Degradation of Politeness: Social Media's Fault?

Fitri Oktaviani, Yun Laturrakhmi

Brawijaya University, Indonesia

0105

The Asian Conference on Media and Mass Communication 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

Abstract

It has been widely argued that introduction of new media can change the nature of people's interaction and communication. However, further research is still needed to investigate changing aspects of communication and the extent of the changes. This paper tries to look at one important aspect in language and communication: politeness. Many previous discussions suspect that younger generation in Indonesia has undergone certain degradation of politeness. The techniques of politeness like the use of terms of address, proper dictions, and other linguistic devices and nonverbal cues important to Indonesian culture are now less considered by the younger generation during virtual or face-to face interaction. Therefore, we want to explore how social media utilisation impacts on the changing perception about politeness and its performance. In answering the research question, we conducted interviews with young adults aged between 18-22 year old. In order to get the description about the dynamic change of the concept of politeness, we also interviewed lecturers coming from older generation. Finding shows that utilisation of any media, including social media should be carefully considered. It may change new generation's language habit impacting on the change of politeness pertinent to particular culture.

Keywords: Social Media, Politeness

Background

Recent discussions and news suspect the younger generation in Indonesia lack of politeness. A study written by Utami, Nirwana, & Fajar (2011) about politeness in Short Messaging Service (SMS) shows that university students tend to ignore linguistic politeness during their communication with their lecturers. This implies that CMC may influence the way younger generation perceive and perform politeness. At the same time, the booming trend of Social Media may also influence the way people communicate and interact with each other. Slama (2005) shows that Indonesian youth consider Internet communication as a middle class status symbol and a means to get social affiliation. It implies that social media can bring a significant model of communication for the youth. Further, Tamtomo (2012) reveals that Indonesian youth immersed heavily on the Internet and social media have become the forefront of multilingualism and linguistic change. It would be interesting to investigate whether this linguistic change also influences the politeness performances that eventually create a gap of politeness concept between generations.

This research's main aim is to explore how social media utilisation impacts on the changing perception about politeness and its performance. Using university setting, first this paper tries to understand youth's perspective of politeness and its application in everyday interaction, especially during Student-Lecturer interaction. Then, we also intend to see the older generation's perspective on politeness and the new form of interaction to get the dynamic concept of politeness. Finally, we discuss the way Social Media shapes the concept of politeness among younger generation in Indonesia.

Post-Modern Discursive Approach of Politeness Theory

Before we outline the concept of politeness, we would like to acknowledge Neil Postman's idea about the importance of humanistic and ethical consideration in studying media technology (2000). This notion is important since 'introducing a new technology into a culture will alter the culture because the communication ecology of the social system will change' (Barnes, 2008, p. 16). The change, eventually, may result in the change of some aspects of cultural identity important for a particular culture.

One aspect of language features heavily dependent on culture is politeness. Brown and Levinson's Politeness theory (1987) is one of the most prominent theories in the study of politeness and has been credited as classic or traditional approach on politeness. The theory is built based on Goffman's face concept (1967) about the "public self-image every member of a society wants"(1987, p. 61). Such politeness is expected in many communicative situations and discourses. The absence of politeness will create disappointment in the society since it breaks the social norms and values.

Brown and Levinson also introduce the concept of positive face (one's self-esteem), and negative face (one's freedom to act). Some interactions are considered as Face Threatening Acts (FTA), which are acts that may threaten Speaker/ Hearer's Positive and Negative Face. To threaten the negative face, the speaker may have the intention

to impede a hearer's autonomy, push the hearer to accept a deal, or persuade the hearer to concede something. To threaten the positive face, it is possible that the speaker disagrees, or even has no concern on hearer's positive face like insults, refusal, and denial. From this perspective, politeness is performed to reduce the damage of the Face.

Linguistic politeness is a culturally defined phenomenon. Face concerns have a greater impact in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures (Liao & Bond, 2011, p. 25). As Indonesian is a collectivist culture (see Hofstede, 1993), the people naturally have a greater face concern that need to be addressed. Thus, speakers need to be aware to maintain hearer's public images via politeness strategies. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 249) state that different factors in politeness (Power/ P, Social Distance/D, Degree of Imposition/R) might impact on the performance of different strategy of politeness. In the case of interaction, among the dimensions that are important in Indonesian politeness are age differences, social status, and social roles. Therefore, maintaining different types of language and the using extensive negative politeness may be needed and expected when ones speak with others who are older or higher in social status.

However, recent studies of politeness have been shifting to the contesting paradigm especially coming from post-modern perspectives that offer alternative conception about politeness (Haugh, 2008). One of these perspectives is the discursive approach that is first brought to light by scholars such as Eelen (2001), Watts (2003), and Mills (2003).

Postmodern discursive views on politeness argue that the conceptualisation of politeness comes from two degrees. The first degree of politeness definition should come from the layperson perspectives, and the second is from theory (Fukushima, 2013; Haugh, 2008; Murata, 2008). Both Watts (2003) and Ellen (2001) agree that layperson concepts of politeness (first-order politeness) should be the central of politeness research, while second order of politeness is useful for description about first order politeness to 'offer a way of assessing how the members themselves may have evaluated that behaviour' (Watts, 2003, p.19). Taking from Watts, Ide and Ehlich, Hague (2008) summarises that a first-order lay conceptualization of politeness is defined as 'the various ways in which polite behaviour is perceived and talked about by members of sociocultural groups', while a second-order theoretical conceptualization of politeness is defined as 'a term within a theory of social behaviour and language usage.'

According to Murata (2008), researchers in this paradigm put politeness within a theory of social practice that is observable in instances of ongoing social interaction amongst individuals, which most often involves language. Further, these scholars also argue that listeners' interpretation about politeness should also be taken into account when analysing politeness. Mills (in Murata, 2008) argues that analysing politeness should take broader account than mere textual analysis of utterances; it should also take into account the discourse and context in which particular utterances take place, such as in a particular community of practice (Murata, 2008). As cited in Murata, Mills contends that 'politeness cannot be understood simply as a property of utterances, or even as a set of choices made only by individuals, but rather as a set of practices or strategies which communities of practice develop, affirm and contest'

(2003, p. 9) and that 'politeness and impoliteness play a key role in presenting and producing a particular type of identity, and negotiating a position in the community of practice.'

In this sense, politeness evaluation occurs within social norms that are not static, but it occurs in dynamic social interaction and sometimes contains discursive struggle among people who use them (Haugh, 2008). This implies that 'politeness is negotiated between speakers and hearers dynamically and discursively and thus should be captured at the discourse level not at the speech-act level' (Murata, 2008, p.11). Moreover not only speakers but also hearers should be adequately taken into consideration in assessing (im)politeness (Murata, 2008, p. 11). Within this framework, we argue that the conceptualisation is useful in capturing the reality of changing perspectives about politeness faced by generational difference. In this research, we capture the conceptualisation of politeness from younger generation in Indonesia and contest it with that from older generation to see the dynamic change.

We use generational comparison in this research because people from different generations may have different characteristics and value systems. As stated by Spencer-Oatey (2008), people coming from different group and categories such as gender groups, ethnic groups, generational groups, national groups, professional groups can have different value system that, eventually may influence their conceptualization of politeness. In this research we contrast the view of university students representing younger generation and that of lecturers representing older generation. According to Fukushima (2013), these groups of people belong to the similar (sub)culture paradigm, therefore it will be interesting to see the dynamic of politeness from these views.

The Rise of Social Media and its Impacts to Individuals

The rise of technology particularly the computer and the Internet have changed the landscape of human interaction since they provide a new medium with completely different characteristics to communicate. As a result, a great deal of interpersonal communication that is now mediated by technology, especially computer-mediated technologies (e.g., SMS, chat rooms, email, virtual group work, weblogs, mobile social software) can sometimes facilitate or obstruct communication and can change interpersonal interactions (Konijn, Utz, Tannis, & Barnes, 2008, p. 3). From communication perspectives, how technology affects human interaction might be best described from Media Ecological perspective (McLuhan, in Bannes, 2008).

As argued by Barnes (2008, p.18), media ecological perspective could be used to study CMC and social media because 'it examines changes in communication patterns, such as the shift from broadcast mass media systems to interactive digital systems.' McLuhan's vision about a global village is not only a technological phenomenon, but also a human phenomenon. As outlined by Schroeder, (in Barnes, 2008, p. 18) 'technological and social change must be examined conjointly at several interrelated levels' (p. 137). It means that on a basic level, understanding interpersonal communication in a mediated world requires awareness about how one person communicates with another using a communication medium (Barnes, 2008, p. 18). Barnes also highlights that media ecology can be used to answer the question on

the differences between communicating face to face and in a mediated context and how these differences will influence interpersonal communication. Previous studies on CMC have highlighted how the shift of linguistic codes influenced communication behaviour (Baym; Jones; Hiltz & Turoff; Murray; Rice & Love, in Barnes, 2008, p. 19). The recent study attempts to capture such impact occurs in the context of politeness among youth (college students) in Indonesia.

Methods

To obtain cross-generational first order conception of politeness, a series of interviews are conducted to 16 college students aged 18-21 years, and eight lecturers coming from generation X and Y (1970s-early 1980s). Four of the lecturers were interviewed individually and four others were interviewed in a group discussion. As for the students, seven of them were interviewed individually and nine of them joined two group discussions. Both students and lecturers are active users of one or more forms of Social Media.

Data collected from interview and discussion was transcribed. The process of analysing data involves the steps suggested by O'Leary (2010): (1) identifying biases and noting overall impressions; (2) reducing, organising, and coding; (3) mapping and building themes; (4) building and verifying theories; and (6) drawing conclusions. During the coding / finding categories, researchers used concepts and words to find patterns involve both inductive and deductive process to get meaningful understanding. To guarantee the ethical issues, all informants name are masked under name Lecturer (L1-8) and Student (S1-16).

Further, to get deeper understanding about the role of social media in shaping this 'new' concept about politeness, especially among youth, the student groups and lecturer group were asked to evaluate youth actual textual messages/posts in social media. The students' discussion is a part of a class project to observe youth language trend in social media. The messages/posts presented in this paper were about asking for a favour/information and showing disagreement about particular things. The results of students and lecturers' evaluation are compared to get meaningful understanding about both views on politeness. Both data analysis results are crosschecked or verified to strengthen the validity of the data.

Research Findings & Discussion

Lay Person Concept of Politeness

From a more lay-person (folk) perspectives, the term politeness is mostly defined by 'good manner both verbal and non verbal to show respect and reverence to others and to avoid hurting others especially those who are older', as stated by the following interviews:

> *(L1) 'Politeness is about how a person...whose language behaviour does not impose other' feelings, and uses good connotation.' (1)*

> *(L2) 'Politeness is very subjective, it is about etiquette when we talk to others...especially when we greet others, when we regard other feeling...for*

example the way we sit, the way we listen others...when we talk (in particular situation)...for example in classroom' (2)

(S1) *'It's about manners...the way we speak, the way we behave to others who we just meet and to older people' (3)*

(S2) *'The words we used should not hurt others, think about their feeling, are they going to be offended when we say that?' (4)*

Although the informants come from different generation, they seem to agree that the focus of politeness is on manners of speaking. Interestingly, there is a difference in emphasis of politeness, the lecturers (L1, L2, L3) focus on not hurting others' feelings and consideration of other, and the focus of politeness is not only the verbal language (words) but also non-verbal cues that accompany the verbal utterances such as attentiveness while listening, time and place mindfulness, and tone of voices. Impoliteness may be considered because of the absence of such criteria, as outlined in the following scripts:

(L1) *'My experiences here (in the university) is little bit hurtful for me, for example...when making appointments, I felt that the speech acts used are not like a (proper) appointment, as if they give... (order), like this : "Ma'am, I am going to campus at this particular our," does it mean that I have to go to campus at that particular hour too? Or for example (asking) "Where is your position now?".... He/ she asks that way as if she/he asks to friends without considering the boundary'* (5)

(L3) *'Students these days – although not all- are pretty rude...for example one case of a student failed in my class. I did not pass him because the examination supervisors found evidence that he was cheating, and the supervisor wrote it in the report along with the evidence attached. What troubled me was that the students came up to me and asked for 'fairness' but not in a good way. He went straightforwardly "Why do you give me an E?" then I explained the situation that the examination supervisor found evidence he was cheating and so forth, but he said bluntly and rudely "I do not cheat!" without ability to prove. This strong oppositional words despite the evidence found made me feel intimidated, there was evidence why couldn't he admit it? And he was constantly demanded me (to change the mark). This thing, in my opinion, crosses my authority (rights)'* (6)

Using the concept of face, extract (5) explains the lecturer's evaluation of a student's request to see her. The request here is considered as threatening the lecturer's (L1) negative face because it appeared that the student did not intend to avoid the obstruction of the lecturer's freedom of action. When calling a supervisor or a lecturer, students are expected to mention their names and objectives, and afterwards they are allowed to ask for a possible appointment time. Yet, this often does not happen during students' calls that elicit L1's anger and disappointment to many of her students. Extract (6) is considered as threatening the hearer's (lecturer's) positive face since the student expressed disagreement with the lecturer's decision. Both of the lecturers above imply that tone of language emphasized the rudeness greatly. The important point to consider is that Indonesian culture greatly regards and values

indirectness and it is considered as high context culture. The conversation described by lecturers above show how the supposed cultural values need to be considered when possible FTAs occurs, especially from people of different age groups and social status, either in mediated or face to face communication.

The interviews and discussion with lecturers reveal that in most cases lecturers feel that students threaten their negative face. The problems of impoliteness that arise are about: (1) time sensitivity ('some students call me at 11 pm just to ask whether I am going to campus the next morning', or 'Once a student consulted with me for two hours, without thinking that I have other important thing to do,'); (2) empathy ('I was sick and should take rest and this student keeps on calling me and demanded whether she could see me to ask for my signature'); (3) lack of hedges ('just straightforwardly ask for appointment at particular time', 'came late in class and just said that he had slept''); (4) the use of improper terms of address (use of the word 'aku', one lecturer (L1) even complains the student use the word 'gue[1]') during Lecturer-Students' interaction, use the word 'mbak'/'mas[2]' instead of Bapak/Ibu especially for younger lecturer; and (5) use of improper diction and variety of language (use *bahasa gaul* during interaction with lecturers).

Findings above show that lecturers, coming from older generation regard politeness very close to Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness, and congruent with Ting-Toomey and Chung's (2012) suggestion about Hall's High Context Culture and Indirectness. Interestingly, most students measure impoliteness and politeness from the formality (vs. informality) of the language used as seen from the following interview:

> S4: *'Yes, when we talk to older people we have to be more formal, like -- "Where are you today? While with friends I will say "where?" or "position?"' (7)*

In extract (7), the differentiator between talking with older people or people with higher status according to the informant is the degree of language formality. Bahasa Indonesia does not have multiple complex levels like Javanese or Japanese to show politeness. Yet, according to lecturers' point of view, expressed in different interview, students should use not only formal language (versus slang language), but also consider hearers' feeling and face, for example the appropriateness of the language, as L1 put it 'so what if you know my position?'

Further, some students reveal that they differentiate the degree of 'politeness' when they are talking to much older lecturers v.s younger lecturers and lecturers which are approachable v.s lecturers which are not approachable as described by the following interview:

> (S2) '*Yes, for example if I talk to Mr. BS I have to talk very formally, trust me. The first is that he is very senior, so I think we have to give him high respect,*

---

[1] gue 'is Jakartan variety of the word 'aku', this often found in the very core of Bahasa Gaul to show their modern or individualized identity

[2] Mbak means older sister, mas means older brother. Bapak means Sir/ Mr. and Ibu means Maa'm or Ms.

don't we? Well, although Mr. BD is older but he is easy-going, isn't he? I have to be polite, like to be formal. But very relaxed' (8)

Excerpt (8) shows that politeness used by students depends on several factors. While Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the weigh of politeness depends on the Power distance, Degree of Imposition, and Social Distance (W= P+D+R), the students consider that personality (approachable) and age difference may weigh more than power in academic setting (since BD structurally has higher positional power than BS).

Politeness in Social Media Context

When asked about how they use social media, all of the students interviewed admit that they use multiple social media platforms, particularly social networking site such as Facebook and Twitter. In addition, some of the students use Path, Instagram, Youtube, and various lesser-known social media sites. The most active account they have is Twitter, for it is used to exchange information with their college friends and close friends, while Facebook is used for adding all type of friends and acquaintances (from active, passive, and just met – 'friends'). Interview result also shows that the informants (students) use social media very often, more than five times a day and equal to, around six-eight hours per day. Some even say that they sometimes check it as often as every hour. The lecturers interviewed admit using one (or more) social media platform, especially Social Networking Site Facebook at maximum of one hour per day. Some lecturers are 'friends' with students while some choose not to be 'friends.'

The study further investigates the possible relationship between the changing concept of politeness and the utilization of social media among students. To achieve this, politeness investigation in the context of Social Media is conducted. The first extract is taken from students' Tweet in the context of request for a favour.

Speech Act: request for a favour [3]
(1)   A: @NAME.B doni TA in aku yaa? Lg di kampung don sumpah :(
       A: @NAME.B doniii!!!!
       B: @NAME.A yah aku baru bc skrg der…Maaf ya

Eng   A: @NAME.B doni sign the list for me? In the country don swear :(
       A: @NAME.B doniii!!!!
       B: @NAME.A ouch just read it der...Sorry

Students' group evaluation on extract (1) is that A is impolite because it does not contain request word (like *tolong*/ please). While lecturers' group evaluation on this extract is that A is impolite because: (1) it does not contain request word; (2) A seemed to force and order B by using exclamation mark multiple times; (3) A did not

---

[3] Extract no 1 above shows that A asked B's favour to cheat on the lecturer by fabricating A's signature on the Students' attendance list. When B did not reply, A called B's name and using multiple exclamation mark. Then a moment later, when the class was over, B replied and told A that he was sorry that he just read A's Tweet (and thus he did not do A's a favour). There was no reply from A afterwards. Tweet A uses Informal Indonesian of Bahasa Gaul.

reply B's apology for not fulfilling the favour; and (4) It is very improper to ask someone to cheat, not to mention, in public.

Speech Act: Disagreement[4]

(2)   C: @Dname kalo raisa gak bgt trs lo apaan? Yakali lo ngomong gt ngaca dulu gendut
       D: @Cname it's my mouth I can say what I want dr pd lu g pasang poto? hahaha
       C: @Dname hahaha so pake bahasa Inggris orang mulut lo aja kaya ga disekolahin, tutup deh ya mulut lo hina" org emang lo tuhan ngejudge seenaknya

Eng   C: @Dname if raisa is uggly then what are you? You talk without looking at mirror you fatty
       D: @Cname it's my mouth I can say what I want compared to you not post photo? hahah
       C: @Dname smarty-pants talk in English while your mouth is not educated, shut up you are not god judging as you like

Both lecturers and students evaluate the extract is very rude due to its insulting and offensive nature. Yet, the students would still use it if they had to, but lecturers said that their chance to be involved in this kind of debate is very small, considering the trivial subject matter, and the feeling that they would look 'low' when they said that, although they might still hide their identity.

From both extracts, it can be seen how social media actually offer more interactivity and freedom (extract 1), and interactivity, freedom, & anonymity (extract 2). In a more personal interaction like in extract 1, the act of asking someone to cheat on her favour possesses a greater FTA. Yet, the interlocutor (A) did not or perhaps did a minimum effort to reduce the FTA. Both students and lecturers evaluate the extracts as impolite, but students' focus is on the lack of request words while lecturers add more reasons why the extract is impolite. In extract 2, the anonymity of the fan-group may add to the freedom of speech using rude and hurtful words. C and D openly mocked each other using very bad words that may not occur in a more personal interaction. Yet, the improper and rude words are still on display and seem to be accepted as normal as celebrity's hateful vs fanatic comments.

Discussion

From the results above it is found that there is a different concept of politeness between lecturers' generation (X and early Y) to students' generation (late Y). While lecturers emphasise that their negative face should be appreciated, students regard that the most important thing during Student-Lecturer interaction is achieving lecturers' positive face. In Brown and Levinson terms, during verbal communication students

---

[4] The second extract above is taken from a celebrity Instagram account. At the beginning of the extract, C mocked D for commenting that the celebrity is fat then subsequently called D fat (*Yakali lo ngomong gt ngaca dulu gendut*). Here, C used Bahasa gaul. D replied using English '*it's my mouth I can say what I want*' mixed with Indonesian that shows a mock to C questioning why C did not display C's photo. C replied that D was being know-it all (*smarty-pants*) by using English while D does not even educate her mouth. C asked D to be quiet and compared D's insult as being God that have the right to judge.

try to reduce the Social Distance with their lecturers by using positive politeness strategy like utilization of Bahasa Gaul (slang or colloquial style of Bahasa Indonesia), use terms 'aku' instead of 'saya'[5] for terms of address 'I', and utilization of more diversed communication media, from more personal like Telephone and SMS in Cellular Phones, Smart-phone application like WhatsApp and Line, to more public like Facebook and Twitter to contact and connect with their lecturers.

Related to social media, results show that, considering the frequent usage and the status symbol they bring, the utilization of social media impacts in the development of language habit. The first effect of social media usage is spontaneity. Many students admit that in interpersonal face-to-face communication or in more personal mediated communication (like phone call or SMS) the habit of fast reply, anonymity, and lack of context offered by Social Media are brought in. This is not surprising considering how deep and long these students are penetrated with Social Media. Most of the students admit that they have used the media since they were in Junior High School, the period when they like to try different language varieties (styles, registers, dialects, multiple languages) in their practices of identity construction (Bucholtz; Bailey; Eckert; in Tamtomo, 2010).

The second effect is the movement labelled by Hall (in Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2012) as High Context Culture to Lower Context Culture verbal style. Social Media, given its nature, practically do not provide contextual cues although some form of non-verbal language like emoticons, punctuation, or 'like' buttons are available. These forms of 'non-verbal' cues do not provide equal function as 'real life' cues and contexts. As a result, students who use the media a lot may measure what is polite and what is impolite from the content dimension of their language, for example whether the language contains swear words or not, whether it is formal or not, whether it contains hurtful words or not. Other important contextual cues such as time sensitivity, empathy, indirectness, and proper terms of address and honorific important for older generation are considered lack of importance or not thought of. To the great extent, as long as the words are not hurtful, and it is stated in a formal Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), it should be polite. This explains how students' language style may move further to a lower context verbal style focusing on the sender's clarity and straightforwardness compared to their lecturers who prefer a higher context verbal style focusing on the hearer interpretation from the contextual cues.

The third impact of the utilisation of Social Media toward language habit may be attributed to Social Media's support for spreading 'Bahasa Gaul', a more informal style of Bahasa Indonesia. A study by Hefner (2007, p. 184) concludes that Bahasa Gaul is used as a status symbol for younger generation as the language of modernity, egalitarianism, and expression. It can be argued that Bahasa Gaul, can be seen as having similar values with Social Media that encourage expressiveness and promote equality. Applied in interpersonal asymmetrical relationship between Student-Lecturer, students may use Bahasa Gaul to reduce the Social Distance and to achieve closeness with the lecturers. Something that is not acceptable by lecturers, considering the values brought by Bahasa Gaul is in contrast with the need of maintaining lecturers' negative face.

---

[5] like in French Tu/Vous (Aku/Saya) to show solidarity/reverence

The final role of Social Media in changing the youth language habit may be attributed to its ease to contact and connect with lecturers. Some of lecturers interviewed said that they are or were 'friends' with their students in some type of Social Media or more Personal Application like WhatsApp or Line, therefore students can easily contact them at any hour and any context. A lecturer even explained that at the beginning, a student conversed with her using polite language when greeting her on social media, yet eventually as the student found her online more frequently in social media, the more 'casual' the students' messages became. The student even progressed with asking her 'what is she doing this late' etc. Here, students may lose control and contextual cues of what is appropriate or not, given the social media atmosphere of freedom, 'closeness', and expressiveness.

From the above finding, we contend that youth immersion in social media has shaped their habitual ways of thinking about politeness. While it may look normal that an introduction of new media may alter the way human communicate, the impact may also be negative. Politeness in interaction is argued not only as language phenomenon, but it contains cultural ethics, etiquette, and values in communication differentiating one culture from another.

It is also important to note that this research only aims at looking at the changing concept of politeness from a discursive view with the role of social media in it. The researchers agree that this element may not be the only factor that causes such change, because the change can also be influenced by Mass Media penetration, parenting style, educational institutions changes, and education curriculum changes. Yet, we argue that Social Media have the amplification roles as argued in the above discussion.

Conclusion

Utilisation of any media, including social media should be carefully considered. It may change new generation's language habit impacting on the change of politeness pertinent to particular culture. Related to the research question, we argue that that youth's immersion in Social Media has influenced their language habit. The first change is spontaneity promoted in social media brought in within interpersonal asymmetrical interaction between Student-Lecturer. The second change is the movement toward a lower context communication style (LCC). As a consequence, politeness is valued from formality, absence of swear words, and hurtful words. The third change is the often use of 'Bahasa Gaul' that values egalitarianism, modernity, and expression during interaction with lecturer to reduce social distance. Finally, feeling of connectedness as a result of easy and convenient contact with lecturers develops students' casual choice of language. This notion may also challenge the concept of 'traditional' politeness that is expected during Student-Lecturer Interaction.

Implication of this research is that education institutions and practitioners should make policy to regulate communication media that is more suitable for student-lecturer interaction; and to incorporate politeness, broader language etiquette, and

cultural ethics in academic curriculum. For mainstream media, they should be more careful in presenting the model of politeness within broadcasted interactions.

References

Barnes, S. B. 2008. *Understanding social media from the media ecological perspective*. In E. A. Konijn, S. Utz, M. Tanis & S. B. Barnes (Eds.), Mediated Interpersonal Communication. Routledge, New York.

Brown, P., and Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Eelen, G. 2001. *A Critique of politeness theories*. St. Jerome, Manchester.

Fukushima, S. 2013. 'Evaluation of (im)politeness: A Comparative study among Japanese students, Japanese Parents, and American students on evaluation of Attentiveness'. *Pragmatics*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 275-299.

Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction rituals: Essays in face to face rituals*. Aldine Pub. &Co., Chicago.

Haugh, M. 2007. 'The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative'. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 295-317.

Hefner, N.J. 2008. 'Youth language, gaul sociability, and the new Indonesian middle class'. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 184-203.

Hofstede, G. 1993. 'Cultural constraints in management theories'. *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 81-94.

Jones, S., M. 2008. 'Politeness theory'. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden.

Konijn, E. A., Utz, S., Tanis, M., & Barnes, S. B. (Eds.). 2008. *Mediated interpersonal communication*. Routledge, New York.

Liao, Y., & Bond, M. H. 2011. 'The dynamics of face loss following interpersonal harm for Chinese and Americans'. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 25-38.

McLuhan, M. 1964. *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Signet, New York.

Mills, S. 2003. *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Murata, K. 2008. 'Politeness theory: Its trend and development'. *The Ryukoku Journal of Humanities and Sciences*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 1-13.

Postman, N. 2000. 'The humanism of media ecology'. Paper presented at the Inaugural Media Ecology Association Convention, Fordham University, New York.

Slama, M. 2005. *Towards a new autonomy: Internet practices of Indonesian Youth*. Working Paper der Kommision fur Sozialanthropologie. Australian Academy of Sciences, Commission for Social Antrophology, Wien.

Spencer-Oatey, H. 2008. 'Face, (im)politeness and rapport'. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. Continuum, London, pp. 11-47.

Tamtomo, K. 2012. 'Multilingual youth, literacy practices, and globalization in an Indonesian city: A preliminary exploration'. Paper presented at the 8th Northeast Conference for Indonesian Studies, Yale University, New Haven.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Chung, L. C. 2005. *Understanding intercultural communication*. Roxbury Publishing Company, Los Angeles.

Utami, I.H, Nirwana, M.D, & Fajar, D.P. 2011. *Strategi kesantunan dalam komunikasi mahasiswa-dosen melalui mobile te*xt *networked communication dalam bentuk SMS*. Unpublished Research Report, FISIP, Universitas Brawijaya

Watts, R.J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.