell me, so you don't have a lot of report cards.*

S-01: *(S-01 doesn't answer question T-01)*

S-01 violated the principle of politeness in the tact maxim by answering, "Um sir...". S-01 expressed the statement to benefit himself and reduce the profits of the T-01. His dishonesty because he had been truant aims to find a justification for his mistake. That violates the principle of tact maxim because S-01 should convey reasons honestly so that T-01 does not have to bother with other questions. The violation of the tact maxim occurs when the speaker does not respond honestly to the answer of the speech partner because dishonesty is a behavior that adds benefits to oneself (Febriasari & Wijayanti, 2018).

The subsequent violation of the tact maxim is found in S-02's utterance, which answers T-02's statement regarding the part written. S-02 tried to refuse the task given by T-02. S-02 grumbled when T-02 responded to his question because he

1 felt it was a challenging task for him. As in data (2) below.

S-02: Does that mean all are written?

T-02: Yes, because if it is only part of the short story, the short story will not be complete.

S-02: But I am annoyed, Sir. I'm tired.

S-02's statement violates the principle of politeness in the tact maxim. The violation shows from the answer of S-02, "But I am annoyed, sir. I'm tired." He shouldn't have said that; he just did what T-02 said. The S-02 did not give the T-02 an advantage as a person it should have great respect for.

b. Violation of the Generosity Maxim

Violation of the generosity maxim found in S-03's utterance when asking T-03 for the results of the collected tasks. As T-03 distributed successively, S-03 asked loudly because he couldn't wait for his turn to call. As in data (3) below.

S-03: What's my name, sir... It's been a long time!

T-03: Be patient. This is your turn.

S-03's utterance violates the generosity maxim. It can see in S-03's words that disrespect T-03 by using language that is not polite and accompanied by shouts or high notes. Even though at that time, T-03 was called one by one in order based on attendance. In the context of politeness, it is not appropriate for a student to say that towards T-03. The generosity maxim requires the speaker not to impose his will when conveying his speech to the speech partner, but in the speech event above, S-03 seems to force his will on T-03.

Violation of the generosity maxim is also found in S-04's utterance when he answered T-04's order when he reminded that his back shirt came out. At that time, S-04 did not thank him. Instead, he replied that the clothes came out independently, as in data (4) below.

T-04: The back of your uniform is out. Come on in!

S-04: Come out by itself, Ma'am.

In the example of the speech above, S-04 has violated the generosity maxim in delivering his speech. He should have kept his words to a minimum of making excuses against T-04. However, S-04 seeks justification by deliberately looking for reasons. S-04 should have put his clothes in immediately because T-05 had warned him.

c. Violation of the Approbation Maxim

The violation of the approbation maxim is found in S-05's speech when responding to orders from T-05 to cooperate with his group. The S-05 did not react well to the T-05's demands. The S-05 even refused the T-05's orders and in an attitude of disrespect for the T-05, as in data (5) below.

T-05: Let's all work together with the members of their respective groups.

Students: Yes, Sir.

S-05: No, Sir! I don't want to think.

S-05 has violated the approbation maxim in the delivery of his speech. He should have followed T-05's orders and minimized criticism of his group mates. The S-05 denied the T-05's charges and said it lacked teammates. These utterances tend to vilify friends with who she should invite to work. In the approbation maxim, speakers require to respect the statements of others.

The violation of the approbation maxim also occurs in S-06's speech which interrupts T-06's speech. When T-06 asked why the two students did not go to school the previous day without permission, suddenly S-06 interrupted while mocking before the two students who did not attend school the last day answered T-06's question. The T-06 did not ask the S-06 about it. As in data (6) below,

T-06: Who didn't get permission yesterday?

Student: (Two students raise their hands)

T-06: Why didn't you make a permit?

S-06: There is no paper. No envelopes!

S-06 has violated the approbation maxim by degrading and cornering his two friends in front of T-06 and his classmates. S-06 violates the maxim of gratitude for trying to take advantage of others. He didn't respect other people who would speak. Even the S-06 mocked him. Research says that speakers who do not appreciate their interlocutors violate the approbation maxim (Yu & Ren, 2013).

d. Violation of the Modesty Maxim

The modesty maxim's violation is found in S-07's utterance, which answers orders from T-07 with arrogant speech. S-07 did not show humility because when he spoke, he also threw a book to his friend. In the principle of politeness, speakers who speak arrogantly or arrogantly say to violate the modesty maxim or simplicity (Felemban, 2012). As in the following data (7).

T-07: You work in groups. Please start to discuss.

1
S-07: *Here you go! (Throwing the book to his friend)*

The utterance violates the modesty maxim because it spoke loudly. S-07 looks arrogant as he gives his answer by throwing the book at his friend. S-07's utterance categorizes violating the modesty maxim because he did not show humility in responding to T-07's statement.

The violation of the modesty maxim also occurs in S-08's utterance when responding to a question from T-07. In the speech, S-08 answered T-07's question while interrupting the conversation while telling S-09 (his friend) that he had done the task in the book. As in the following data (8).

T-07: *The group work has been done.*
S-09: *Not finished, Sir.*
S-08: *I have answered.*

The statement violated the modesty maxim because S-08 boasted by saying that he had completed the task in the book. He gave the S-09 a loss in the face of the T-08. S-08's words made S-09 look like a lazier child than himself.

e. Violation of the Agreement Maxim

The violation of the agreement maxim can see in S-02's speech which cannot accept T-09's speech when it conveys that time is running out, and the teacher must collect assignments immediately. S-02 grumbled that he hadn't finished his assignment yet. As in the following data (9).

T-09: *Assignments, please collect immediately because time is running out!*
S-10: *That's right...still not finished taking notes yet.*
T-09: *You have given enough time, but you didn't do it right away.*

The data shows that the S-10 grumbled because there was a mismatch between him and the T-09. The discrepancy should convey well so that he does not seem rebellious. The speaker must maximize the agreement with the speech partner in the agreement, but this is not done by S-10.

Violation of the agreement maxim also occurs in S-11's utterances that answer questions from T-10. The answer given by S-11 shows an attitude of disagreement with T-10's speech. S-11 told T-10 to shift the question to another group. As in the following data (10).

Q-10: *What about the other groups? All the same? Or not yet? How about S-11?*
S-11: *Not yet, Ma'am. Another, Ma'am!*

The speech data is seen as impolite speech because it minimizes the agreement between T-10 and students. Even though S-11 had not finished doing his assignment, he should not have asked T-10 to appoint another student to answer the question.

f. Violation of the Sympathy Maxim

The violation of the sympathy maxim finds in S-12's speech interrupts T-11's statement by grumbling. At that time, T-11 asked students not to go out before T-11 closed the lesson. As in the following data (11).

T-11: *Don't go out before I finish!*
S-12: *I'm hungry, Sir.*

The S-12 utterance violates the principle of politeness in the sympathy maxim. The violation sees when S-12 denied T-11's warning not to leave before T-11 said hello. S-12 is not sympathetic to T-11. Students should obey the orders of T-11 and speak politely.

Violation of the sympathy maxim is also found in S-13's speech when borrowing pencil from other students. S-13 spoke with a shout. When warned by T-12 not to shout in class, S-13 instead felt guilty or apologized. However, he denied T-12's warning by saying harshly. As in the following data (11).

S-13: *Tiaa... Pencil.*
T-12: *S-13, it's not in the forest, so don't shout out.*
S-13: *He didn't hear me, Ma'am. I called deaf.*
T-12: *Heh, why do you even say that harshly?*
S-13: *Hehe.*

Violation of the principle of politeness in the sympathy maxim committed by S-13. He didn't heed T-12's words that reminded S-13 carefully. Even S-13's displeasure continued when he rebuttal T-12's advice by saying that his friend was "budek" which in Indonesian means "deaf." The findings of the study support the research findings on the violation of the sympathy maxim.

Field records show that the reality of students' language politeness in elementary schools is very worrying. The speech acts used by students to teachers are far from polite; even students in high grades communicate with teachers like friends. When learning is taking place, there are still many students who make fun of when answering questions from the teacher. Various factors cause the violation of politeness principles. The factors that influence it are as follows.

1. *Speech Emotion Situation*

The student's emotional situation affects the violation of the principle of politeness. Students can commit breaches because of their unfavorable emotional state, such as upset, nervous, etc. It would help if students were careful when talking to other people, especially when their emotions are not good, so you don't offend other people (Langlotz & Locher, 2017).

2. *The Purpose of the Students*

The purpose of the students' speech also affects the violation of the principle of politeness. The students' intention or goal in inviting other people to talk sometimes has a specific meaning. So that it can offend the partner's feelings, such as implanting or other things (Culpeper & Terkourafi, 2017).

3. *Psychological*

What causes students to violate the principle of politeness is psychological problems. That tends to be due to immature emotional nature, so they cannot control their emotions. This psychological factor can form by the habit of violence and impoliteness that continues around their environment (Zhang & Sapp, 2013). Feeling higher self-esteem can also trigger students to think of other people as trivial and not shy.

4. *Learning program*

The majority of learning program methods in Indonesia always excel in the academic section. Learning about character development in terms of ethics and manners is not given much attention. Teaching ethics and manners in schools tends to be theoretical (Duhita & Zulaeha, 2018). In addition, the learning program should be fun and not burdensome and tedious so that students lose enthusiasm and become bored in the learning process (Félix-Brasdefer & Mugford, 2017).

5. *Advances in Technology and Information*

The development of advanced technology and information makes an impact on the mindset of students. Furthermore, distance learning or online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic exacerbated students' impoliteness in the language (Graham & Hardaker, 2017). That is due to the lack of parental attention to control students' language politeness for more than three semesters of learning from home. Even students send assignments via Whatsapp to the teacher by writing, "This is my assignment. Read it." This form of speech interprets that students' linguistic

politeness when learning is critical and requires immediate treatment.

6. *Teacher-student Relationship*

Some so many teachers want to position themselves as fun teachers to their students to label as "slang" teachers. It is also good to get closer and are not afraid to ask something so that their students' thoughts can be free to explore. However, closeness does not rule out the possibility that it will negatively impact. Namely, students feel shy and no longer see their teacher as someone they need to obey (Wang et al., 2005).

7. *Family Factor*

Family environmental factors also have an influence. Students who are used to violating the principle of politeness and fighting against their parents will undoubtedly behave like that at school (Fukushima, 2013). In addition, there are also cases where parents insist on defending their students if problems occur at school. Even though it was the student's fault, the parents still insisted on blaming the school. That way, the student will be more daring to violate the principle of politeness when talking to his teacher.

8. *Promiscuity*

Promiscuity is an effect of the modernization of culture that is not by Indonesian customs. It will lead to the imitation of western civilization, which tends to be accessible without any ties to traditions that have long existed in the life of the Indonesian people (Schepers, 2014).

9. *Social Media*

The condition of students' language politeness is further exacerbated by the negative influence of social media (Chen, 2015). Students who are familiar with gadgets and technology during online learning get a little or a lot of bad results in terms of language impoliteness, such as from the TikTok platform, Youtube, online games, Facebook, and various other application platforms (Graham & Hardaker, 2017). One of them is like playing free-fire online games that elementary school students love at this time. This game hurts several aspects, namely (1) student learning outcomes (Harahap & Ramadan, 2021); (2) student learning interest (Meutia et al., 2020); (3) students' emotional and social development (Paremeswara & Lestari, 2021); and (4) students' communication behavior, especially those related to language politeness (Debi & Yamin, 2021).

1 10. Game Online

Students addicted to online games often speak harshly and say swear words when playing games through cellphones, internet cafes, or game centers (Mulya Sari, 2019). Students who are addicted to online games include in the psychological addiction group. Students have a solid and wholehearted desire (impulse) to do something continuously; in this case, there is an inner urge to play online games always (Erofiana et al., 2021).

Students who often play online games do not have good verbal and nonverbal communication skills (Asmiati et al., 2021). That was also expressed by several teachers who were interviewed. When students ask to express opinions, they do not do so. Students tend to be engrossed in their activities. Likewise, when spoken to, students tend not to maintain eye contact with the interlocutor (Yuli, 2021). In addition, the interaction of students who often play online games affects the interaction ability in communicating with people outside of playing online games. The low interaction of students addicted to online games will trigger an indifferent attitude towards teachers, fellow friends and even hurt friends (Iman et al., 2020).

Conclusion

In the learning process at SD Berau Regency, East Kalimantan, politeness in the language emphasizes. Students are always taught to use polite language when communicating with teachers. However, in reality, there are still many students who do not heed the advice given by the teachers in communicating with their teachers. Many students violate the principle of politeness in communicating with their teachers.

Of the six principles of politeness in language proposed by Leech (1993), in the learning process at SD Berau District, East Kalimantan, all of them were violated by students. The six maxims of politeness in language are (1) the tact maxim, (2) the generosity maxim, (3) the approbation maxim, (4) the modesty maxim, (5) the agreement maxim, and (6) the sympathy maxim. A breach of the tact maxim is that students respond to the teacher's orders with an attitude that is not serious or joking. Violation of the generosity maxim is shown by the way students express their intentions or desires emotionally. Violation of the approbation maxim is students criticize directly or openly. The violation of the modesty maxim carried out by the students demeaned the speech partner. Violation of the agreement maxim is indicated by students' attitudes who do not respect the teacher's orders using harsh diction. The form of a breach of the

sympathy maxim is that students lose their empathy for friends who are having trouble.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported from The Innovation Talent Program of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Higher Education Indonesia.

References

- Bach, K. (2004). *Pragmatics and the Philosophy of Language*. The Handbook of Pragmatics, 463, 487.
- Batibo, H.M. (2014). The growth of Kiswahili as language of education and administration in Tanzania. In *Discrimination through Language in Africa?*, 57–80.
- Bell, A., & Gibson, A. (2011). Staging language: An introduction to the sociolinguistics of performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(5), 555–572.
- Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS)*, (2nd ed.), Elsevier, 326–330.
- Brown, P. (2020). Politeness. *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*, 1–8.
- Culpeper, J., & Terkourafi, M. (2017). Pragmatic approaches (im) politeness. In *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im) politeness*, Springer, 11–39.
- Duhita, A.A., & Zulaeha, I. (2018). The Politeness Speech of Primary School Teacher in the Character Building of Learners. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(2), 112–121.
- Febriasari, D., & Wijayanti, W. (2018). Language politeness in the learning process in elementary schools. *KREDO: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 2(1), 140–156.
- Felemban, F.H. (2012). Building up learners' communicative competence: The politeness principle. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 70–76.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J.C., & Mugford, G. (2017). (Im) politeness: Learning and teaching. *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) Politeness*, 489–516.
- Flick, U. (2018). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage.
- Fukushima, S. (2013). Evaluation of (im) politeness: A comparative study among Japanese students, Japanese parents and American students on evaluation of attentiveness. *Pragmatics*, 23(2), 275–299.
- Graham, S.L., & Hardaker, C. (2017). (Im) politeness in digital communication. In *The*

- Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) politeness*, Springer, 785–814.
- Group, L.P.R. (2011). *Discursive approaches to politeness*. Walter de Gruyter, Vol. 8.
- Hamrakulova, G. (2020). Politeness Theory in Language. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, (2), 151–157.
- Haryanto, H., Weda, S., & Nashruddin, N. (2018). Politeness principle and its implication in EFL classroom in Indonesia. *XLanguage" European Scientific Language Journal"*, 11(4), 90–112.
- Jingwei, T. (2013). Pragmatic functions of hedges and politeness principles. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(4), 155–160.
- Karimnia, A., & Khodashenas, M.R. (2017). Patterns of politeness in teacher-student interaction: Investigating an academic context. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 5(1), 69–87.
- Lakoff, R., & Lakoff, R.T. (2004). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries*. Oxford University Press, USA, Vol. 3.
- Langlotz, A., & Locher, M.A. (2017). (Im) politeness and emotion. In *the Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) politeness*, Springer, 287–322.
- Leech, G. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Lycan, W.G. (2018). *Philosophy of language: A contemporary introduction*. Routledge.
- Mahmudi, A.G., Irawati, L., & Soleh, D.R. (2021). Kesantunan Berbahasa Siswa dalam Berkomunikasi dengan Guru (Kajian Pragmatk). *Deiksis*, 13(2), 98–109.
- Mariani, N. (2016). Developing Students' Intelligent Character through Linguistic Politeness: The Case of English as a Foreign Language for Indonesian Students. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 101–106.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. 3rd. Ed: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muammar, M., & Mustadi, A. (2019). Students' Politeness Language Use in Elementary Schools in Mataram City. *3rd International Conference on Current Issues in Education (ICCIE 2018)*, 337–343.
- Nashruddin, N., & Al-Obaydi, L.H. (2021). Linguistics Politeness in Reinforcing Character During Learning Activities. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 8(1), 210–217.
- O'Driscoll, J. (2017). Face and (Im) politeness. *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im) Politeness*, 89–118.
- Peng, L., Xie, F., & Cai, L. (2014). A case study of college teacher's politeness strategy in EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1), 110–115.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Schepers, B.M. (2014). Teaching Pragmatics:(im) politeness in an EFL classroom. *BELT-Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 5(1), 22–29.
- Terkourafi, M. (2015). Conventionalization: A new agenda for im/politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 11–18.
- Wang, N., Johnson, W.L., Mayer, R.E., Rizzo, P., Shaw, E., & Collins, H. (2005). The Politeness Effect: Pedagogical Agents and Learning Gains. *AIED*, 686–693.
- Wardhana, D.E.C., & Noermanızah, N. (2021). Early Childhood Language Politeness Strategy Model In Multiethnic Communication. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 9(2), 313–322.
- Yu, H.A.O., & Ren, C.H.I. (2013). Politeness principle in human communication. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, 4(3), 54–57.
- Zamzani, Z., Musfiroh, T., Maslakhah, S., Listiyorini, A., & Rahayu, Y.E. (2012). Development of Indonesian Politeness Measurement Tool in Face -to -Face Formal Social Interaction. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 17(2), 92-117.
- Zhang, Q., & Sapp, D.A. (2013). Psychological reactance and resistance intention in the classroom: Effects of perceived request politeness and legitimacy, relationship distance, and teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, 62(1), 1–25.

Exploration of Impoliteness Students' Utterances in Learning Activities during the New Normal Covid-19 Pandemic

ORIGINALITY REPORT

92%

SIMILARITY INDEX

92%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

7%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

int-jecse.net

Internet Source

89%

2

Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah
Purwokerto

Student Paper

2%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography Off