IMPOLITENESS IN THE NARRATIVES OF ELT STUDENTS DURING THEIR TEACHING PRACTICUM[1]

Impolidez em narrativas de estagiários do curso de Letras Inglês

Victoria Moura da Silva[2]

Orientação: Prof. Dr. Ricardo Rios Barreto Filho[3]

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze how future teachers' identities are affected by impoliteness during their compulsory teaching practicum and how these experiences shape their perceptions of their careers. The participants answered a Google Forms questionnaire, describing a situation involving impoliteness that caused discomfort, embarrassment, or other negative feelings. The reports were analyzed using Spencer-Oatey's face components and Culpeper and Hardaker's work on intentionality and emotions to observe how respondents viewed impolite behavior and how it affected their professional choice. It was concluded that most of the participants had at least one negative experience to share, which implies that their expectations of how an educational environment should be were frustrated; and the most common face attacks were on their social face and on their quality faces, which may cause the feeling of inadequacy and vulnerability, as well as a demotivating factor.

Keywords: Impoliteness; Face Management; Teaching Practicum; Identities

---

[1] 1 Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao Curso de Letras Inglês da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE), cuja banca de defesa foi composta pelos seguintes membros: Prof. Dr. Ricardo Rios Barreto Filho; Profa. Mariana Ferreira Schulz, na seguinte data: 11 de novembro de 2025.

[2] Graduanda em Letras Inglês na UFPE

[3] Professor do Curso de Letras Inglês da UFPE

RESUMO:

Esta pesquisa tem por objetivo analisar o modo pelo qual as identidades de futuros professores são afetadas pela impolidez durante o estágio obrigatório de docência e como essas experiências influenciam a maneira como percebem suas carreiras. Os participantes responderam a um questionário no Google Forms, no qual narraram uma situação que envolveu impolidez e que gerou desconforto, constrangimento e outros sentimentos negativos. Os relatos foram analisados a partir dos componentes de face propostos por Spencer-Oatey e dos trabalhos de Culpeper e Hardaker sobre intencionalidade e emoções, com o intuito de observar como os respondentes compreendem o comportamento impolido e como ele impacta sua escolha profissional. Constatou-se que a maioria dos participantes vivenciou ao menos uma experiência negativa, implicando que suas expectativas em relação a como o ambiente educacional deveria ser foram frustradas; além disso, os ataques de face mais recorrentes foram à face social e à face de qualidade, o que pode ocasionar sensação de inadequação e vulnerabilidade, bem como ser um fator desmotivador.

Palavras-chave: Impolidez; Gestão da Face; Estágio Docência; Identidades.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The impoliteness studies are situated within the pragmatics and sociointerational field. Culpeper and Hardaker (2017) argue that impoliteness cannot be viewed simply as a "mirror image of linguistics politeness." Although pioneer works such as Brown and Levinson's were focused on politeness, later studies suggested that impoliteness should not be considered its opposite, or the lack of politeness. Culpeper (2011) defines impoliteness as "a negative attitude towards specific behaviors occurring in specific contexts."

An important concept to the impoliteness theories is identity and how it is affected by impoliteness. Spencer-Oatey (2007) borrows Simon's definition, arguing that identity and face are interrelated and it is both cognitive and social. According to the author, one of the functions of identity is to provide "people with a sense of belonging (through their relational and collective self-aspects) and with a sense of distinctiveness (through their individual self-aspects)." (Spencer Oatey, 2007, p. 641). This concept grounds the proposal of the present research.

When it comes to teaching formation, one of the most important parts is the teaching practice that students must go through in order to obtain their degree. In Brazil, the teaching internship is regulated by the Constitution, Law 11.788/2008, and it is defined as a "supervised educational act at school (...) which aims to prepare for productive work students who are attending regular education in institutions of higher education (...)" It is compulsory for the English Language Teaching course, a condition for obtaining the degree.

Once it is a step that every ELT student must go through in Brazil, it should also be a crucial moment in students' lives, especially in the construction of their identities as future teachers. This work, thus, aims to observe if and how ELT students experienced impoliteness during their teaching practice, based on reports collected via Google Forms, and how these negative experiences affected their identities and their perceptions of the teaching environment. Understanding this may also help future works in the impoliteness field to identify common face attacks in the educational environment.

This work is divided into five sections: this brief introduction; a theoretical framework, delimiting the works that grounded the research and a contextualization of

the impoliteness theory; the methodology used; the analysis of the corpus, which consists of reports of students and ex-students of ELT; and a conclusion.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

One of the most influential works in the impoliteness field is the book *Politeness-some universals in language usage,* by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). The authors utilized the concept of "face" proposed by Goffman, a face that would be split between two wants: the negative face, or the desire of every competent adult to act unimpeded; and the positive face, or the desire to be understood, approved, or admired. This model was based on the Face-Threatening Acts (FTA).

Despite being a milestone in studies on impoliteness, Brown and Levinson's theory was revised and criticized, mainly because of its supposedly universal character, with the concept of a Model Person, who would be an ideal fluent native speaker of a given language, endowed with the special proprieties of "face and rationality". On the other hand, the authors recognized that it is also needed to consider face culturally. Gino Eelen (2001, p. 5) points out that this corroborates the idea that Brown and Levinson's theory does not necessarily lead to a supposition of cultural universalism. To the author, "the core theoretical notions of the existence of positive and negative face, the principle of face-threat (…) are expected to be cross-culturally constant and thus universally valid."

Another relevant work in the impoliteness area is Culpeper's *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence* (2011). The author states that impoliteness involves a "mental attitude held by a participant and comprised of negative evaluative beliefs about particular behaviours in particular social contexts, and the activation of that attitude by those particular in-context behaviours." (Culpeper, 2011, p. 22). Such an attitude is sustained by expectations, wants or beliefs regarding the social organization, including how one's or a group's identities are mediated by others in interactions. Thus, behaviors are considered "impolite" when they conflict with what is expected.

A key element to Culpeper's theory is the emotions, also considering Goffman's and van Dijk's views. In this sense, emotions would stimulate attitude systems that encompass evaluative beliefs: the self-conscious ones (for example, shame and

embarrassment) would be associated with face violations, whilst the emotion that condemns others (disdain or anger) would be more linked to social rights violations (2011, p. 22).

Furthermore, the author's analysis distinguishes two main types of impoliteness: conventionalized formulaic impoliteness and implicational. The first one refers to linguistic forms that are "pre-charged" with impoliteness effects in specific contexts, and these formulae may be intensified through grammar (with intensifiers or taboo words, for instance), through lexicon and non-verbal aspects. The second one happens when impoliteness is inferred from what was said or done (or not said or not done), without the use of conventional impolite formulae.

According to Culpeper, the implicational impoliteness is divided into three orientations: form driven, which is activated by marked semantic content (such as insinuations or mimics); convention-driven, which happens when there is an incompatibility between context elaborated by some conventionalized formulae and the other part of behavior, or even a broader context usage, like sarcasm, when impoliteness interpretation is motivated by contextual expectations; and finally, context-driven, even if behavior is not marked or is completely absent (an example would be not saying "thank you" in a context in which it is expected).

Another important research to this work is Spencer-Oatey's, especially when it comes to face, rapport, and identity. In her work, *Culturally speaking*, the author defines rapport as "people's subjective perceptions of (dis)harmony or smoothness turbulence in interpersonal relations" (2008, p. 335). She also states that there are three key factors that influence rapport: face sensitivities, sociality rights and obligations, and interactional rapports.

Spencer-Oatey also defines face as something related to people's sense of worth, dignity, and identity, associated with respect, honour, status, reputation, and competence. The author believes that face is a universal phenomenon, as everyone has concerns about face. According to her, it is something closely related to one's sense of identity or self-concept. In her paper *Theories of identity and the analysis of the face*, Spencer-Oatey points out that the "notion of face cannot be divorced from social interaction," once that face entails making claims about one's attributes that in turn entail the appraisal of others. (Spencer-Oatey, 2007, p. 643)

The Face Threatening Acts (FTA) concept, in her point of view, is a subjective perspective and it is context dependent. Similar to this concept, she argues that

positive rapport (that is, harmony) may be threatened in three ways: face-threatening behaviour, through rights-threatening or obligation-omission behaviour, and through goal-threatening behaviour. (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 17)

The author then provides some rapport management strategies: illocutionary domain, or the speech act strategies, with three essential elements: the selection of speech act components (e.g., gratitude and requests); linguistic directness/indirectness, and the use of upgraders and downgraders, which modify the impact of the speech act. (2008, p. 22-23) The other domains of rapport management are the discourse domain (related to discourse content and structure), participation domain (deals with procedural aspects of interaction such as turn taking), stylistic domain (concerned with choice of tone, vocabulary, syntax, terms of address or honorifics), and the non-verbal domain (gestures, body movements, eye contact, proxemics).

When it comes to narratives, Anna De Fina states that they are the main vehicle for expressing identity, collective or individual. There seems to be a consensus among researchers that identities are not individual essences, but rather constructed - people build their own and other people's identities, in a situated, historical, and interactional construction. One of the theories discussed by De Fina is the view of storytelling as a practice, which considers identities negotiated within storytelling events as closely related to the rights, obligations, and particular tasks indexed by specific social activities. Viewing narrative as a practice also emphasizes the role of all of the participants in the construction of identities. (2015, p. 360)

Catherine Riessman's *Narrative Methods in Human Science Research* presents some proposals to analyze narratives. One of them is thematic analysis, which is centered on what is said, written, or visually shown in a narrative. Its main goal is to identify and categorize the topics that emerge from participants' reports. (2008, p. 80). This kind of analysis seeks to keep the narrative intact, and it also takes into account the social context, especially the broader ones, such as power structures and cultural ideologies. It is a powerful tool to understand what narratives communicate in terms of content and meaning, connecting individual experiences to social contexts. Thus, this is the chosen proposal for the corpus analysis that consists of personal narratives, focusing on the content of the participants' stories and selecting the main topics (in this case, impoliteness).

3. METHODOLOGY

As stated in the theoretical framework, the corpus, consisting of personal stories sent by Google Forms by the participants, is analyzed under the concept of narratives proposed by Riessman and De Fina, considering their personal experiences and the context, as well as the content of each report, which makes this a qualitative research. Once the contexts of the narratives is well delimited - during participants' teaching practicum - it is possible to find a common ground (if there is any).

The Google Forms consists of four parts: consent form, inclusion criteria (that is, if the informants have ever had a negative experience during their teaching practicum), personal information (name, gender, how long they have been or have studied at university, and when the teaching practicum took place); and the report itself of their experience(s) and how they define this situation in one word.

The applied methodology of analysis of the corpus is the face management structure proposed by Spencer-Oatey in her work "*Managing rapport in talk: using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations*" (2007). In this work, the author distinguishes between face management and sociality rights management, being the two main motivational components for rapport management. She points out that face management has some aspects, such as the quality face, or the desire for being evaluated positively; and the social identity face, or the desire for people to acknowledge our social identities and roles. The sociality rights management also presents two interrelated aspects: equity rights and association rights.

Other important works include Culpeper and Hardaker's "*Impoliteness*" (2017), Spencer-Oatey (2005), and her rapport management strategies: behavioral expectations, face sensitivities (with two fundamental types of face: respectability and identity), and interactional wants. Culpeper's (2011) impoliteness formulae - insults, personalized negative vocatives, personalized negative assertions, pointed criticisms or complaints, condescensions, silencers, dismissals, and so on - were also applied to the corpus.

Thirteen answers from people who are still studying or have already graduated were analyzed. They came from different backgrounds and institutions, although most of them are or were students at Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. 62,5% of the participants identify as female, 25% as male and 12,5% as non-binary. 72,7% related

having had uncomfortable, embarrassing or bothering situations, against 27,3% who claim not having experienced anything like that.

4. ANALYSIS

The first narrative analyzed here shows the text of a trainee who felt embarrassed by a coordinator's behavior, as it follows:

Respondent 1 (L.C.)

I was embarrassed by a coordinator in an English course due to my English level at the time I had my teaching practicum there. He used an unnecessary, sarcastic tone to refer to my (English) level in front of other teachers. After this episode, he fired me. I felt uncomfortable and embarrassed because this took place in front of other teachers and because it came from a person who had already graduated and thus had already gone through all the stages I was still experiencing. This made me insecure, and I thought seriously about giving up the course.

In this first sample, the participant reports that the coordinator used a "sarcastic tone" to refer to her English level. Furthermore, the situation took place in front of other teachers. According to Culpeper and Hardaker (2017), one of the ways impoliteness occurs is when "the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally" or "the hearer perceives behaviour as intentionally face-attacking", or a combination of those two. This way, intentionality has a crucial role in the evaluation of impoliteness, which may impact the hearer's emotional response.

It is clear that the hearer, L.C., perceives the coordinator's behaviour as an intentional attack on her face, especially when the participant goes on using the words "uncomfortable" and "embarrassed". Regarding Spencer-Oatey's work, *Managing rapport in talk: Using sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations* (2002), L.C. had a violation of their social identity face, once the participant felt personally attacked, with the aggravating factor that it took place in front of some colleagues. Respondent one's experience also contains a violation of their quality face — in the end of the report, L.C. felt insecure, that is, the experience affected their self-esteem, and it almost made the respondent

give up on her course, because the coordinator embarrassed the participant in front of other teachers talking about L.C.'s English level and, thus, ability and capacity.

The next situation involves W.J. (Respondent 2), in which a student had an inadequate behavior in their point of view. The following excerpt illustrates the circumstance that started the impoliteness evaluation and the trainee's answer to that:

Respondent 2 (W.J.)

"*During my teaching practicum in middle school, while I was teaching in a grade 9 class, a specific student was disturbing the classmates and my class, even his classmates were complaining about the situation, for he would not sit and kept wandering around the classroom and talking in a loud voice with other students who did not want to talk. I called the student's attention more than once, but at this moment I was alone in the classroom, because my supervisor had to leave for a few minutes, so he simply acted with debauchery and pretended not to hear what I was saying. It was when I decided to leave the classroom and call a coordinator who was passing through the corridor and she took the student to the head teacher, and this way I could continue with my class, but I lost about 10 minutes because of the student's interruptions.*"

In this specific narrative, W.J. reported a situation with a student who didn't behave well and kept interrupting the class. Respondent 2 described the student's actions as "debauched," making it obvious that this was received as a face attack, more specifically, their social identity face; during the practicum, the respondent was teaching and thus represented an authority in the classroom. However, the student did not seem to recognize W.J.'s authority. Something similar happened in the next reported situation, when some other students called the participant "boring and annoying," and the word "uncomfortable" was used to describe the respondent's feeling at the moment. Respondent 2 stated that they were trying to be "polite and nice." Thus, at the end of the day, what affected respondent 2 the most was students' indiscipline, a factor that attacked both his quality and social identity face.

According to respondent 3, this situation took place during her time as a teacher in an English school, with the coordinator of the course. In her words, the person

Respondent 3 (L.G.)

"(...) embarrassed me on my first day with a class: I was talking to the new students going up the stairs to show them their classroom and she shouted from downstairs I was impolite because I hadn't greeted her with a good morning. I realized that it not only caused me discomfort but, in the students, too, and this caused an awful first impression."

Here, there are two perceptions: the coordinator's and the respondent's. The coordinator called L.G. "impolite" for not greeting them with a "good morning", and in front of the students. In this sense, Culpeper (2011) pointed out that emotions are linked to contexts, especially cultural ones. In this particular case, the coordinator called L.G. out for not greeting them, something considered discourteous in their cultural context (Brazilian). Respondent 3, on the other hand, described that being called out like that in front of the students caused general discomfort. It is possible, then, to assume that being publicly scolded causes a negative impression on others, even more than not saying "good morning."

Another circumstance related by L.G. involved blaming:

"As it was my first time teaching children, I asked my coordinator what I was supposed to do and she, one more time, told me it was my problem I was not teaching interactive classes to them (the students), it was almost as if I had to be a court jester to get the minimum attention and she did not help me at all to elaborate this kind of class. Once the next topic would be "how much" and "how many", I decided to create a little shop with some materials the school had to try and follow the coordinators advice for a playful class. However, one of the children decided to be the "shop's thief" in the game and threw a pouf, which hit the classroom's television. I was the one to blame, even though I was following the instructions which

> *were given to me. In a previous episode, this same student had cracked my cellphone's screen as a joke and I wanted to talk to the child's parents, but the school did not let me because it was an "occupational accident,' and, again, if I were properly entertaining the child this would not have happened. "*

Respondent 3 related a feeling of being pressed to act as a "court jester" to entertain students, as well as of being left alone, without clear directions except for creating amusing classes. In one of these classes, a student ended up breaking a television, and the teacher was the one to blame. In terms of the management of sociality rights defended by Spencer-Oatey (2002), which are concerned with personal/social entitlements derived from personal expectations, the author also claims that this component involves people's worries regarding justice, consideration, and social inclusion or exclusion. One aspect of this component is Equity rights, an essential belief that we are entitled to personal consideration from others and to be treated fairly. Within equity entitlement, there are two more components: the notion of cost-benefit, and the issue of autonomy imposition, or the extent to which people control or impose on us.

This situation illustrates a violation of the equity right, more specifically, the autonomy imposition; the respondent expected to be treated respectfully and to be helped and supported, but it did not happen. On the contrary, the whole situation was treated as an accident for a lack of attention, also violating the respondent's social identity face, who felt that the only required ability was to learn how to impose oneself and that one needs to flatter their superiors, making this a negative experience on the whole.

M.C. shared a personal experience with a student who knew them personally, a neighbor who was also a student at the school the participant was teaching.

Respondent 4 (M.C.)

When the student saw me entering his classroom for the first time, he exclaimed in a laud, indignant tone: "Oh, it's my crazy neighbor!" I was shocked because I have never suffered violence now as a "teacher," only as an elementary school student.

> *The class teacher asked me if I knew him (the student) and I confirmed I did, and she defended me and demanded respect (from the student).*

The student used a slur to refer to the participant: "my crazy neighbor." M.C. related that people who lived near them called them ableist slurs for being autistic. In this situation, it is possible to observe a double attack to the face: a quality face attack, referring to the respondent's abilities in a rude way, and also an attack to the social identity face.

The participant stated that this was the first time something like that happened during their teaching practicum, but that similar situations occurred during their student days. The fact that the student felt confident enough to use those words in front of the whole class, and that M.C. felt "shocked", shows that the expectation of being respected and well-treated in a classroom context as a teacher may be frustrated at any time, especially when it comes to people with disabilities. The respondent described this moment as quite traumatizing, directly affecting their emotions. The fact that the teacher defended and demanded respect from the said student may have contributed to repairing the respondent's social identity face.

F.Y. narrated three situations, two of them involving third parties and one directly at the respondent. The first two moments were quite similar: other teachers having an argument in front of the respondent and making them uncomfortable, but this cannot be considered a direct attack to the face. However, the third circumstance may be analyzed properly:

Respondent 5 (F.Y.)

In another moment, this time in a technical school, I needed to teach with a very skilled English teacher, but I felt very uncomfortable because I was not fluent, and I believe he expected this from me. What made me most insecure about teaching was the fact that this teacher started to speak in English with me despite having welcomed me well, and this blocked me.

Even though the said teacher did not explicitly treat F.Y. badly, the respondent used the word "uncomfortable" to describe the moment, by expecting them to be fluent in English and then proceeding to speak in the language with respondent 5. According

to Culpeper (2005), impoliteness can be either a speaker's act containing an intentional face attack or how the hearer perceives this behavior. In this case, respondent 5 considered this as something relevant to relate in this research, confirming that perception is a key factor when it comes to impoliteness.

This report is another example of an attack on the quality face; F.Y. felt challenged by the teacher, as if he or she was testing their abilities in the language - thus, the competence and abilities, key factors when it comes to quality face.

When it comes to appearance, the following situation happened to H.S. (Respondent 6):

Respondent 6 (H.S.)

After I had my hair cut (I have curly hair), I was ordered to tie up or wet my hair because it was "too voluminous", "out of the standard" and "looked like a black-power."

(…) The argument they used was because "it was not in accordance with the dress code," even though a dress code of any kind was never mentioned neither during the training nor in the digital files made available for consultation of protocols. I felt embarrassed, I had been interning for a few months and I did not want to antagonize my superiors in any way, and my colleagues and students who had seen me minutes earlier noticed I had wet my hair, and I needed to answer the students vaguely, but I had spoken openly to my colleagues about this event.

The words used by H.S.'s coordinator are a clear attack on their social identity face. It is stated that the participant did not want to "oppose the superiors," refusing to change the hairstyle, showing an explicit hierarchical structure, where teachers are not at the top. Culpeper and Hardaker (2017), while discussing the matters of power and impoliteness, affirm that patronising behaviour (including condescending, belittling, ridiculing, and demeaning behaviours) involves an abuse of power, including producing or perceiving a display of power that infringes an understood hierarchy. (Culpeper and Hardaker, 2017, p. 13). The fact that respondent 6 complied with the coordinator's request also raises the issue of autonomy-imposition, stated by Spencer-Oatey (how people control us or impose on us).

Furthermore, H.S. judges relevant to informed that they are not a black or mixed person. In Brazilian society, it is known that black and mixed people are often victims of racism in various contexts, and the teaching practicum context might be one. Despite the fact H.S. declares being a white person, a physical appearance considered inadequate by the school's pattern is an indication that their standard may be based on a certain type of phenotype. Addressing the teacher's appearance, thus, is more than just a violation of their social identity face and quality face - especially because the participant needed to explain the sudden change to the students - but also equity face violation.

A similar situation happened to L.N.

Respondent 7 (L.N.)

I had been teaching in an early childhood school. I did not go there with my hair loose, but when I did, the school director (and owner) called my attention to avoid using my hair like that. Even if it was an internship, I did the same work as the other teachers did. My hair is short, curly and voluminous, and I had never seen her (the director) calling out other teachers about this matter. Some of them have very long, straight hair, and they would help feed the children, something I never did. The assistants were the ones who would always wear mobcaps, because they dealt with the children's food. I remember that on this day some parents would come to school for an event. I felt very embarrassed. I believe it was a prejudiced situation, and if this request was made to the other teachers in general, mainly the ones with long hair, I would not have felt this was only something about me. However, I felt offended, as I did not see this request being made or respected as part of the school's culture among the teachers.

The participant did not disclose their ethnicity. However, the fact that the school owner saw a problem with L.N.'s "curly, voluminous" loose hair but not with the other teacher's long, straight loose hair seems to be a mix of social identity face violation and equity rights violation. Respondent's 7 comparison with the different treatments towards the teachers reinforces that they felt wronged, especially because the participant mentions that if the request was made for all the other teachers, they would

not have felt personally attacked and, thus, offended. It is possible to observe here how injustice affects one's emotions and perceptions of an event.

L.S. shares a situation with a parent of their student, in this case, homophobia. However, it is not specified exactly what was said or done. Nevertheless, the participant felt offended by the comments that were brought to her by her daughter:

> Respondent 8 (L.S.)
>
> *"I suffered homophobia from the mother of a student of mine. It was not anything explicit, I did not comment or evidenced a thing, but she made assumptions, and I know she made comments that offended me to her daughter, who told me everything on another occasion."*

The fact that the comments caused negative emotions in L.S. reveals a violation of their quality of face, as it was a direct attack on their identity. According to Spencer-Oatey (2007), the many aspects of identity help people develop their self-esteem and self-respect, and the respectful recognition of others also has an important role. Attacking one's sexual orientation, thus, is also attacking their identity and self-esteem.

In A.F.'s (Respondent 9) case, a situation started because someone cursed in their class:

> Respondent 9 (A.F.)
>
> *The most remarkable situation took place in 2024, in a nine-grade elementary school. I was teaching my class, when I heard a very loud swearword being uttered. I immediately turned back (I was writing on the board) and asked if it was directed to me. I asked the specific student who had uttered the swearword, still not understanding what was going on. I was firm and stated that tat was inadmissible, once I had always treated everyone with respect and cordiality. The student said the swearing was not directed at me. At the end of the class, I clarified everything with her, but the whole situation was really embarrassing. I felt very disrespected as a teacher.*

When it comes to the words known as "taboo words", Culpeper (2011) argues that those are a strategy of positive impoliteness, projected to harm the addressee's positive "face wants", such as ignoring the other, using taboo words, or calling the other names. In this situation, A.F. relates that a student swore during their class, and the student claimed it wasn't directed at the respondent. In this sense, it is not relevant if this was true or not, because A.F. considered the behavior "inadmissible" and felt embarrassed and disrespected as a teacher.

The fact that respondent 9 considered the student's behaviour offensive, even though the offense might not have been used towards them, has to do with the hearer's perception of impoliteness. In this situation, the student - intentionally or not - attacked A.F.'s social identity face, something related to the sense of public worth of a person (Spencer-Oatey, 2002), because it threatened the respondent's authority inside the classroom in front of the other students, and, thus, their identity as a teacher.

5. CONCLUSION

Analyzing the reports from all 13 participants, it is possible to state that most of them experienced at least one kind of face attack during their teaching practicum. Whilst 30% (4 people) of the respondents declared that they had never experienced impoliteness during their internships, 70% had at least one negative experience, and this shows that the classroom environment may be hostile to novice teachers.

Culpeper and Hardaker state that "Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and /or beliefs about social organization, including, in particular, how one person's or a group's identities are mediated by others in interaction." (Culpeper and Hardaker, 2017, p. 204)

Thus, the fact that most of the participants who answered the questionnaire reported having experienced negative situations in their teaching practice shows how their expectations were frustrated, because it is not expected that this kind of circumstance occur in a school, for example, and yet, they did. It reveals much about the beliefs of how new teachers think an educational environment should be with a given group, in this case, with teachers and future teachers.

Most of the respondents, that is, 61% (8 people), related a situation of social identity face attack, followed by 46% (6 people) quality face attacks. Spencer-Oatey

(2005) observed that if some self-aspects are "challenged or undermined", people might perceive it as a threat to their face. Furthermore, one of the functions of identity is to locate individuals in their social worlds, helping them to determine where they belong and do not belong to in relation to others (Spencer-Oatey, 2007). By having their social identity face violated, students may feel they do not belong to that environment, or even to the very profession they have chosen. When their quality face is at risk, most of the participants felt personally offended, using words such as "discomfort" and "embarrassment" to define their emotions. Alongside social identity face attacks, this kind of violation seems to affect – and enhance – deeply respondents' perceptions and negative feelings, making them self-aware and vulnerable, especially when the attack comes from someone hierarchically superior.

Equity rights (23%) and autonomy imposition (15%) were the least observed forms of face attack in the reports, which shows that situations involving injustice and control were rarer, but not inexistent, and that it disturbs the participant's face management and, thus, their interactional rapport. It also reveals that it is expected that superiors at school environments treat everyone the same way, and that it is a shock when this does not happen.

In conclusion, understanding the way impolite experiences affect future teachers' perceptions and expectations may also help to identify and avoid those kinds of situations. The fact that most of the respondents had at least one negative experience demonstrates that the educational environment for English teaching students may directly damage their professional and personal identities, causing feelings of inadequacy and helplessness. Thus, being able to recognize face attacks (direct or indirect) may help to build a more respectful and healthier experience, and, maybe, in the future, more than just 30% of students may say that their teaching practice was something positive in their academic lives.

REFERENCES

BRASIL. Lei nº 11.788, de 25 de setembro de 2008. Dispõe sobre o estágio de estudantes. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, 26 set. 2008. Seção 1, p. 3.

BROWN, P.; LEVINSON, S. C. Politeness: some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

CULPEPER, J. Impoliteness: using language to cause offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

CULPEPER, J.; HARDAKER, C. Impoliteness. In: CULPEPER, J.; HAUGH, M.; KÁDÁR, D. Z. (Org.). The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. p. 199-227.

DE FINA, Anna. Narratives and identities. In: GEORGAKOPOULOU, A.; DE FINA, Anna (Org.). The handbook of narrative analysis. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

EELEN, G. A critique of politeness theory. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2001.

RIESSMAN, C. K. Narrative methods for the human sciences. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008.

SPENCER-OATEY, H. Culturally speaking: culture, communication and politeness theory. 2. ed. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2008.

SPENCER-OATEY, H. Managing rapport in talk: using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. Journal of Pragmatics, Amsterdam, v. 34, n. 5, p. 529–545, mai. 2002.

SPENCER-OATEY, H. Theories of identity and the analysis of face. Journal of Pragmatics, Amsterdam, v. 39, n. 4, p. 639–656, abr. 2007.

SPENCER-OATEY, Helen. (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, [S. l.], v. 1, n. 1, p. 95-119, 2005. DOI: 10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.95.