



## The Study of Verbal Impoliteness in the Users' Comments of *Sahamyab Stock Market Website* According to Culpeper's Theory

Naghshbandi. Shahram<sup>1\*</sup> -Razavian. Hossein<sup>2</sup> -Aryaeifar. Hossein<sup>3</sup>

1: Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics, University of Semnan, Semnan, Iran:

Correspondence author ([naghshbandi@semnan.ac.ir](mailto:naghshbandi@semnan.ac.ir))

2: Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics, University of Semnan, Semnan, Iran.

3: PhD student, Linguistics, Research Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies, Tehran, Iran.

**Abstract:** The phenomenon of impoliteness has always been one of the issues drawing different researchers' attention, which hasn't been considered as it ought to be in the Persian language. Therefore, the researchers decided to study it on a stock market website and investigate it from another perspective. This study was carried out on some of the most challenging stock market symbols having the biggest number of transactions on Sahamyab website. In this research, by analyzing about 3,600 comments equivalent to about 100,000 words, these questions were answered about how and to what extent Culpeper impoliteness models (1996, 2011) were used in the tweets of Sahamyab website users. The results indicated that almost every kind of Culpeper's impoliteness strategy was employed, with bald on-record impoliteness being the most frequent at about 34%, showing that people tend to adopt the most explicit offensive strategy to destroy the addressees' face. Mock politeness turned out second with almost 26.4%, in the form of sarcasm, irony, metaphor, and so-called dishonest politeness indicating that preserving own face when insulting others is a priority to a large number of people. Finally, negative impoliteness in conjunction with withhold politeness both amounted to 12.6% as the least frequent strategies. It could be interpreted that the main reason for the sheer volume of impoliteness and the major cause of offending individuals' faces explicitly is the cyber relationship between the users, allowing them to hide their identity, preserve their own face, and destroy addressees' faces with them feeling less concerned compared to face-to-face communication.

**Key words:** Culpeper's theory, face threat, Sahamyab website, Verbal impoliteness.

- Sh. Naghshbandi; H. Razavian; H. Aryaeifar (2024). The Study of Verbal Impoliteness in the Users' Comments of *Sahamyab Stock Market Website* According to Culpeper's Theory, *Journal of Linguistic and Rhetorical Studies* 15(35),423-444.

[Doi: 10.22075/jlrs.2024.33250.2429](https://doi.org/10.22075/jlrs.2024.33250.2429)

## 1. Introduction

Respecting addressees' face and considering politeness in relationships, in turn, reflect individuals' character, showing their communication level, and at a higher level ensure their relationships to survive. Actually, politeness is one of the most fundamental principles in human's behavior. In order to have a strong relationship, employing politeness strategies makes it possible for people to drive their relationships along in a much better way. However, impoliteness has been inevitably witnessed in relationships as well, and this issue has different reflections in different parts of the society (Yule, 2017).

One of the most important elements taking center stage in people's social-mental well-being is associated with their jobs. Moreover, in our community, one of the most common areas that people choose as a job for investment and making a living is stock market. As well as any other occupations, entering this market needs a number of certain skills that can be acquired after years of academic education and practical training under the eyes of highly-accomplished professors, in conjunction with a great deal of individual effort. But, recently, unfortunately, owing to misleading advertisements, the prevalence of fallacies, and the tempting market available, a great number of people have enthusiastically entered the market with lack of sufficient expertise, awareness, firm back-up and without knowing the probable dire consequences. However, it should also be considered that a big amount of profit can be made given that investment activities are done wisely. Such a drastic fluctuation span makes it more necessary for the participants to acquire well-rounded knowledge required, while numerous people who recently started to invest are devoid of fundamental expertise. What can compensate such poor expertise is to take advantage of specialists' worthwhile experience through communicating with them properly, which can be in form of either consultation or education. Thus, they must be crucially equipped with some certain communication skills to make that happen better, considering the fact that one of the most important indicators of a good communication is strong verbal communication which can be closely connected with the way politeness acts are implemented. Therefore, we came up with the idea of studying impoliteness in stock market based on Culpeper's theory (1996, 2011), on Sahamyab website that is one of the most

important and popular stock analysis websites in Iran. We did it in 8 challenging symbols (Shasta (TAMN1), Khodro, khasapa (SIPA1), Shepli (PLAK1), Shapna (PNES1), Zob (ZOB11), Barekat (BRKT1), Qapinoo (MINO1)". since many of the people's wrong decisions' roots lie in miscommunication while they themselves have no idea about this either, making them aware of how they can avoid impoliteness acts, and get to know how impolite their talking sounds when communicating, can help them accomplish their communication goals thereby driving their process in a better way. Along with this, this paper aims to clarify how each strategy is employed, highlight the differences between them, and understand the potential motives behind their use.

Politeness can be considered as a kind of concept like polite social behavior or taking care of social etiquette. Besides, for polite treatment in social interactions of a certain culture, different general principles can be found. Some of these principles include being thoughtful, forgiving, modest and passionate to others (Yule, 2017). The most famous politeness theory was formulated by Brown and Levenson in 1987, which can be perceived as the most influential face-based theory which tries to establish a correlation among face, face impacts, face-threatening acts, and social variables related to threatening face and language approaches (Derikvand, 2019). Although a united definition verified by linguists hasn't been identified yet, we are going to mention some of the definitions as follows.

Culpeper (1996, 2011) put it in this way that Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviors 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. Situated behaviors are viewed negatively – considered 'impolite' – when they conflict with how one expects them to be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought to be. Such behaviors always have or are presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offence. Various factors can exacerbate how offensive an impolite behavior is taken to be, including for example whether one understands a behavior to be strongly intentional or not. Locher and Bousfield (2008) believe that Impoliteness is behavior that is face-aggravating

in a particular context. Terkourafi (2008) believes that impoliteness occurs when the expression used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; it threatens the addressee's face, but no face-threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer. From Bousfield's perspective, impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008). Holmes et al, (2008) also point out that verbal impoliteness is linguistic behavior assessed by the hearer as threatening her or his face or social identity, and infringing the norms of appropriate behavior that prevail in particular contexts and among particular interlocutors, whether intentionally or not.

Furthermore, a few other domestic investigations have been carried out in a number of TV series, art works, educational centers like schools, and so forth. In terms of verbal violence, a few studies has been conducted on social media namely Instagram, but no particular research was done on impoliteness on economic websites like Sahamyab yet. Therefore, we perceived verbal impoliteness on Sahamyab website as an issue to investigate in the hope that achieving suitable results along with the research objectives turns to be fruitful outcomes worthwhile to the investigators who work in this field as well as the people seeking a good way of communication.

## **2. Research Background**

According to the subject of the present study, we are going to present a review of previous investigations conducted on verbal violence by Iranian investigators as well as foreign scholars. Foreign studies include Bagshaw (2004), Cashman (2006), Geiger and Fisher (2006), Eliasson, et al, (2007), Strasburger, et al, (2009) Upadhyay (2010), Neurater-Kessels (2011), Ratana Vinita (2014), Serra-Negra et al, (2015), Dani (2015), Saz-Rubio (2023) and Yusri et al, (2024). The results of these studies indicate that verbal violence is a common phenomenon among teenagers which might hurt their mental and physical well-being, and it is perceived as a cultural tool used by some teenagers for different purposes

including drawing attention, punishing others, dominating them and showing off. It was mentioned that it comes from the depth of social interactions. It is worth mentioning that there is also a link between impoliteness usage in individuals' self-recognition and ideological positions. Besides, impoliteness is implemented in form of threatening addressees' face (character, reputation and honesty) most. As for the role of media, impoliteness is mostly shown on TV in an exciting way as if it has a valid face. As far as schools are concerned, impoliteness strategies have been seen in both teachers and students. And, sarcasm was the most frequently used strategy between teachers and students, while Withhold Politeness turned out the least frequent one. It was also indicated that girls and boys are different in reacting to verbal impoliteness. As for girls, when it comes to threatening their changeable features like combing their hair, they don't usually react mutually. But, when it comes to hurting their social identity or a firm feature like religion or nationality, they get to react to it severely. Besides, verbal impoliteness is seen between girls in times of battle as an exceptional factor, while it is found as a friendly behavior or sense of humor between boys as well.

The domestic investigations also include studies by Majlesi (2008), Noor Mohammadi, (2010), Haji Mohammadi (2010), Navah, et al, (2014), Khatib & Lotfi (2015), (Forouqi, et al, (2015), Nikoobin & Shahrokhi (2017) and Taherian, et al, (2021). The findings demonstrate that there is a meaningful link between verbal violence and gender. While, there is an inverse correlation between the usages of impoliteness signs and age. Considering schools, all kinds of impoliteness strategies are common between students, as well as between students and teachers. There is also a link between verbal impoliteness and age, the way students are brought up in society, excitement and parents' control. Intimacy also showed an inverse connection with verbal impoliteness. Besides, the differences between social class and social power lead to variation in the way impoliteness strategies are used and the amount of adopting them. The other issue which was witnessed was that there is a correlation between power and verbal impoliteness.

Locher and Bousfield (2008) believe that Impoliteness is behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context. Bousfield (2008) believes that impoliteness constitutes the communication of

intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted. Terkourafi (2008) points out that impoliteness occurs when the expression used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; it threatens the addressee's face, but no face-threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer. As far as Lakoff (1989) is concerned, rude behavior does not utilize politeness strategies whether they would be expected, in such a way that the utterance can only almost plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational. Holms (2008) believes that verbal impoliteness is linguistic behavior assessed by the hearer as threatening her or his face or social identity, and infringing the norms of appropriate behavior that prevail in particular contexts and among particular interlocutors, whether intentionally or not.

It should be considered that one cannot easily find a united definition about impoliteness. In fact, many of these definitions don't follow regular principles. Sometimes, defining violence brought about conflicts between experts. And it should be mentioned that there can be countless definitions and perspectives about violence. As for the way it affects people, we cannot say what violence is better than the other, because all kinds of violence have detrimental effects on individuals which are partly similar. However, people who tend to be violent employ different strategies to hurt the other person, which leads it to be in different models including verbal, financial, mental, physical and sextual. Verbal impolite behavior as a human behavior has special features in different parts of the society. Along with this, verbal violence can be perceived as a kind of violence having a discourse function. What comes out from the concept of verbal violence in discourse areas is losing independence and human nature under pressures of social norms and language unquestionable rules.

On the whole, two kinds of verbal violence can be considered: A) offensive speech B) offensive silence. Actually, there are many strong unpleasant words in language that can influence individuals as harshly as they can create grudge and hatred in them. Such words

which are so offensive and nasty can be such destructive that they break individuals' souls and lead to negative long lasting consequences. Some of the offensive verbal forms are as follows.

1. Verbal contempt, scurrility and using vulgar language
2. Blame, ridicule and taunt particularly in presence of others
3. False accusation
4. Speaking in an offensive way

Sometimes, silence can also be a sign of violence in family relationships which can bring about more destructive consequences than offensive speech. In fact, this silence indicates inattention and cold shoulder to victims and can create a lot of pain and suffering in relationships (Noormohammadi, 2010).

### **3. Culpeper's Theory of Impoliteness Strategies**

Based on Brown and Lavinson's model (1987) of politeness strategy, Culpeper (1996, 2011) writes a seminal article on impoliteness. He identified impoliteness as "the parasite of politeness" (1966) and the politeness strategies are the opposite of impoliteness strategies. The opposite here refers to its orientation to face. Politeness strategy is utilized to enhance or support face which can avoid conflict while impoliteness strategies are used to attack face which cause social disharmony. As Culpeper (1996) defines impoliteness as the use of strategies to attack the interlocutor's face and create social disruption. For this Culpeper proposes five super strategies that speaker use to make impolite utterances as follows:

**Bald on record impoliteness:** This strategy is performed when face is in much danger, and where the speaker wants to offend the addressee's face. In fact, the goal is that it is done in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way.

**Positive impoliteness:** The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as:

- Ignore, snub the other - fail to acknowledge the other's presence
- Exclude the other from an activity
- Disassociate from the other - for example, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.
- Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic
- Use inappropriate identity markers - for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains

- Use obscure or secretive language - for example, mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target
- Seek disagreement - select a sensitive topic. Make the other feel uncomfortable - for example, do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk.
- Use taboo words - swear, or use abusive or profane language.
- Call the other names - use derogatory nominations. (Culpeper 1996) Negative impoliteness: The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as:
  - Frighten - instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
  - Condescend, scorn or ridicule - emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).
  - Invade the other's space - literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).
  - Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.
  - Put the other's indebtedness on record -with a negative aspect, put the other's indebtedness on record (Culpeper, 1996).

Sarcasm or mock politeness: It is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations. It is close to Leech's (1983) conception of irony "If you must cause offence, at least do so in a way which doesn't overtly conflict with the Politeness Principle, but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by way of an implicature" (1983: 82).

Withhold politeness: This refers to the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness. (Culpeper 1996, 2011).

#### **4. Research Methodology**



The data collection method was conducted in the field by visiting the website of Sahamyab, one of the most popular websites in the stock market in Iran. An attempt was made to select symbols related to various industries present in the stock market. The data studied in this research consists of comments from users of the Sahamyab website who have shared their opinions with other users and in some cases have also responded to other users' opinions. Among them, 8 symbols that were highly visited and discussed, attracting more users' attention, were selected. These symbols include Shasta (TAMN1), Khodro, khasapa (SIPA1), Shepli (PLAK1), Shapna (PNES1), Zob (ZOB11), Barekat (BRKT1), Qapinoo (MINO1). The data for this research was collected in the summer of 2018, during a period when the stock market experienced high volatility. The collected data in this research can potentially yield better results as it examines users' opinions in both bullish and bearish market conditions. Therefore, the data was collected over a wider time frame when users were experiencing both bullish and bearish or neutral conditions with their stocks. To ensure data homogeneity, collection was done under similar conditions where symbols were experiencing similar situations. Ultimately, a total of 1800 comments from the mentioned 8 symbols, consisting of approximately 50,000 words for each theory, were gathered. In total, 3600 comments were examined for both patterns. In order to reach a logical generalization at the end of the research and to provide a suitable statistical sample, a relatively high number of comments of these eight symbols were randomly selected.

## **5. Data Analysis: Verbal Impoliteness Based on Culpeper's Theory on Sahamyab Website**

### **5.1 Bald on Record Impoliteness Comments**

It is used when face is in a lot of danger and where the speaker tends to offend the addressee's face. In fact, the goal is to destroy the addressee's face as much as possible, and threatening face is direct, explicit and absolute. Within this strategy, both the speaker and the listener are aware that face is in a critical situation, and the speaker holds more power than the listener. However, interpersonal aspects of relationships are not considered a great deal (Culpeper 1996). For example, when a house is engaged in fire, and the son doesn't pay attention to the father's screams when he hides somewhere, the father yells at the son angrily: where the hell are you? Why don't

you answer? Are you deaf? Why do you treat like your stubborn mom? In this context, the father tries to save the son but criticizes his wife by appointing the adjective “stubborn” as well. As a result, in Bald on record impoliteness, the phrase is mentioned in a direct, absolute, explicit way.

Comment 1: *You illiterate, unconscious idiot, just give nonsense, first you destroyed Shasta then you did the stock market, you must have been cashed on Monday and suffered like a dogggggggggg.*

Explanation: The use of the phrases “illiterate, unconscious” and “suffer like a dog” leads face to be destroyed in a direct, explicit way.

Comment 2: *You miserable, asshole. Shasta followed a special policy for its sale on Wednesday and it will definitely have an incredibly long queue, supported by legal entities. The market is upward and the buy queue 'll keep on till Shahrivar 19.*

Explanation: attributing miserable and asshole to the addressee which is an explicit example of threatening face and apparent impoliteness.

Comment 3: *Loiterer, what's wrong with you? Why on earth are you horsing around here and making everything a big deal? You are devoid of a little stock understanding.*

Explanation: The speaker clearly threatens the addressee's face through aggressive, offensive words.

Comment 4: *Dear friend, go do your brokerage job, what do you do here? Budding traders, don't talk a lot, listen more. You'll see that what I say is right. I don't ask you to either buy or sell, I just tell what I did. I might have 100 times more money than you in the market. So, I don't care about what you say. I'll comment, I don't care who buys or sell.*

Explanation: the speaker who claims to have more money expresses more power and tries to destroy the addressee's face and job directly using the word “brokerage”, and calls his addressee “budding” which is a representation of impoliteness to a person considering himself experienced. Besides, the speaker put the addressee's face under threat by asking him not to speak anymore.

Comment 5: *In my opinion, we shouldn't talk anything over with a person taking shares for his honor. My apology, I didn't know how dogmatic you were to it. Our misery comes from max Planck story, making us afflicted with Shafer impacts. Those who have no idea about it had better surf the net.*

Explanation: The addressee tries to keep his share and advocate his financial decision, while the speaker tries to destroy the addressee's face clearly considering him as a person taking shares for his honor.

### **5.2 Sarcasm or Mock Politeness Comments**

Sarcasm or mock politeness: The FTA is performed with dishonest politeness, and the main aim of employing verbal politeness strategies is not taking care of politeness, but to annoy the addressee through sarcasm, implicature or metaphor, to have the opportunity of denying it when feeling danger. Mock politeness can be pretty offensive and irritating like sarcasm (Culpeper 1996). For example, we tell a person who is leaving the room angrily: "Good luck, close the door too".

Comment 1: *Be afraid of an oppressed innocent who doesn't have any rescuer but God (Imam Hossain)*

Explanation: The speaker tries to render the addressee delinquent through a shallow sarcasm and metaphor, while he presents himself oppressed.

Comment 2: *Be a man and bring up this comment next week. Meanwhile, you explain what today's and yesterday's candles mean. I want to learn that from you, because I don't know it and as you said I copied it from other channels. You taught me that, cross my heart I want to learn it.*

Explanation: The aim of the speaker saying those sentences is not learning, but speaking sarcastically and offending the other guy's face.

Comment 3: *Guys, take care, sick poison-sprayers attack the market.*

Explanation: The speaker put "sick poison-sprayers" as a metaphor to offend the individual's face and speak sarcastically.

Comment 4: *They are playing games with people, games, games, games. Tab Tab Abbasi (a Persian phrase when playing games with children), God I'm tired of games.*

Explanation: The aim of the speaker is not to show happiness when playing, but to render the addressee oppressor implicationally to protest against their activities, which is a kind of face-threatening act as well.

Comment 5: *In order to understand the reason for the ordered market drop, listen to the speech of the father of economics shown in June.*

Explanation: Using this adjective is a kind of mockery that the speaker attributed to the addressee to complain to him, which leads to suffering, and this is a realization of impoliteness.

### **5.3 Positive Politeness**

It's a strategy to turn down the request that the addressee expects to be verified. In Culpeper's theory, the tools to destroy others' positive face include blame, cold shoulder, inattention, excluding someone from an activity, disagreeing with separation out of hatred, using vague and mysterious language, using taboo words, calling someone's name with offensive words, creating a sense of unsafety and things like that (Culpeper 1996).

Comment 1: *I did not see a head executed, except for many heads under his feet, the arrogant ones relied on the throne or sofa. They read the book of God in such a way that they take advantage of it. Those who wear mantle rip of one-shirt. Those who wear headscarves throw their heads around the necks of those who fear God. And those who shut the water on the people, water the people from the edge of the razor.*

Explanation: The speaker uses a vague language taken from a book script aiming at blaming those who make a staggering amount of profit, leading to ruining their positive face.

Comment 2: *What naive people we are, they have stocks with the name of reform. Was this the slogan of investing in the stock market? We are just getting homeless.*

Explanation: The speaker uses blame to offend face.

Comment 3: *I swear to God that reforming this stock is over. The legal didn't support this stock today. So much better though. Much better not to make the last one negative. The stock market sucks. Nobody cares about how people's investment is terminated. Hey, new arrivals that heard the market's fame in the news and sold your car to enter it, let's cry now.*

Explanation: The speaker tries to blame the addressee using different ways and phrases.

Comment 4: *I must admit that I have been damn played. My dream palaces were destroyed on my head. Anybody who trusts this government should pay for it like me, and say goodbye to their dreams. I entered a nasty game which was loss-loss. The reality is bitter but I must admit it.*

Explanation: offending positive face regularly, the speaker is trying to blame himself.

Comment 5: *You just ate and slept within recent years empty of stock literacy. Studying a little bit, you will realize I am right. See you in this month.*

Explanation: Although the speaker brags about seeing the addressee again, the disinterest in communication in his words is quite vivid, leading to the destruction of positive face.

#### **5.4 Negative Impoliteness Comments**

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants, e.g. frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, be contemptuous, do not treat the other seriously, belittle the other, invade the other's space (literally or metaphorically), explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect (personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'You'), put the other's indebtedness on record (Culpeper 1996).

Comment 1: *Bro, when on earth did you take your stock code? Every Tom, Dick, and Harry would be analyst. The market comes back from reform and you still say we will see reform in 1800?*

Explanation: Threatening the addressee's face through contempt, using the highlighted phrase, due to the wrong prediction.

Comment 2: *Hey you who claimed to be a professor of signaling a few weeks ago. You realize you know nothing about bourse? Or you're such a coward person that you destroy the money of hard-working people? It will not last forever. Illiterate, cowardly people like you don't go too far either.*

Explanation: Threatening face is done by belittling the addressee by attributing offensive characteristics.

Comment 3: *My relatives always ask me what I do, and I say I hang around the stock market, and they say so I'm jobless. Nobody perceives it as a job. Job is recognized when it is done all physically rather than mentally. It means that a guy who works as a computer programmer is considered as jobless in people's opinion. Indeed, it's right to call us third-world.*

Explanation: The first highlighted sentence by the relatives is a kind of belittlement and is used to ridicule the speaker's job, which hurts his negative face, and also the speaker got to ridicule the group and himself by saying the second highlighted sentence.

Comment 4: *Stay here tomorrow noon as well. You sold expensive and seek to buy cheap. Go to bed early to get up early. Get the line, you might end up with some profit.*

Explanation: The speaker tries to invade the addressee's privacy as well as blaming the way he buys and sells, followed by teasing him by

saying the second highlighted statement, which are instances of positive and negative impoliteness.

Comment 5: *We just laughed out loud at this analysis, you such a pity with this kind of talent in this market.*

Explanation: Threatening the addressee's face by teasing him.

### 5.5 Withhold Impoliteness Comments

Withhold impoliteness: This refers to the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness. (Culpeper 1996). To Culpeper, Brown and Levinson touch on the face-damaging implications of withholding politeness work by saying that "politeness has to be communicated, and the absence of communicated politeness may be taken as the absence of a polite attitude".

Comment 1: *Don't whine a lot, guys, good news is around the corner, the real good news.*

Reply: *I 'd guess you 'd better watch TV less.*

Explanation: Although the speaker tries to give hope to addressees, and expect them to thank him, he faces a negative reaction, which is perceived as a kind of withhold impoliteness, and threatens his face wants.

Comment 2: *What is inverse advertisement? I investigated last night, the intrinsic value of Shasta was 300 thousand billion tomans, it is achieved in the best way by investigating the bourse and non-bourse prices, but, at present, it is traded with 400 thousand billion tomans meaning that it's higher than almost 100 thousand billion tomans. Well, what companies are the sub-sets of Shasta? Such as Saba Tamin Tapico. It means that some who buys Shasta 5000 t, buys Foolad 2500 t (50% more than the present price). A recommendation to the people who are a big fan of Shasta, if you want to buy Shasta, buy its sub-set at a reasonable price. This is a piece of experience to everybody.*

Reply: *Bro don't put too much pressure on yourself and do not copy things from other places.*

Explanation: The addressee gets to threaten the speaker's face rather than employ a polite strategy to meet the speaker's expectation for his valuable information.

Comment 3: *The overall index reacted well to Fibo 38% resistance, and a good trend is seen in the chart on the whole.*

Reply: *You are living on the easy street. Without a care in the world.*

Explanation: Avoiding politeness and compliment, thereby threatening the addressee's face.

Comment 4: *I asked you to sell over 4500 t, but who listened? Guys, it falls up to 2400, anyway, I hope it comes back to 3500 and it gives the chance to sell. But, the best time to sell is the present time. Don't let it go to the standstill.*

Reply: *well, you recommended and we didn't listen, and probably you sold. Ok? So, what are you doing on Shasta page?*

Explanation: Refusing to thank thereby not meeting the expectation created.

Comment 5: *Saturday will witness a dramatic movement index; it is my recommendation.*

Reply: *you are waiting for some to sell which leads you to buy. Feel free.*

Explanation: The addressee decides to judge the speaker and offend him rather than respect his recommendation and thank him.

## 6. Research Findings

The findings of the present study indicated that verbal impoliteness is pretty common in stock market verbal activities. This kind of violence is prevalent among all classes of users on Sahamyab website (as one of the official analysis websites in Iran). Suitable examples for all the theory strategies have been found. And, the following results turned out having studied over 1800 comments (as many as 50000 words) in 9 challenging symbols (Shasta (TAMN1), Khodro, khasapa (SIPA1), Shepli (PLAK1), Shapna (PNES1), Zob (ZOB11), Barekat (BRKT1), Qapino0 (MINO1”

1. Among the 1800 comments which were investigated, 58% of the comments included at least one of the strategies of Culpeper's theory (bold-on record, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, mock politeness, withhold politeness). In fact, in 1044 comments out of 1800 comments, the users employed one of the strategies.
2. Among the 1800 comments in which one of the strategies was adopted, bold-on record was the most frequent strategy with 360 frequencies (34%). In the subsequent place, mock politeness turned out second with 276 comments (26.4%). The third most frequent strategy was positive impoliteness with 144 comments (13.7%). And, negative impoliteness with almost 132 comments (12.6%) was the least frequent strategy witnessed in the users' comments.

Table 1. The frequency and percentage of Culpeper strategies

<b>Culpeper strategies</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>percentage</b>
<b>bold-on record</b>	360	34.4
<b>negative impoliteness</b>	132	12.6
<b>mock politeness</b>	276	26.4
<b>positive impoliteness</b>	144	13.7
<b>withhold politeness</b>	132	12.6

The table mentions five strategies that were observed in the comments: Bold-on record: This was the most frequently observed strategy, with 360 instances, accounting for 34% of the total comments analyzed. This strategy involves making strong, assertive statements or opinions without being impolite. Mock politeness: This was the second most common strategy, with 276 comments, making up 26.4% of the total. Mock politeness involves using polite language or expressions in a sarcastic or insincere manner. Positive impoliteness: This was the third most frequent strategy, with 144 comments, representing 13.7% of the total. Positive impoliteness involves expressing disagreement or criticism in a direct and confrontational way. Negative impoliteness: This was the least frequent strategy observed, with almost 132 comments, accounting for 12.6% of the total. Negative impoliteness involves expressing disagreement or criticism in a more indirect or subtle way. Overall, the study found that users on the Sahamyab website tended to use a variety of communication strategies in their comments, with bold-on record being the most common approach. The findings provide insights into how users communicate and interact with each other in an online stock market community.

## **7. Conclusion**

Overall, in the 1800 comments which were investigated on Sahamyab website, in 1044 cases (58%), one of the impoliteness strategies was found while 756 comments were devoid of the strategies. It means that when either a reader wants to read a comment or a speaker is about to leave a comment, they are going to involve one of the impoliteness strategies thereby encountering a face threatening model with nearly 60 percent of probability, that needs to be analyzed. In fact, there is a very considerable difference in the way face-threatening acts and offensive tools are employed in



today's communication, as well as the way people turn to violence in their everyday interactions, compared to the previous generations. In other words, in the past, politeness and its strategies used to be perceived as an indispensable part of people's ethical principles in communication, and crossing politeness boundaries was considered as taboo even between young generations. Besides, regardless of social class, situation, time and other factors playing a role in communication, respecting older people used to be of important etiquette in people's social behavior. Having investigated more to find the reasons, we can witness the footprints of technology, the advent of cyberspace, shifting the foundation of society from spiritual-based and culture-oriented to consumerism and materialism. In the space in which we carried out the research, all the three factors have been engaged either directly or indirectly. Considering the role of cyber space in communication, it is worth mentioning that having passed almost a decade from the advent of social media, and experiencing a number of common virtual platforms which worked for a period of time, along with the experiences obtained, social media with its formed interiorized features is converted to an environment in which individuals' face is felt unreal. It could be from the absence of many users face-to-face and their identity. It creates a place in which people threaten each other's face without them abiding by fundamental ethical principles. On the other hand, the website's atmosphere is embedded with financial activities as well as profit-loss issues. Since making more profit is perceived as a principle to individuals in today's materialistic society, people react in an unpleasant way to anything getting on the way of achieving it. Thus, people's face and character are on the verge of threat and destruction. As a result, the virtual environment in which the website users got to trade escalates the intensity of the way impoliteness strategies are employed, and justifies the high volume of verbal violence on the website. Furthermore, on the Sahamyab website, the most frequent impoliteness strategy based on Culpeper's theory was bold-on record (34%), in which the addressee's face is explicitly offended. One of the reasons participants use this strategy is that they find it easier to disempower and dominate the addressees, allowing them to impose pressure and show off. The society goes like the people who are more violent have more power and can drive processes in a

better way. In the research findings, it was also witnessed that the second most frequent strategy was associated with mock impoliteness (26.4%) in which threatening addressees' face is done through sarcasm, implicature and dishonest politeness. The reason for prevalence of this strategy is closely connected with people's tendency to destroy individuals' face while preserving their own face. In fact, in previous generations, the sense of philanthropy, honesty and solidarity have been disseminated a great deal more in a way that people were in pursuit of taking care of each other's rights in plentiful social, economic and cultural cases, and even put others' rights ahead of theirs, whereby a kind of solid bonding could be clearly seen in people's relationships. While, this bonding has already been broken in today's society, honesty and togetherness are replaced with opportunism, dishonesty and hypocrisy towards achieving personal goals. The considerable issue justifying the widespread use of impoliteness strategies is that a host of people aim to destroy others, trample upon their rights and take advantage of the consequences in their favor in a way that their own face is preserved at the same time. Whereas, when they offend people's face explicitly, they expose their own face to threat and offence as well. Hence, they seek to encounter the least amount of offense to their face when trying to destroy addressee's face, as a result, they cling to mock impoliteness strategies. Finally, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness and withhold impoliteness accounting for roughly the same proportion (12.5%) turned out next in the website users' comments. With a little bit of more attention to the website's statistics, it was witnessed that in total, nearly 60% of impoliteness found in the users' comments were either explicit and absolute or through sarcasm, implicature and dishonest impoliteness.

The main reason for the high volume of rudeness in the speech of users, who come from various social classes and strata of society, seems to be the virtual nature of the space they are in. In this virtual space, the type of language used by them is often not proportionate to their personalities. The virtual nature of the space, on one hand, prevents users from facing each other face-to-face, and on the other hand, allows them to hide their identities and stay away from potential damage to their reputation. This completely open space has

created a high volume of rudeness in verbal communication that is not seen in real life and face-to-face interactions.

## References

- Bagshaw, D. M. (2004). *Verbal abuse and adolescent identities: marking the boundaries of gender*. Doctoral dissertation, Melbourne: University of Melbourne. School of Behavioral Science and School of Social Work.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4)*. Cambridge university press.
- Cashman, H. R. (2006). Impoliteness in children's interactions in a Spanish/English bilingual community of practice. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 2(2), 217-246. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2006.012>
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 35-72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). 13. Politeness and impoliteness. ed. Gisle Andersen; Karin Aijmer. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. *Pragmatics of society*. p. 391-436 (Handbooks of Pragmatics; Vol. 5).
- Dani, E. P. (2015). *The impoliteness strategies used by teacher and student in classroom interaction*. Doctoral dissertation, UNIMED.
- Derikvand, Z. (2019). A Linguistic Study Impoliteness in Iranian Cinematic Films. Case Study: Movies: we do not get used to and Forever and One day, *Language Analysis*, 6, 71-88.
- Eliasson, M. A., Isaksson, K., & Laflamme, L. (2007). Verbal abuse in school. Constructions of gender among 14-to 15-year-olds. *Gender and Education*, 19(5), 587-605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250701535600>
- Forouqi, M., Majidi Qahroudi, N., Safari, M.D. (2015), Violence discourse in the shadow of speech, In *The National Conference of Knowledge and Technology of Social, Psychological Studies of Educational Sciences in Iran*, Tehran.
- Geiger, B., & Fischer, M. (2006). Will words ever harm me? Escalation from verbal to physical abuse in sixth-grade classrooms. *Journal of*

- Interpersonal Violence*, 21(3), 337-357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505282886>
- Haji Mohammadi, S. (2010). *The study of impolite language between Tehrani Persian men and women*. MA dissertation, Allame Tabatabaee University, Tehran.
- Holmes, J., Marra, M. and Schnurr, S. (2008). Impoliteness and ethnicity: Māori and Pākehā discourse in New Zealand workplaces. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 4 (2): 193--219. <https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2008.010>
- Khatib, M., & Lotfi, K. (2015). Impoliteness and power: An interlanguage pragmatic approach to the use of impolite patterns in terms of power. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 7(15), 43-67.
- Lakoff, R. (1989). The Limits of Politeness: Therapeutic and Courtroom Discourse. *Multilingua Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 101-130. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.101>
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Locher, M. A., & Bousfield, D. (2008). Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language. In D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. (pp. 1-13). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344>
- Majlesi, A. (2008). *Verbal violence: A case study in Tehran high schools*. MA dissertation, Tehran University, Tehran.
- Neurater-Kessels, M. (2011). Reader Responses on British Online News Sites. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 7. pp 187-214. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2011.010>
- Navah, A., Rezapour, D., & Koopaei, M. B. (2014). A Study of Individual and Social Factors Influencing Verbal Violence among Male High School Students in Bushehr City. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 13-21.
- Nikoobin, A., & Shahrokhi, M. (2017). Impoliteness in the Realization of Complaint Speech Acts: A Comparative Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Native English Speakers. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 32-54. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n2p32>

- Noor Mohammadi, Q. (2010). *Ignoring violence from religion's and intellect's perspective*. Tehran: The center of family and women affairs of presidency entity.
- Saz-Rubio, M. (2023), Assessing impoliteness-related language in response to a season's greeting posted by the Spanish and English Prime Ministers on Twitte, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 206, No. 1, pp. 31-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.01.010>
- Serra-Negra, J. M., Paiva, S. M., Bendo, C. B., Fulgêncio, L. B., Lage, C. F., Corrêa-Faria, P., & Pordeus, I. A. (2015). Verbal school bullying and life satisfaction among Brazilian adolescents: Profiles of the aggressor and the victim. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 57, 132-139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2014.11.004>
- Strasburger, V., Wilson, B. & Jordan, A. (2009). *Children, Adolescent, And the Media*. Second Edition. Sage.
- Taherian, A., Razavian, H., Shahsani, A. M., & Esmaeili, E. (2021). Reflection of Verbal Violence in Farrokhi Yazdi's Poems: An Analysis Based on Malkin's Approach. *The Journal of Linguistic and Rhetorical Studies*, 12(25), 247-272. <https://doi.org/10.22075/jlrs.2020.21305.1769>
- Terkourafi, M. (2008). Towards a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness. In D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. (pp. 45-74). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.1.45>
- Upadhyay, R. (2010). Identity and Impoliteness in Computer-mediated Reader Responses. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 6,105-127. <https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2010.006>
- Yule, G. (2017). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yusri, Y., Mantasiah, R. and Anwar, M. (2024), Assessing language impoliteness of primary school teachers in Indonesia, *Asian Education and Development Studies*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-08-2023-0098>