FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF PERNAMBUCO (UFPE)
CENTER FOR ARTS AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Impoliteness in Personal Narratives of University Students

Emylly Mikaele da Silva Rodrigues

Supervisor
Ricardo Rios Barreto Filho

Academic Month and Year:
August - 2024

☒**Article**   ☐**Undergraduate Dissertation**
Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
[BA IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING]

Abstract

This article explores how impolite situations in educational contexts can cause negative emotions and affect the learning process. This research aims to understand how students evaluate offensive situations through narratives, analyzing in which context they happened and which linguistic and nonlinguistic elements contributed to the perception of that interaction as impolite. The objectives of this research involve the construction of a narrative corpus and verifying how the relationship between impoliteness and emotions can negatively affect learning at the university level. The methodology used to develop this project involves data collection through digital forms and the analysis based on the components from Spencer-Oatey's rapport management (2002; 2005). As a result of impolite situations experienced in classrooms, students' relationships with professors were significantly damaged, and the consequences were seen in the impacts it had on their reported performance throughout the course.

Keywords: Impoliteness, University Students, Narratives, Offense.

Resumo

Este artigo explora como situações de impolidez em contextos educacionais podem gerar emoções negativas e prejudicar o processo de aprendizagem. A pesquisa visa entender como os estudantes avaliam situações ofensivas por meio de narrativas, analisando em quais contextos elas ocorreram e quais elementos linguísticos e não linguísticos contribuíram para a percepção dessa interação como impolida. Os objetivos da pesquisa envolvem a construção de um corpus de narrativas e a verificação de como a relação entre impolidez e emoções pode afetar negativamente a aprendizagem no nível universitário. A metodologia utilizada para desenvolver este projeto inclui a coleta de dados por meio de formulário digital e a análise baseada nos componentes do gerenciamento de relações de Spencer-Oatey (2002; 2005). Como resultado das situações de impolidez vivenciadas em sala de aula, as relações dos alunos com os professores foram significativamente prejudicadas, e as consequências foram observadas nos impactos relatados sobre o desempenho dos alunos ao longo do curso.

Palavras-Chave: Impolidez, Estudantes Universitários, Narrativas, Ofensa.

1. Introduction

Human interactions are a fruitful topic for analysis and research across multiple humanities areas. Inside the field of Linguistics and Education, the discussion expands and becomes even more multidisciplinary. Many factors, such as linguistic structure and social,

cultural, and identity contexts, must be considered. Thereafter, interaction is a complex matter beyond a single discipline.

(Im)politeness studies emerge in this scenario, like a domain that aims to understand the interpersonal relations permeated by language and behavior that provoke offense in social interactions (Culpeper, 2011). Spencer-Oatey (2005) defines (im)politeness as "the subjective judgment that people make about the social appropriateness of verbal and non-verbal behavior." Thus, in our interactions, we constantly evaluate the language and behavior of our interlocutors just like we do with ours, creating labels that will define how we perceive the interaction. We can evaluate a certain utterance as gentle, offensive, polite, aggressive, rude, or others. These labels can emotionally impact the individuals who participate in this interaction.

Impoliteness studies have been gathering the attention of researchers from different areas. They seek to understand how certain behaviors and linguistic elements can negatively affect social interactions and cause discomfort, embarrassment, offense, and other problems.

However, the need to intensify research regarding this topic in education is noticeable. For a long time, the relationship between emotions, affection, and learning has been discussed, particularly highlighting Vygotsky's socio-historical perspective ([1934] 1999) that brings attention to the dangers of separating dichotomous cognition from emotions.

It is relevant to consider that access to higher education in Brazil has been facilitated in the last couple of years, promoting greater diversity in the classroom of most, if not all, university programs. Students ' and professors ' different personal contexts and backgrounds directly impact the perception of what is considered polite or not in social interactions. Since impoliteness is not limited to an individual dimension, attacks or offenses to social groups with which one is affiliated can also be considered impolite.

Considering that impoliteness is not a universal experience and is an evaluation of behavior and language supported by social and individual contexts, I chose narrative inquiry as a method (Cladinin; Rosiek, 2007; Cladinin et al., 2016; Paiva, 2019) because narratives are "a way to understand experience" (Cladinin; Connely, 2000 p 20), and this is my goal: to understand how university students notice and evaluate impolite situations that they experienced in the educational context.

The main objective of this study is to research impolite situations experienced by university students and analyze how they affect their learning process. Since impoliteness affects an individual at a social level, when their social identity is attacked, I aim to build a corpus of narratives about impolite experiences and identify how they correlate to the reported

emotions. Another objective is to verify how impoliteness can negatively influence students' social identity development and academic performance.

Thus, I collected narratives from university students through online forms. Informants detailed their situations and evaluated them as impolite in their university experience. This allowed me to understand which factors influence impoliteness in educational situations, how it is noticed and evaluated by the students, and its emotional impacts.

This article is thus divided into three other sections. Section 2 presents the theories that drive this investigation. Section 3 introduces the methodological aspects related to the research. Section 4 presents and discusses the analysis, results, and discussion. Finally, I present the conclusion for the paper.

2. Theoretical Framework

Impoliteness studies have been rising in popularity in the Linguistic field. Historically, the focus was on politeness and its development within communication. Only recently have researchers shifted their focus towards impoliteness and its effects on social interactions.

Culpeper and Hardarker (2017) highlight that this view was widespread because impoliteness was seen as an anomaly, a failure in a basic interactional principle, the Politeness Principle (PP), in which human beings always interact to seek harmony and mitigation. Due to this observation, impoliteness was not thought to deserve a systematic and descriptive treatment, which is curious since impoliteness cases are more noticeable than politeness cases. The first usually provoke conflicts, while the latter are seen as usual.

Culpeper (1996) was not the first linguistic work to bring attention to this topic, but it was the one that gained prominence in this field. In the first moment, the author was interested in showing the linguistic community that impoliteness presents systematicity and is worthy of a deeper scientific understanding, just like politeness.

To support this thesis, Culpeper developed a model that bore similarities to the one made by Brown and Levinson (1987). However, it was about the other side of politeness: impoliteness. While these authors supported their theory with the notion that interactants, essentially, protect their faces and the faces with whom they are interacting, Culpeper (1996) introduces the idea that, in some situations, interactants will attack the faces of the ones they are interacting with instead of protecting.

This way, the author points out an important characteristic of impoliteness associated with emotions like anger, embarrassment, humiliation, etc. This consideration brings an

essential methodological consequence: the relevance of working with instruments that will induce reflection on the interactants, like questionnaires, interviews, or reports.

In light of the importance of emotions in impoliteness studies, Clandinin's (2000) work, which is about researching narratives, proposes a view on storytelling that allows us to comprehend how the offense happened according to the participants. A self-report through personal narratives enables a better analysis of the collected data because "they are a way to understand experience" (Cladinin; Connely, 2000 p. 20), and this is exactly what we are aiming for in this research, that is to understand how university students evaluate impoliteness in academic contexts.

Spencer-Oatey (2005) Rapport management comprises five components: *quality face,* which refers to the individual's desire to have their personal qualities evaluated positively, *social identity face,* the way we are perceived in relation to the social groups we are part of, *relational face* can be understood as the management of the relationships among the participants of an interaction. *Equity rights* are related to the fair and equal treatment expected in interactions and relationships, and *association rights* are related to the belief that we have the right to be treated fairly and with empathy (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, 2005, 2007).

Another question that permeates the impoliteness studies is the question of identity. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) intersect the development of identities with linguistic interactions, observing it as a social product rather than something purely individual and psychological. Considering that impoliteness is equally present in interactions, the principles detailed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) can be observed in the narratives since, directly or indirectly, impoliteness can attack an individual's face and identity.

3. Methodology

This research is grounded in narrative inquiry (Clandinin, 2000). I collected informants' narratives using Google Forms, which consisted of five questions encompassing demographic information and the narrative of their experience with impolite situations.

After collecting the data, the analysis was done through the categories of Rapport Management and Face Studies, Quality Face, Social Identity Face, Relational Face, Equity rights, and Association Rights, along with impoliteness studies (Spencer-Oatey, 2005; Culpeper, 2011).

The sample of participants comprises 13 students, currently studying or not, who experienced an impolite situation in an educational context. The participants were carefully selected, guided by the relevance of their report to this research.

The gender distribution of the participants was 75% self-declared female, 16% male, and 8% non-binary. This disparity can implicate different perceptions of impoliteness or experiences. The study field of the participants also exhibits great diversity. Around 22% of the participants were English majors, while others were from different areas, for example, physiotherapy, business, psychology, and international relations. Just like there is a difference between the experiences and perceptions of a male and female student, there are also situations that are particular to students of a certain field.

This research was conducted following ethical and rigorous principles and approved by the *Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco Campus Recife—UFPE* (Approval Protocol Number: 60942822.6.0000.5208). The approval followed the guidelines established by Resolution 510/16 *Conselho Nacional de Saúde*.

4. Analysis

When analyzing the collected data, one of the main dimensions observed was rapport management, which, according to Spencer-Oatey (2002), is how people manage and evaluate their interpersonal relationships in interaction. Rapport management comprises five components: *quality face, social identity face, relational face, equity rights,* and *association rights* (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, 2005, 2007). This theoretical approach allows us to understand how university students evaluate impoliteness in educational institutions and how it affects their social identity and emotions.

After collecting the data, it was identified that *equity rights* were the most addressed aspect in the narratives, shown in 39% of the reports. In most cases, a lack of fair treatment toward the students was reported, specifically when the interaction happened between student and professor, which was the majority of the scenarios. Inequality in the power relations within the academic environment can directly impact the student's perception of their experience in higher education and cause damage to the learning process in the short, medium, and long term. Beyond that, it leads to discomfort, individually and collectively.

The second most identified component in the narratives was the *quality face*, present in 21% of the reports. The topics regarding the quality face were mostly directed at professors who directly or indirectly questioned the students' intelligence or ability to perform a certain task or attitudes were evaluated subjectively. A direct attack from an authority figure, such as a university professor, can severely affect the student's self-esteem and confidence in doing what is expected in the classroom.

Social identity face (17%) and *relational face* (13%) appear significantly in the analysis. In a diverse and collectivist setting such as a university, social identity face becomes a critical area for further discussion. Furthermore, the relational face is indispensable, as the university environment shapes individuals' interpersonal development.

Association rights were identified in 8% of the reports, highlighting the expectation of fair, equal, and empathetic treatment within the academic environment. Both professors and peers are presumed to contribute to contribute to these values. However, some participants recounted experiences that contradicted these expectations, negatively impacting their perception of classroom dynamics.

In the following sections, I explore the analysis qualitatively. Therefore, I will focus on samples from the dataset that illustrate each of the categories related to *rapport* management (Spencer-Oatey, 2005).

4.1 Equity Rights

The transition to university life presents a significant challenge for many students, especially first-year undergraduates. There are high expectations about what kind of experiences they will have living in this new environment and adapting to new routines. It is necessary to understand that challenges will arise once people engage in new activities and spaces; mistakes or difficulties are expected—informant 1 shares what happened on her first day of university.

> (1)
>
> I started college in the middle of the semester. My first class with a professor happened to be on the day of the exam, and it was calculus. I informed her that it was my first class, but since it was my first time, I didn't know I was supposed to bring a calculator. I asked her if she could lend me one, and she was extremely rude, saying in a harsh tone that I should have one and even implying that I was stupid. [...] At the moment, I felt very embarrassed, and I consider it a negative situation for my learning because I never had the courage to ask her anything again, so I had doubts in class but never clarified them.

In the report, the professor did not consider the position of 'new student' of the Informant and did not treat her fairly, speaking "rudely" that students needed to bring their calculator because they would be using it often in classes and exams. Equity rights are directly related to how we evaluate the treatment we receive, whether it is equal and fair or not.

In an educational context, violations of students' equity rights can lead to stress and embarrassment and negatively affect their learning process. Informant 1 reflects on the consequences of this impolite experience, noting that it persisted to the extent that she no longer felt comfortable asking questions related to the subject, potentially affecting her academic performance in the short and medium term.

A second case, similar to the one previously mentioned, was reported by Informant 5.

(2)

The professor of a mandatory course in our first semester was extremely rude. He didn't understand that we had just finished high school and showed no empathy for our naivety. For example, he saw that I had written the word 'structuralism' in lowercase (at the time, I didn't even know that I was supposed to capitalize movements, periods, etc., even in the middle of sentences). This same professor told me I should take my brain out of my foot and put it in my head.

Informant 5 evaluated the professor's treatment of her and other students as not empathetic or fair, disregarding their inexperience.

Understanding that no linguistic structure is intrinsically polite or impolite (Spencer-Oatey, 2005), corrections could be seen as something common to hear from a professor inside a classroom. However, impoliteness is a subjective evaluation of verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Spencer-Oatey, 2005), so context influences how we perceive them. Informant 5 also describes the professor as "extremely rude" and "smart, but too snobbish." This perception affects the evaluation of the correction about "Structuralism" with a capital letter. It did not directly impact the learning process like Informant 1. However, it is possible to infer that, since she continues in her report: "[...] *today I am in my master's and even change the route if this professor is in the same corridor as me"*.

The implication of equity rights on university students' learning process cannot be disregarded. Still, it is relevant to delve deeper into the damages caused by impolite situations in the classroom and the lack of care in relationship management among students and professors. It is necessary to consider that the effects of an impolite situation can last longer than one expects. In Informant 1's case, the embarrassment experienced on her first day of classes made her too uncomfortable to ask questions for the whole semester. In contrast, Informant 5 cannot maintain an amicable relationship with her professor after graduating.

Since it is one of the most identified components in the narrative, we emphasize the importance of professors being aware of the lasting impacts that an attack on equity rights can have on students and how it can harm their learning process in the university.

4.2 Quality Face

A significant aspect of university life centers on classes and academic activities, where it is common and often expected that professors provide individual and collective feedback. However, issues arise when this feedback exceeds the boundaries of constructive criticism and turns into offense.

Informant 6, from the English department, narrates a situation she evaluated as impolite.

(3)

It really bothers me that a university professor insists on excessively and uncomfortably correcting students' pronunciation mistakes when they are presenting seminars. She also doesn't know how to handle students who struggle with presenting their work and prefers to say things like 'you have to do it' instead of 'take your time, you can do it.

Understanding that quality face is related to the desire to be evaluated positively for our individual qualities, that is, our self-esteem, this type of constant correction can directly affect students' performance. They feel embarrassed and lose confidence while presenting seminars or speaking up in classes in addition to the attack of student's face.

Just like Informant 5, professors' corrections are expected when dealing with academia and education in general. Corrections identify mistakes in students' works or ideas and help them achieve the best possible result. However, that does not mean that correction will be evaluated positively. The general behavior of the professor, together with the context of correction, will act as a scale of how much it will be considered impolite or not.

Corrections are considered sensitive matters to students. They expose them to the class, and if not done carefully, they will affect their self-esteem. They may cause unwanted damage to the professor-student relationships, creating difficulties in the learning process.

4.3 Social Identity Face

Attacks on social identity face became a recurrent case in the experience of university students, being the third most identified component in the analysis. Various cases can be brought as examples of the emotional impact of the offense on this social identity.

Informant 7 narrates how attacks on religion offended a huge part of the students in the classroom and, beyond them, the religious group they are part of.

(4)

In a specific situation, the marketing professor in the business administration course was talking about his international travels. During part of his story, he began using offensive words to refer to various religions, completely ignoring the fact that many students in the classroom,

myself included, had religious beliefs and were feeling offended by the words he was using. Among the religions he offended the most, showing complete intolerance, were Christianity and religions of African origin. At the end of the class, some students expressed their opinions, refusing to do the activity he had assigned. The professor simply said that we were mediocre and that the activity would be worth double the points so we could learn to think properly and not be deceived by fantasies.

Even after complaints and arguments regarding the improper nature of the professor's comments, he kept using prejudiced language to refer to them, mainly Christianism and religions of African origin. This stance caused so much discomfort to the students that Informant 7 considered giving up the classes in the middle of the semester, but since she had scholarships, that was impossible. Students also went to the coordination to remove the professor, but it had no effect.

Situations like this disrupt the classroom environment and damage professor-student relationships, creating difficulties for the learning process. They lead to discussions and arguments, relegating the learning and teaching process to the second plan and causing a bad atmosphere every time they clash, provoking discomfort, anger, and embarrassment.

Another case of a social identity face attack by a teacher was identified in the Informant's 11 narrative.

(4)"

A professor said that university faculty became worse after the affirmative action laws were applied to professor positions. As a Black woman aspiring to a Ph.D., I felt offended, especially because this professor claims to be anti-racist."

Although the narrative does not explicitly clarify whether the subject referred to affirmative action laws in general or those targeted at a specific minority group, the informant inferred that the comment regarded racial groups. She stated, 'As a Black woman, I felt offended,' indicating that she perceived the remark as impolite due to her identification with the group in question.

Spencer-Oatey (2005) defines prescribed behaviors as socially and legally mandatory. In other words, people are not only expected to do them but also required to. Religious and racial tolerance is one of these behaviors. As mediators of education in a plural and diverse environment, professors must behave respectfully toward all identities represented in their classrooms.

4.4 Relational Face And Association Rights

The discussions about relational face and association rights are fundamental in academic contexts. Interpersonal relations are basic to student life, either in school or university. As we discussed, relational faces refer to people's desire to have their relationship valued. At the same time, association rights are the rights we believe we have to keep mutual relationships, and they are composed of involvement, empathy, and respect (Spencer-Oatey, 2005).

Informant 9 relates her experience in her second undergraduate course, which will relate to association rights and relational face.

(5)

I am 50 years old and pursuing a second degree. Most of the students in my class don't even look at me or greet me. When they need study materials, some come to me asking for help because they know I'm committed. I shared materials a few times, but I stopped due to the continued lack of basic consideration and respect. The disregard is very clear when they don't need support. After I took this stance to maintain self-respect, many of the people I helped stopped greeting me. I just regret that they don't know what it means to have good group dynamics.

The Informant does not feel valued as an active class member by her classmates. This directly affects her relational face and prevents her from developing stable relationships with them. We also identify violations of her association rights. The Informant claims she lacks three components essential for association rights: empathy and respect. Her involvement is only present when the group needs assistance or study materials; whenever she denies it, it is over.

It is not explicit in the narrative, but it is possible to infer from her evaluations that her age plays a part in the coexistence problems with the group. She starts the narrative by highlighting her age, "I am 50 years old". Behavioral expectations are one of the basis of our judgment of what is impolite or not, and often, they are based on norms, conventions, and protocols (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). We can identify that there was an expectation from the Informant towards her experience in the classroom, mainly when we consider that it is her second undergraduate course. The group behavior does not comply with expectations and creates discomfort, offensive situations, and social isolation.

Another case by Informant 2 relates to relational face and is equally relevant to our research.

(6)"

As a granted student for a community outreach project, I had to present the project's results at an event on my university's main campus, located in another city about two hours away from

mine. [...] On the way back, for some reason, we started talking about relationships, and my advisor confessed to feeling attracted to a former student from the project. I felt extremely uncomfortable, but I didn't say anything at the time, nor did the other girls in the project. [...] Hearing him so freely admit that he had wanted to cheat on his wife with a student who was in his undergraduate program was definitely not something I expected. After that, I started avoiding situations where I would be alone with my advisor, and the trust and admiration I had for him before completely disappeared."

The professor's admission of feeling attracted to an ex-student from his projects can be interpreted in various ways, but it opens space to question his character and morals. Another important factor is that it is reported that this professor is also married. Some boundaries and limits are important in the context of power relations. The difference in status, age, and power in the university realm is big and could lead to problems that impact negatively beyond the academic context.

While interacting with others, relationships can be maintained, improved, or damaged (Spencer-Oatey, 2005). The relationship between Informant 2 and their advisor was damaged by a comment that, even though it did not directly affect him, caused discomfort and provoked distancing that may not be repaired in the future.

4.5 Emotion Analysis

The analysis could give us a broader vision of how impolite situations happen inside academic contexts. Studying undergraduate and graduate courses is challenging, not only because of advanced theoretical content but also because students are immersed in a plural context that probably contrasts with their past experiences in elementary and secondary education.

The presence of impoliteness is a common component in the shared narratives. Mostly, the reports were centered on the professor figure as the one who commits the impoliteness. Remarkably, just a few reports brought impoliteness practiced by colleagues or other participants within the university context, like coordinators, employees, and other areas that are not professors.

Spencer-Oatey (2005) argues that behavior expectations are the basis of evaluating what is considered polite. Some of these behaviors are based on role specifications that individuals assume, both contractual in work contexts and implicit specifications that are the biggest part of these expectations.

The professor's role is associated with many expectations, such as being a mediator, educator, reliable person, authority figure, expert in their field, etc. The dynamics inside a classroom are subjective and can be damaged, like in the case of Informant 2, where his advisor assumed to feel attraction to one of his past students and harmed their relationship, which had been built for months while working together on their research project.

Another important aspect is that even situations that are expected inside the university environment, like corrections, can create impolite situations and cause offense in how they are conducted. Mills (2017) states that evaluating a linguistic structure as polite or impolite is not simply an individual act but is rooted in the perception of social norms and moral order. So, even though there is an expectation that corrections or any other similar situation happens in learning environments, we assume that they will be done in a fair, respectful, and empathetic manner, not attacking the quality face, like in the case of the Informant 5, where she was corrected because she used a lowercase letter to write "Structuralism" and was told by the professor, after being corrected, that she "should take her brain from her feet and put it in her head."

These narratives help us comprehend the university student experience. These situations deeply affect the students; most carry these effects beyond graduation. While studying, it may affect their grades, performance in presentations, and exams, even leading to potential withdrawal from the course or the university.

The five components of Spencer-Oatey's rapport management research allow a broader view of how context and interactions affect individual and collective perceptions and influence our evaluations of what is polite or impolite through the narratives.

There was a large number of cases regarding equity rights. Most students describe situations where they felt treated unfairly and unequally by professors. This happened both in a collective way, when, for example, Informant 3 stated that after one of his classmates had his phone stolen, everyone in the classroom was treated as suspects and individually, like in Informant 10's case, where the professor did not let her do an exam. She felt "persecuted" by the professor.

Similar situations incite various emotions, ranging from discomfort to anger, embarrassment, sadness, and insecurity. This harms the learning and teaching process because of a bad relationship within the academic environment, especially with professors who are mediators of knowledge and important figures that shape our relationship with the subject and course and, sometimes, even validate our abilities and capabilities.

In summary, the university students' narrative regarding impoliteness situations in an academic context provides a good view of how delicate and complex interpersonal relations are, where long-lasting effects can negatively impact the student's learning process. Considering these aspects, promoting harmony, fairness, equity, and tolerance is important, minimizing the risk that impolite behavior or comments take away from students' study opportunities. The university is perceived as a pluralistic and diverse place, and good rapport management aligned with politics promotes respect and educational policies that will enable the necessary actions so students from different groups can experience healthy development.

5. Conclusion

Through the five components of rapport management of Spencer-Oatey and also understanding the idea that most of our evaluation comes from the break of expectation (Spencer-Oatey, 2005) and our perception of social norms and moral order (Mills, 2017), we could observe how impolite situations happen in higher education contexts.

One of the most recurrent components found in the narratives was equity rights. Students value fair and equal treatment in their interactions at university is the main topic brought up by students. The fact that most cases are related to professors and not by classmates, for example, reveals the importance of behavior expectations and how they influence the evaluation of impolite behavior, often with a harsher evaluation towards the professor than towards other academic community members.

Although most of the narratives brought the figure of the professor starting the impolite situation, just a few of them relate any type of verbal conflict or "fight back" originating from having these rights violated, possibly because of the power imbalance between professors and students. The narratives are unclear whether any action was taken after. However, it is implicit that they did not confront the professor, and, based on their reports, they felt offended, embarrassed, and uncomfortable with comments and behaviors evaluated as impolite.

Equity rights can be violated through various means and in various contexts. We had reports from a professor who was rude to a student on her first day of class and a professor who graded students condescendingly for spelling mistakes. These behaviors and discourses directly affect students' feelings and performance in the classroom.

Another emphasis should be placed on the social identity face. Universities offer a plural and diverse space and encourage the exploration of students' self-identity, so it is necessary to reflect on discourses and attitudes that perpetuate prejudice and stereotypes. We

analyzed cases where religion and affirmative laws, targeted at minority groups, were at the center of offensive discourse, and it does not only affect the individual but the whole group they are part of.

It is necessary to reflect on the importance of institutions and understand the relevance of impoliteness inside the classroom, mainly when it comes to conflicts between professors and students. Promoting safety and respect is one of their obligations as educational institutions, and they should be held responsible for intervening whenever necessary and creating means to enforce inclusive environments.

Lastly, this research's conclusions aim to promote awareness about impolite situations experienced by university students. Creating an environment that values respectful and equal treatment of those who participate in this context is crucial for students' development and an effective learning process.

6. REFERENCES

BROWN, P; LEVINSON, S. C. **Politeness:** some universals in language usage. New York: Cambridge University press, [1978] 1987.

BUCHOLTZ, M.; HALL, K. Identity and interaction: a Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. **Discourse Studies,** v. 7, n. 4-5, p. 585–614, 1 out. 2005.

CLANDININ, J D; CAINE, V; LESSARD, S; HUBER, J. **Engaging Narrative Inquiry with Children and Youth**. New York: Routledge, 2016.

CLANDININ, J D; CONNELLY, M F. **Narrative Inquiry:** experience and story in qualitative research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

CLANDININ, J D; ROSIEK, J. **Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry:** borderland spaces and tensions. In: CLANDININ, J D; ROSIEK, J. Handbook of narrative inquiry: mapping a methodology. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2007.

CULPEPER, J. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. **Journal Of Pragmatics,** [s.l.], v. 25, n. 01, p.349-367, 1996.

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

CULPEPER, J; HARDAKER, C. Impoliteness. In: CULPEPER, J; KÁDÁR, D; HAUGH, M (Ed.). **The Palgrave Handbook of Impoliteness.** [s.l.]: Palgrave, 2017, pp 199-226.

MILLS, S. Sociocultural Approaches to (Im)politeness. In: CULPEPER, J; KÁDÁR, D; HAUGH, M (Ed.). **The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness**. [s.l.]: Palgrave, 2017 p. 41–60, 2017.

PAIVA, V L M O. **Manual de pesquisa em estudos linguísticos.** São Paulo: Parábola, 2019.

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

SPENCER-OATEY, H. (Im)Politeness, Face and Perceptions of Rapport: Unpackaging theirBases and Interrelationships. **Journal Of Politeness Research**. [s.l.], v. 1, n. 1, p.95-119, 1jan. 2005. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.95.

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

VYGOTSKY, L. S. **Teoria e método em psicologia**. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes. [1934] 1999.