


# Factors Influencing the Language Politeness Behavior of The Z Generation

Abdullah Pandang<sup>1</sup>, Mantasiah R.<sup>1</sup>, Nur Fadhilah Umar\*<sup>1</sup>, Azzam Arifyadi<sup>2</sup>, M. Amirullah<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Tadulako Palu, Indonesia

 [nurfadhilahumar@unm.ac.id](mailto:nurfadhilahumar@unm.ac.id)\*

<p><b>Submitted:</b> 2024-03-07</p> <p><b>Revised:</b> 2024-03-27</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> 2024-04-19</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> factor of politeness; language politeness; politeness behavior; z generation</p> <p><b>Copyright holder:</b> © Pandang, A., Umar, N. F., Mantasiah, M., Arifyadi, A., &amp; Amirullah, M. (2024)</p> <p><b>This article is under:</b> </p> <p><b>How to cite:</b> Pandang, A., Umar, N. F., Mantasiah, M., Arifyadi, A., &amp; Amirullah, M. (2024). Factors Influencing the Language Politeness Behavior of The Z Generation. <i>Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy</i>, 6(1). <a href="https://doi.org/10.51214/00202406848000">https://doi.org/10.51214/00202406848000</a></p> <p><b>Published by:</b> Kuras Institute</p> <p><b>E-ISSN:</b> 2656-1050</p>	<p><b>ABSTRACT:</b> Language politeness has different standards in every country and even in different regions due to cultural varieties. Thus, factors influencing politeness are also various. The study aims to identify the dominant and pre-dominant factors influencing the language politeness of the Z generation. Nine independent variables were investigated in this study, including gender, school background, discipline, tribe, intensity using social media, intensity adding a comment in social media, semester, and province, as the dependent variables, while the language politeness of the Z gen was the independent variable. The research samples were 1354 students from 3 different provinces, South Sulawesi, Central Sulawesi, and West Sulawesi, selected through random cluster sampling. The instruments in this study included an instrument of factors determining politeness developed by the researchers using a categorization instrument, and Politeness Behavior on Communicating developed using the Likert model. The instrument had been evaluated using EFA and CFA tests, and showed that the model was fit. Data were analyzed using ANOVA continued with the Least of Significant as (LSD). Research findings show four factors influencing language politeness, namely tribe, the intensity of writing comments in social media, provinces, and types of universities. The findings also show that in Indonesia, language politeness is still dominated by factors of culture, religion, and social media. The language politeness of the Z Generation is not only a self-identity in social life but also an image in the virtual world.</p>
---	--

## INTRODUCTION

Communication in the working world is a problem for Generation Z because they prefer to work independently and avoid working in a team (Dolot, 2018; Kapoor & Solomon, 2011). The study by (Iorgulescu, 2016) found a fact that the Z gen's preference to work idenpendently rather than to work in a team influences the way they communicate so that in verbal communication, they usually use informal language that is in Bahasa Indonesia, called *Bahasa Gaul*, and they usually face difficulties in face-to-face communication (Anwar, 2019; Pohan & Lbs, 2022). In non-verbal language, they have informal intonation because they follow the latest fashion and are expressive in social media (Agustina, 2020; Munsch, 2021).

Older generations usually cannot collaborate with the Z gen because they perceive them to have impolite communication patterns (Gabriellova & Buchko, 2021; Seemiller & Grace, 2016). The Z gen is believed to have poor communication skills and no basic communication skills (eye contact) (Farida

Aryani & Umar, 2020; Gould, Nalepa, & Mignano, 2020), experience decadency in their verbal communication to be much more impolite than the previous generation (Pandit, 2015). Thus, the older generations do not fully accept gen THE Z as co-workers. They have no similar working ethics and values (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). The problem emerges due to the lack of formal communication of effective communication management control (Bouckennooghe, 2012; Nwogbaga, Nwankwo, & Onwa, 2015).

The Z gen is considered unable to communicate as effectively as the earlier generation in their environment (McCartney & Rick, 2021; Strawser, Smith, & Rubenking, 2021), does not think of other's feelings, or has low empathy and communication ethics (Bejtkovský, 2016; Fromm & Read, 2018). Based on earlier studies, the Z gen experiences the problem of lacking politeness in verbal and non-verbal communication (Dragomir, Fărcașiu, & Șimon, 2021; ONG, 2022; Rothwell & Waters, 2022). The condition inhibit them from having a good connections (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016; Turner, 2015), and sometimes the condition leads to a toxic relationships, verbal bullying, and microaggressive acts (Elisabeth & Uthama, 2022; Johnson et al., 2018; Khan & Khan, 2012).

Various methods have been implemented by earlier researchers related to how to develop language politeness (Hübscher, Garufi, & Prieto, 2019; Mahyuddin & Rozimela, 2019; Mugford, 2011), however, the language politeness standard is different in each country, and each place has different standard also (Cho & Jo, 2022; Suutala, 2021; Zhu & Bao, 2010). Factors leading to the variety of individual politeness standard is cultural and social norms (Babel et al., 2022; Bacha, Rustum, Umer, & Khan, 2021; Gumartifa, 2022a). For example, the language politeness standard in western society is different from in eastern society (Erkinovna, 2022). Here, western society tends to follow the more universal politeness than Asian culture (Jia & Yang, 2021; Togans, Holtgraves, Kwon, & Zelaya, 2021), including Indonesia (Sujoko, 2021).

Various earlier studies found that the politeness standards in different Indonesian areas are distinctive due to the multicultural condition (Asteka, Suwandi, & St Y, 2021; Mardiana, Rokhman, Rustono, & Mardikantoro, 2021). Thus, it leads to distinguishing factors promoting everyone's language politeness (Gumartifa, 2022b; Xafizovna, 2021). Identifying various factors influencing language politeness can become a strategy to improve language politeness based on the needs and demographical condition of each group (Chocarro, Cortiñas, & Marcos-Matás, 2021). Therefore, the study aims to find out factors affecting the language politeness of individuals in the Indonesian cultural context. The earlier findings showed various factors influencing language politeness, including gender; women are regarded to communicate more politely than men. More specifically, they are more positively polite or linguistically supportive in making interaction (Holmes, 2013; Pandang et al., 2022; Syafrizal & Putri, 2020).

Besides that, school background also influences the language politeness of the Z generation. Students in state universities implement politeness values in communication (Iksan et al., 2012; Suhanti, Puspitasari, & Noorrizki, 2018), yet, students from private universities tend to be closed in communication and unable to interact politely (T. Hidayat & Agustin, 2019). Furthermore, language politeness as a behavioral pattern can be seen from the individuals' communication skills in interaction that is also affected by their discipline background (Chejnová, 2015; Watts, Ide, & Ehlich, 2005). For example, engineering students are less competent in communication and have no intercultural communication skill and politeness in communication. It is due to the lack of social interaction occurring in their environment, and they spend more time interacting with things (Holik & Sanda, 2020; Mezote, 2011), and the Faculty of Social and Humanities are more concerned about language politeness and interpersonal communication pattern when interacting (Senowarsito, 2013). Besides that, other factors influencing language politeness is the tribe (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Language politeness levels

of both speaking and behaving are different based on their religion and culture or ethnicity (Ayeni, 2021; Mantasiah R, Hasmawati, & Umar, 2020).

The earlier findings showed that the language politeness of the Z generation is highly influenced by their intensity using social media and the intensity of writing a comment on social media (Kasim & Zaman, 2021). Someone with high intensity using social media and high frequency posts a comment will reduce the quality of their communication and less polite in social interaction (Gao & Chen, 2021), it is because THE Z generation tend to be different from the older generation and THE Z gen adopt interaction pattern in social media which use much informal language that is being trend (*bahasa gaul*) (Chatzoglou et al., 2020; Mesch, 2012; Toder-Alon et al., 2014).

Based on the semester level, students in the last semester have more structured and polite language than students in the beginning semester because students in the last semester have got a longer period of experience with social interaction and communication with other people (Berliningrum, 2022; E. M. B. Sembiring, 2022; Susanti et al., 2016). Then, the language politeness of THE Z gen in every province is different due to social factors and cultural patterns applied in the society (D. Hidayat et al., 2021; Zharkynbekova & Aimoldina, 2022; Zhuhra et al., 2022).

### Rationale of Study

The current job market requires the young generation, commonly called Generation Z. However, various studies have examined that the characteristics of Generation Z are considered unsuitable for the workplace, such as being individualistic, non-collaborative, and having communication patterns that are deemed ineffective and lacking in verbal and non-verbal politeness (Strawser, Smith, & Rubenking, 2021). Communication is one of the supporting factors for success, and various factors are causing the communication patterns of Generation Z to be considered impolite (Mantasiah R, Hasmawati, & Umar, 2020). If such communication patterns are not controlled and developed properly, it poses risks to Generation Z's personal, social, and career aspects (Iorgulescu, 2016).

### Aims and Hypotheses

This research aims to explore the factors influencing the linguistic politeness of Generation Z through several variable assessments classified into research hypotheses regarding ethnicity, educational background, intensity of social media usage and commenting, and the type of university that may influence the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H1: Gender influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H2: A person's educational background influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H3: A person's discipline influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H4: A person's cultural ethnicity influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H5: The intensity of social media usage influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H6: The intensity of commenting on social media influences Generation Z's linguistic politeness.

H7: The semester level of students influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H8: The province of a person influences the linguistic politeness of Generation Z.

H9: The type of university students attend influences Generation Z's linguistic politeness.

## METHODS

### Design

The study used the quantitative correlational design, which aimed to identify the correlation of nine independent variables which potentially influence the The Z generation's polite behavior in

communicating with others. In a correlational quantitative study, the researchers can identify dominant and not dominant variables influencing the Z gen to communicate politely.

### Research Variables

There were nine independent variables in this study, namely: X1: Gender, X2: School background, X3: Discipline, X4: Tribe, X5: Intensity using social media, X6: Intensity posting a comment in social media, X7: Semester, X8: Province, X9: Types of university, and the Z gen language politeness (Y).

### Participants

There were nine independent variables in this study, namely: X1: Gender, X2: School This study involved 1354 students from three provinces, including South Sulawesi, Central Sulawesi, and West Sulawesi, selected using cluster random sampling. South Sulawesi was selected because it is the biggest province on Sulawesi Island, Indonesia. West Sulawesi was selected because it was a new and developing province. Also, Central Sulawesi is selected because it is also currently developing. Thus, the condition in those three provinces is regarded as similar.

The research population was all university students in South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi, and Central Sulawesi registered in the academic year 2021/2022. The samples were selected through the following stages: 1) getting data about the number of students in each university in South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi, and Central Sulawesi; 2) from the data, we selected the State University of Makassar, University of West Sulawesi, and University of Tadulako. Muslim University, Indonesia, Alauddin Islamic University, Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, Islamic Institute of West Sulawesi, and Muhammadiyah University of Palu; 3) from the selected universities, we selected respondents based on their genders, discipline, tribes, and provinces.

Based on the data, the number of selected students was 15.000. Using the Slovin method, a probability value of .05, we chose 1.354 students. Specifically, the sample demography can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Demography of Research Sample

	Frequencies	Percentages
Genders		
Female	701	51.77
Male	653	48.23
School background/ alumni of		
Senior High School	535	39.51
Vocational High School	380	28.06
Islamic Senior High School	229	16.92
Boarding School	210	15.51
Faculties		
Science Education	205	15.14
Language	145	10.71
Engineering	138	10.19
Mathematics and Natural Sciences	137	10.11
Economics	128	10.19
Social, politics, and laws	135	9.97
Sports	121	8.94
Psychology	127	9.38
Health Education	115	8.49
Others	93	6.87
Tribes		
Bugis	275	20.31

Makassar	265	19.57
Mandar	244	18.02
Toraja	195	14.40
Jawa	107	7.90
Sunda	68	5.02
Kaili	200	14.77
Provinces		
South Sulawesi	552	40.77
West Sulawesi	489	36.12
Central Sulawesi	313	23.11

## Research Instrument

### *Instrumen of Factors Influencing Politeness*

We developed an instrument of factors influencing politeness by involving nine aspects that we believed influencing the language politeness of students in the Indonesian context. The factors include gender, school background, discipline (faculties), tribes, intensity using social media, intensity uploading comments on social media, semester, provinces, and types of universities. Instrument of factors influencing language politeness is a categorization instrument consisting of: 1) gender factors divided into two, male and female, 2) factors of school background divided into four categories, namely Senior High School, Islamic Senior High School, Vocational High School, and boarding school, 3) factor of discipline consisting of ten categories, namely Science Education, Language, Engineering, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Economics, Social, politics, and laws, Sports, Psychology, Health Education, and others (agriculture, usluhuddin, da'wah), 4) factor of tribe divided into seven categories, namely Bugis, Makassar, Mandar, Toraja, Jawa, Sunda, and Kaili. 5) factor of the intensity of using social media divided into four levels, *very often*, *often*, *seldom*, and *never*, 6) factor of intensity uploading a comment on social media, consisting of four levels: *very often*, *often*, *seldom*, and *never*, 7) factor of semester divided into three categories: beginner (semester 1-3), intermediate (4-6), and last (7-graduate). 8) Factor of provinces consisting of three categories, South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi, and Central Sulawesi, and 9) Factor of types of university, consisting of four categories: state university, private university, Islamic state university, and private Islamic university.

The instrument of language politeness factors was distributed to search samples using a Google Form attached with a statement sheet of their willingness to fill in the instrument, guidance to fill the instrument, and consent form of information they submit to the instrument (the confidentiality of data would be guaranteed, and it would be only used for the research purpose).

### *Politeness Behavior in Communicating*

The instrument of language politeness factors was distributed to search samples using a Google Form attached with a statement sheet of their willingness to fill in the instrument, guidance to fill the instrument, and consent form of information they submit to the instrument (the confidentiality of data would be guaranteed, and it would be only used for the research purpose). The results of the Efa test can be seen in Table 2, the PBC instrument was in the fit index category based on the values

Table 2. Results of the EFA Test

Instrument	N	Reliability Test		Validity Test		
		<i>McDonald's</i>	<i>Cronbach's</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>GFI</i>	<i>CMIN/DF</i>
Politeness Behavior in Communicating	1354	.921	.943	.055	.961	925.721/493
Moral Action		.962	.953			
Impression		.918	.907			
Imitation Behavior		.904	.902			

Table 3. Factors Influencing Language Politeness

Language Politeness Factors		Sum of Square	M-Square	F
Language Politeness	Genders	6.875	0.683	0.016
	School background	58.297	20.665	0.496
	Faculties	494.412	54.953	1.324
	Tribes	10077.98	167.997	4.098***
	Intensity to use social media	34.288	11.429	0.274
	Intensity to upload a comment on social media	456.840	152.280	3.648*
	Semester	115.616	57.808	1.390
	Provinces	3343.467	171.738	4.149*
	Types of Universities	427.217	142.406	3.443*

Note. N = 1354 (students in three provinces: South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi, and Central Sulawesi), \*\*\* (p <0.001); \*\* (p <.01); \*(p <.05)

of chi-square, GFI, RMSEA, McDonald, and Cronbach Alpha. Thus, the PBS instrument was feasible to be used in this study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### *Factors Influencing Language Politeness*

Based on the ANOVA analysis in Table 3, we found four factors that did not influence the language politeness of students with a significance value of more than 0,05 ( $p < .5$ ), namely genders ( $M-Square = .683$ ), school background ( $M-Square = 20.665$ ), Faculties ( $M-Square = 54.953$ ), intensity using social media ( $M-Square = 11.429$ ), and semester ( $M-Square = 57.808$ ). Besides that, the other four factors influencing students' language politeness got values below .05 ( $p < .05$ ) were the intensity

Table 4. Differences in Politeness Factors

Politeness Factors		Sub Factors	Mean	SD	M-Square	Wilks Lamda
Language politeness	Tribes	Bugis	57.516	6.505	167.997	.015***
		Makassar	58.362	6.600		
		Mandar	56.856	5.931		
		Toraja	55.315	6.427		
		Jawa	57.262	6.390		
		Sunda	59.436	6.999		
		Kaili	57.310	6.096		
	Intensity to upload a comment in social media	Never	57.512	6.973	152.280	.006*
		Rarely	57.288	6.197		
		Often	57.481	7.408		
	Provinces	Very often	66.800	10.330	171.738	.007*
		South Sulawesi	57.649	6.584		
		West Sulawesi	56.303	5.779		
	Types of universities	Central Sulawesi	57.585	6.552	142.406	.0016*
State University		57.665	6.528			
Private University		56.059	5.920			
Islamic State University		56.739	7.185			
		Islamic Private University	57.387	4.897		

Note. N = 1354 (students di 3 provinces South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi and Central Sulawesi), \*\*\* (p <.001); \*\* (p <.01); \*(p <.05)

of uploading comments on social media ( $M\text{-Square}= 167.997$ ), tribes ( $M\text{-Square}= 152.280$ ), provinces ( $M\text{-Square}= 171.738$ ), and types of universities ( $M\text{-Square}= 142.406$ ).

### Differences in Politeness Factors

Table 4 shows factors influencing language politeness. Related to tribes, Sunda had the most polite language ( $M= 59,436$ ;  $SD= 6.999$ ), while the lowest one was Toraja ( $M=55.315$ ;  $SD= 6.427$ ). Data about the intensity of using social media showed that the highest politeness score belonged to the group of students who very frequently uploaded a comment ( $M=66.800$ ;  $SD= 10.330$ ), while the lowest one was the students who rarely wrote a comment on social media ( $M=57.288$ ;  $SD=6.197$ ). Then, the most polite students came from South Sulawesi ( $M=57.649$ ;  $SD= 6.548$ ), while the lowest politeness score was shown by students from West Sulawesi ( $M=56.303$ ;  $SD=5.779$ ). Based on the type of university where they studied, the highest politeness score was found in students from State Universities ( $M=57.665$ ;  $SD=6.528$ ), while the lowest one was from private universities ( $M=56.059$ ;  $SD= 5.920$ ). Then, we carried out a post hoc test through LSD, and the results can be seen in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8.

### Differences in Politeness Factors

Table 5 shows that a significant difference in students' language politeness was influenced by the tribe. The language politeness of Bugis is much different from Toraja ( $MD= 2.204$ ;  $SE= .639$ ). Besides that, the language politeness of Makassar is also different from Toraja ( $MD= 3.050$ ;  $SE= .699$ ). Lastly, Toraja has a different politeness level from Sunda ( $MD=4.123$ ;  $SE=1.171$ ).

### Post-Hoc Test of Social Media Factor

Table 6 shows a significant difference in politeness levels caused by the intensity of adding a comment on social media. Students who never added a comment on social media had a much different politeness level from those who very often commented ( $MD= 2.204$ ;  $SE= .639$ ). Besides, the

Table 5. Differences in Politeness Factors

		Tribes	Mean Difference	SE	P <sub>tukey</sub>
Language politeness	Bugis	Makassar	-0.846	.507	.638
		Mandar	.660	.554	.897
		Toraja	2.204	.639	.010*
		Jawa	0.254	.872	1.000
		Sunda	-1.920	1.068	.549
		Kaili	.207	.643	1.000
	Makassar	Mandar	1.506	.622	.190
		Toraja	3.050	.699	< .001***
		Jawa	1.100	.917	.894
		Sunda	-1.074	1.104	.960
		Kaili	1.053	.703	.746
	Mandar	Toraja	1.544	.734	.351
		Jawa	-0.406	.943	1.000
		Sunda	-2.580	1.127	.250
		Kaili	-0.453	.737	.996
Toraja	Jawa	-1.950	.996	.443	
	Sunda	-4.123	1.171	.008**	
	Kaili	-1.997	.803	.165	
Jawa	Sunda	-2.174	1.313	.646	
	Kaili	-0.047	.999	1.000	

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

Table 6. Post-Hoct Test of Social Media Factor

Intensity to Send a Comment on Social Media			Mean Difference	SE	P <sub>tukey</sub>
Language politeness	Never	Sometimes	.224	.433	.955
		Often	.031	1.294	1.000
		Very Often	-9.288	2.900	.008**
	Sometimes	Often	-0.193	1.255	.999
		Very Often	-9.512	2.883	.005**
		Very Often	-9.319	3.130	.016*

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

language politeness level of students who seldom wrote a comment on social media was different from students who very often wrote a comment ( $MD=9.512$ ;  $SE= 2.883$ ).

**Post-Hoct Test of Provinces Factor**

Based on the post hoc test through the least significant difference on province factor in table 7, we found different levels of students’ language politeness. The difference can be seen in students from South Sulawesi and West Sulawesi ( $MD= 1.347$ ;  $SE= 0.474$ ).

**Post-Hoct Test of Types of University**

Based on the post hoc test through the least significant difference in factors of types of universities in table 8, we found a distinction in the language politeness of students from state universities and private universities. The difference can be found in students from state and Islamic state universities ( $MD= 1.607$ ;  $SE= .512$ ).

**DISCUSSION**

Based on the post hoc test through the least significant difference in factors of types of universities, we found a distinction in the language politeness of students from state universities and private universities. The difference can be found in students from state and Islamic state universities ( $MD= 1.607$ ;  $SE= .512$ ).

Table 7. Post-Hoct Test of Provinces Factor

Provinces			Mean Difference	SE	P <sub>tukey</sub>
Language politeness	South Sulawesi	West Sulawesi	1.347	.474	.013**
		Central Sulawesi	.064	.513	.991
	West Sulawesi	Central Sulawesi	-1.282	.621	.098

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

Based on research findings, we found that tribe influences students’ language politeness. It is

Table 8. Post-Hoct Test of Types of Universities

Types of universities			Mean Difference	SE	P <sub>tukey</sub>
Language politeness	State University	Islamic State University	1.607	.512	.009**
		Private University	.926	.970	.775
		Islamic Private University	.278	1.173	.995
	Islamic State University	Private University	-0.681	1.058	.918
		Islamic Private University	-1.329	1.247	.710
	Islamic Private University	Private University	-0.648	1.494	.973

Note. \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001

because every culture has a different attitudes and mindsets thus, there is a difference in direct and



indirect communication (Kusumo & Jatmika, 2020; L. B. Sembiring, 2020; Wahyuni, 2018). Besides that, the intensity of adding a comment on social media also shows a difference in language politeness. It is because the more often the students wrote a comment on social media, the higher their willingness to act impolitely. It is because the the Z gen perceives social media as the media which offers the freedom to communicate without considering politeness rules (de Sousa Mata et al., 2019; Hidayati & Darmuki, 2021; Wahyuni, 2018b).

Based on the post hoc test, there was a significant difference in the language politeness of Bugis and Toraja, Makassar and Toraja, and Toraja and Sunda, who lived in Sulawesi. Bugis and Makassar tribes had a more striking difference compared to Toraja, both in terms of culture and religion, although tribes Bugis, Makassar, and Toraja lived in the same province. As a consequence, a significant cross-cultural variety will emerge in terms of the speech act of each community (Al-Zumor, 2011a). The cultural difference will also bring varieties in communication (Spencer-Oatey, 2008). It also confirms the significant difference found between Toraja and Sunda. The possible reason is that both tribes have a different religions, cultures, and island origins. Various dimensions of differences significantly contribute to the communication differences between both tribes (Kramersch, 2014; Ting-Toomey & Dorjee, 2018). The study is also in line with (Chang & Haugh, 2011) that there is a significant difference in the impoliteness evaluation of people from different cultural backgrounds.

Post-Hoc Test on data about social media influences shows that language politeness is influenced by the intensity of sending a comment on social media. The study (Julia, Kurnia, & Sudin, 2018a) showed that communication through social media motivates someone to communicate with anyone. However, the study of people aged 19-24 also showed that the increase in motivation to communicate reduces the politeness level indicated by poor ethics or impoliteness in communicating (Julia, Kurnia, & Sudin, 2018b). One of the reasons is the absence of gatekeeper as the filter of comments in social media (Gamble & Gamble, 2020). Another factor leading to such a condition is the *online disinhibition effect*, which stimulates someone to act (comment) expressively and tends to be uncontrol (Lapidot-Lefler & Barak, 2012; Suler, 2004). The *Dishinhibition effect* is triggered by various factors (Cheung, Wong, & Chan, 2016; Sinring, Aryani, & Umar, 2022), but the anonymity in using social media (Wu, Lin, & Shih, 2017) and the limitation of eye contact (Lapidot-Lefler & Barak, 2012), are dominant factors contributing on the emergence of *disinhibition effect*.

Administratively, Indonesia has some provinces and regencies. Generally, Indonesian societies are known to be careful facing their communication partner. In communicating, the context of areas and motivation influence how and what people talk (F. Aryani, Bakhtiar, & Umar, 2020; Douglas, Sutton, & McGarty, 2007). Besides that, in terms of language politeness, variety and diversity exist in every community (Al-Zumor, 2011b). is because politeness is a cultural phenomenon of linguistic act and action in the forms of social practice (Kdar & Haugh, 2013). Thus, factors of place, situation, and background of the speaker can influence language politeness (Yahsyia, 2020).

Results of the Post Hoc test on the types of universities indicate a significant difference in language politeness of students in state and Islamic state universities. When interacting with the lecturer, students will show their language politeness through diction in naming themselves, the use of the pronoun, and the use of titles (Saleh & Baharman, 2016). However, students in the state university and Islamic state university showed a significant difference. It is because of the different characteristics of each university that contributed to the significance of the language politeness in both universities. (Cahyani & Rokhman, 2017), Stated that language politeness is influenced by five factors, namely a place, condition, actors, goals, theme of the talk, and medium of talk. Students in Islamic state universities can learn Islam more than in general state university. Such situational factor also causes language differences (Mislikhah, 2020). A study carried out by (Gunawan, 2013) on students in the Islamic Institute of Kendari also showed that students on the Islamic state campus

tend to use declarative and interrogative sentences more dominantly than imperative sentences as a form of language politeness.

### **Implications**

This research methodically provides implications for the study of culture at large through language politeness in generation Z. Seeing cultural, religious and social media factors has an indirect impact on teachers, parents, counselors, and experts to put forward a model of learning social politeness towards generation Z in terms of behavior and the impact it will have. Of course, related parties need collaborative efforts in providing assistance and preserving positive culture towards generations in their respective regions.

### **Limitation and Strengths**

Methodologically, this study has a weakness that provides a view of the results that is still not broad in terms of the classification of the research sample, considering that we have not touched on areas that have diverse cultures, religions and social media usage and have the potential to add information to the broader research results. Random cluster sampling the risk of under- or over-representation of each cluster, which can lead to bias. Samples tend to have characteristics similar to other clusters. However, we must present basic results across several samples to provide a basis for assumptions. This is related to the strengths of this research, which is one of the novelties that examines multifactors on the language politeness of Indonesian Generation Z.

### **CONCLUSION**

Politeness in the language is an essential thing for generation Z. However. There are problems found related to something that affects politeness in language behavior in gene Z. Therefore, the researcher aims to determine the dominant and pre-dominant factors that influence politeness in language gen Z. Results Research reveals that there are four factors that influence language politeness, including the province of residence, the type of college, the intensity of writing comments on social media, and ethnicity. Thus, the dominant factors of language politeness are cultural, religious, and social media. However, for generation Z, politeness is not only self-identity in social life but also an image of the virtual world.

### **AKNOWLEDGMENT**

We would like to express our deepest thanks to the Directorate of Research and Community Service in Indonesia (DRPTM), Institute for Research and Community Service (LP2M) Makassar State University, which has supported this research by providing full funding.

### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT**

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

### **REFERENCES**

- Agustina, L. (2020). Pola Komunikasi Remaja Generasi Z Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Voxpop*, 2(2), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.24176/perseptual.v5i2.5168>
- Al-Zumor, A. W. Q. G. (2011). Apologies In Arabic And English: An Inter-Language And Cross-Cultural Study. *Journal Of King Saud University-Languages And Translation*, 23(1), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksult.2010.02.001>
- Algiovan, N. (2022). Politeness Strategies Used By Lecturers And Students In Thesis Guidance Through Virtual Communications. *The Journal Of English Literacy Education: The Teaching And Learning*

- Of English As A Foreign Language*, 9(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.36706/jele.v9i1.17437>
- Alief, K., & Nashruddin, N. (2022). Application Of Language Politeness In Learning Activities At School. *Jelita*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.56185/jelita.v3i1.93>
- Anwar, M., Murtadho, F., Boeriswati, E., Yarmi, G., & Rosa, H. T. (2021). The Analysis Model Of Impolite Indonesian Language Use. *Linguistics And Culture Review*, 5(S3), 1426–1441. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1840>
- Anwar, T. M. (2019). Phenomenology Of Communication Of Generation Z In Pekanbaru. *Komunikator*, 11(1), 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jkm.111015>
- Aryani, F., Bakhtiar, M. I., & Umar, N. F. (2020). The Implementation Of Blended Learning Methods To Improve Student Self-Regulation At University. *International Journal Of Innovation, Creativity And Change*, 13(2). [Google Scholar](#)
- Aryani, F., & Umar, N. (2020). Factors Affecting Z Generation On Selecting Majors In The University: An Indonesian Case. *Journal Of Social Studies Education Research*, 11(3), 109–133. [Google Scholar](#)
- Aryanis, F., Utami, S., & Kusmiyati, K. (2022). Kesantunan Berbahasa Di Lingkungan Stai Nurul Hidayat Selatpanjang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Fonema: Jurnal Edukasi Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(2), 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.25139/fn.v5i2.4982>
- Asteka, P., Suwandi, S., & St Y, S. (2021). *Sosiolinguistik Berwawasan Kearifan Lokal*. Perkumpulan Rumah Cemerlang Indonesia. [Google Scholar](#)
- Ayeni, B. (2021). Language Choices And Its Effect In A Culturally Diversified Nigeria Business Places: Adopting Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory. *International Journal Of Applied Linguistics And English Literature*, 10(1), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.10n.1p.80>
- Babel, F., Vogt, A., Hock, P., Kraus, J., Angerer, F., Seufert, T., & Baumann, M. (2022). Step Aside! Vr-Based Evaluation Of Adaptive Robot Conflict Resolution Strategies For Domestic Service Robots. *International Journal Of Social Robotics*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-021-00858-7>
- Bacha, M. S., Rustum, R., Umer, M., & Khan, K. A. (2021). The Pragmatic Concept Of Politeness And Face Work By Different Linguistic Scholars. *Multicultural Education*, 7(1). [Google Scholar](#)
- Bejtkovský, J. (2016). The Employees Of Baby Boomers Generation, Generation X, Generation Y And Generation Z In Selected Czech Corporations As Conceivers Of Development And Competitiveness In Their Corporation. *Journal Of Competitiveness*. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.04.07>
- Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G., & Juhász, T. (2016). Y And Z Generations At Workplaces. *Journal Of Competitiveness*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.03.06>
- Berliningrum, C. (2022). *Pemakaian Ragam Bahasa Indonesia, Alih Kode, Dan Campur Kode Bahasa Dalam Berkomunikasi Di Lingkungan Universitas Indraprasta Jakarta (Kajian Fungsiolek Bahasa)*. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. [Google Scholar](#)
- Bouckenooghe, D. (2012). The Role Of Organizational Politics, Contextual Resources, And Formal Communication On Change Recipients' Commitment To Change: A Multilevel Study. *European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology*, 21(4), 575–602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2011.591573>
- Cahyani, D. N., & Rokhman, F. (2017). Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa Dalam Berinteraksi Di Lingkungan Universitas Tidar: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v6i1.14763>
- Chandra, O. H. (2021). Politeness In The Use Of Language In Social Media. *E3s Web Of Conferences*, 317, 2027. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202131702027>
- Chang, W.-L. M., & Haugh, M. (2011). *Evaluations Of Im/Politeness Of An Intercultural Apology*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2011.019>

- Chatzoglou, P., Chatzoudes, D., Ioakeimidou, D., & Tokoutsis, A. (2020). Generation Z: Factors Affecting The Use Of Social Networking Sites (Snss). *2020 15th International Workshop On Semantic And Social Media Adaptation And Personalization (Sma)*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMAP49528.2020.9248473>
- Chejnová, P. (2015). *How To Ask A Professor: Politeness In Czech Academic Culture*. Charles University In Prague, Karolinum Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.1544745>
- Cheung, C. M. K., Wong, R. Y. M., & Chan, T. K. H. (2016). *Online Disinhibition: Conceptualization, Measurement, And Relation To Aggressive Behaviors*. [Google Scholar](#)
- Cho, Y. Y., & Jo, J. (2022). Linguistic Politeness In Korean. *The Routledge Handbook Of Asian Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003090205-23>
- Chocarro, R., Cortiñas, M., & Marcos-Matás, G. (2021). Teachers' Attitudes Towards Chatbots In Education: A Technology Acceptance Model Approach Considering The Effect Of Social Language, Bot Proactiveness, And Users' Characteristics. *Educational Studies*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2020.1850426>
- De Sousa Mata, Á. N., De Azevedo, K. P. M., Braga, L. P., De Medeiros, G. C. B. S., De Oliveira Segundo, V. H., Bezerra, I. N. M., Pimenta, I. D. S. F., Nicolás, I. M., & Piuvezam, G. (2019). Training Programs In Communication Skills To Improve Self-Efficacy For Health Personnel: Protocol For A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. *Medicine*, 98(33). <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000016697>
- Dolot, A. (2018). The Characteristics Of Generation Z. *E-Mentor. Czasopismo Naukowe Szkoły Głównej Handlowej W Warszawie*, 2 (74), 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.15219/em74.1351>
- Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., & McGarty, C. (2007). Strategic Language Use In Interpersonal And Intergroup Communication. In *Stereotype Dynamics* (Pp. 196–219). Psychology Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Dragomir, G.-M., Fărcașiu, M. A., & Șimon, S. (2021). Students' Perceptions Of Verbal And Non-Verbal Communication Behaviors During And After The Covid-19 Pandemic. *Applied Sciences*, 11(18), 8282. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app11188282>
- Eelen, G. (2014). *A Critique Of Politeness Theory: Volume 1*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315760179>
- Elisabeth, M. P., & Uthama, E. D. (2022). Restoration Of Trust In Toxic Relationships. *Budapest International Research And Critics Institute (Birci-Journal): Humanities And Social Sciences*, 5(2), 9402–9410. [Google Scholar](#)
- Erkinovna, Y. F. (2021). Politeness Markers In Spokenlanguage. *Euro-Asia Conferences*, 37–40. [Google Scholar](#)
- Erkinovna, Y. F. (2022). The Principle Of Politeness In The English And Uzbek Languages. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 6, 65–70. [Google Scholar](#)
- Fromm, J., & Read, A. (2018). *Marketing To Gen Z: The Rules For Reaching This Vast--And Very Different--Generation Of Influencers*. Amacom. [Google Scholar](#)
- Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here Comes Generation Z: Millennials As Managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 489–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.013>
- Gamble, T. K., & Gamble, M. W. (2020). *The Gender Communication Connection*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367822323>
- Gao, Q., & Chen, Y. (2021). Human Factors In Social Media. *Handbook Of Human Factors And Ergonomics*, 1143–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119636113.ch45>
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Sociolinguistic Factors In Code-Switching*. Na. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511576331.007>
- Goldsmith, D. J. (2008). Politeness Theory. *Engaging Theories In Interpersonal Communication:*

- Multiple Perspectives*, 255–267. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483329529.n19>
- Gould, D., Nalepa, J., & Mignano, M. (2020). Coaching Generation Z Athletes. *Journal Of Applied Sport Psychology*, 32(1), 104–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2019.1581856>
- Gulnoza, N. (2021). Principles Of Politeness. *Archive Of Conferences*, 17(1), 165–167.
- Gultom, M. A. B. R., & Rahmadini, N. F. (2022). *The Relation Of The Use Of Language In Social Media To Politeness Among Students*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/dq8wy>
- Gumartifa, A. (2022). Studies Of Sociolinguistics: Theory Of Politeness In English As Second Language. *Journey: Journal Of English Language And Pedagogy*, 5(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v5i1.1811>
- Gunawan, F. (2013). Wujud Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa Terhadap Dosen Di Stain Kendari: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 1(1), 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.1.1.8-18.2013>
- Hidayat, D., Rahmasari, G., & Wibawa, D. (2021). The Inhibition And Communication Approaches Of Local Languages Learning Among Millennials. *International Journal Of Language Education*, 5(3), 165–179. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i3.16506>
- Hidayat, T., & Agustin, R. (2019). Rancangan Strategi Pendidikan Berbahasa Santun Dalam Pembelajaran Berbicara. *Literasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia Dan Daerah*, 9(2), 61–66. <https://doi.org/10.23969/literasi.v9i1.1778>
- Hidayati, N. A., & Darmuki, A. (2021). Penerapan Model Auditory Intellectually Repetition (Air) Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berbicara Pada Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Educatio Fkip Unma*, 7(1), 252–259. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v7i1.959>
- Holik, I., & Sanda, I. D. (2020). The Possibilities Of Improving Communication Skills In The Training Of Engineering Students. *Int. J. Eng. Pedagog.*, 10(5), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v10i5.13727>
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, Men And Politeness*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315845722>
- Hübscher, I., Garufi, M., & Prieto, P. (2019). The Development Of Polite Stance In Preschoolers: How Prosody, Gesture, And Body Cues Pave The Way. *Journal Of Child Language*, 46(5), 825–862. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000126>
- Iksan, Z. H., Zakaria, E., Meerah, T. S. M., Osman, K., Lian, D. K. C., Mahmud, S. N. D., & Krish, P. (2012). Communication Skills Among University Students. *Procedia-Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 59, 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.247>
- Iorgulescu, M.-C. (2016). Generation Z And Its Perception Of Work. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 18(1). [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=...)
- Jia, M., & Yang, G. (2021). Emancipating Chinese (Im) Politeness Research: Looking Back And Looking Forward. *Lingua*, 251, 103028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.103028>
- Johnson, R., Leighton, L., & Caldwell, C. (2018). The Embodied Experience Of Microaggressions: Implications For Clinical Practice. *Journal Of Multicultural Counseling And Development*, 46(3), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12099>
- Julia, J., Kurnia, D., & Sudin, A. (2018). The Impact Of Social Media On Communication Politeness: A Survey Of Prospective Primary School Teacher Students. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 5(3), 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.53400/mimbar-sd.v5i3.14492>
- Kapoor, C., & Solomon, N. (2011). Understanding And Managing Generational Differences In The Workplace. *Worldwide Hospitality And Tourism Themes*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17554211111162435>
- Kasim, A., & Zaman, H. K. (2021). Social Media Analysis On Malay Political Parties In Malaysia: Study On The Issues And Comments Facebook. *International Journal Of Law, Government And Communication*, 6(26), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.35631/IJLGC.626011>
- Kdar, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382717>

- Khan, A., & Khan, R. (2012). Understanding And Managing Workplace Bullying. *Industrial And Commercial Training*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851211202911>
- Kramsch, C. (2014). Language And Culture. *Aila Review*, 27(1), 30–55. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.02kra>
- Kusumo, P., & Jatmika, D. (2020). Adiksi Internet Dan Keterampilan Komunikasi Interpersonal Pada Remaja. *Psibernetika*, 13(1), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.30813/Psibernetika.V13i1.2312>
- Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects Of Anonymity, Invisibility, And Lack Of Eye-Contact On Toxic Online Disinhibition. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 28(2), 434–443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.014>
- Lee, J., & Lee, K. M. (2022). Polite Speech Strategies And Their Impact On Drivers' Trust In Autonomous Vehicles. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 127, 107015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.107015>
- Mahyuddin, N., & Rozimela, Y. (2019). Polite Language Learning Model Through Interactive Learning Cds At Bukittinggi Kindergarten. *1st International Conference On Innovation In Education (Icoie 2018)*, 636–640. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoie-18.2019.133>
- Mansoor, I. K. (2018). Politeness: Linguistic Study. *International Journal Of Research In Social Sciences And Humanities*, 8(4), 167–179. [Google Scholar](#)
- Mantasiah, R., Yusri, M., & Umar, N. F. (2019). The Development Of The Instrument Of Politeness In The Language Used By Teachers In The Learning Process. *1st International Conference On Advanced Multidisciplinary Research (Icamr 2018)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icamr-18.2019.67>
- Mantasiah R, M. R., Hasmawati, H., & Umar, F. (2020). The Influence Of Teacher's Language Impoliteness In Triggering Students' Bullying Behavior. *Journal Of Educational Science And Technology*, 6(3), 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.26858/est.v1i1.13944>
- Mardiana, D., Rokhman, F., Rustono, R., & Mardikantoro, H. B. (2021). Penguasaan Retorik Interpersonal Sebagai Strategi Kompetensi Komunikatif Guru Kelas Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Di Pendidikan Abad 21. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana (Prosnampas)*, 4(1), 348–354. <https://doi.org/10.33084/tunas.v6i2.2519>
- Mccartney, M. L., & Rick, H. A. (2021). The Adult Student/Consumer Model: Micro-Credentials As A Solution For Adult Learners. In *Ensuring Adult And Non-Traditional Learners' Success With Technology, Design, And Structure* (Pp. 244–261). Igi Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-6762-3.ch015>
- Meret, C., Fioravanti, S., Iannotta, M., & Gatti, M. (2018). The Digital Employee Experience: Discovering Generation Z. *Digital Technology And Organizational Change*, 241–256. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62051-0\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62051-0_20)
- Mesch, G. S. (2012). Technology And Youth. *New Directions For Youth Development*, 2012(135), 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20032>
- Mezote, A. (2011). Development Of Cross-Cultural Communication Skills Of Engineering Students. *10th International Scientific Conference Engineering For Rural Development, Proceedings*, 10, 508–528. [Google Scholar](#)
- Mislikhah, S. (2020). Kesantunan Berbahasa. *Ar-Raniry, International Journal Of Islamic Studies*, 1(2), 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.20859/jar.v1i2.18>
- Mojo, J. K., Tulung, G. J., Kalangi, L. M. V., & Imbang, D. (2021). Positive Politeness Strategies Of Tonado Javaness (Jaton) Community. *Linguistics And Culture Review*, 5(S1), 1100–1109. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1493>
- Mugford, G. (2011). That's Not Very Polite! Discursive Struggle And Situated Politeness In The Mexican English Language Classroom. *Situated Politeness*, 53–72. [Google Scholar](#)

- Munsch, A. (2021). Millennial And Generation Z Digital Marketing Communication And Advertising Effectiveness: A Qualitative Exploration. *Journal Of Global Scholars Of Marketing Science*, 31(1), 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2020.1808812>
- Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials In The Workplace: A Communication Perspective On Millennials' Organizational Relationships And Performance. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 25(2), 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7>
- Nashruddin, N., & Al-Obaydi, L. H. (2021). Linguistics Politeness In Reinforcing Character During Learning Activities. *Ethical Lingua: Journal Of Language Teaching And Literature*, 8(1), 210–217. [Google Scholar](#)
- Nwogbaga, D. M. E., Nwankwo, O. U., & Onwa, D. O. (2015). Avoiding School Management Conflicts And Crisis Through Formal Communication. *Journal Of Education And Practice*, 6(4), 33–36. [Google Scholar](#)
- Ong, C. H. (2022). Understanding Purchase Intention Of Electric Vehicles (Ev) Among Gen-Z Users In China. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Business, Humanities, & Education*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4060480>
- Pandang, A., Umar, N. F., Hajati, K., & Hamidi, B. (2022). Gender Disparities In Students' Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (Ese) With Various Areas. *Education Research International*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9479758>
- Pandit, V. (2015). *We Are Generation Z: How Identity, Attitudes, And Perspectives Are Shaping Our Future*. Brownbooks. Orm. [Google Scholar](#)
- Pohan, S., & Lbs, M. A. H. (2022). Use Of Anonymous Social Media Accounts As Self-Disclosure Media For Generation Z On Postmodernism. *Bricolage: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi*, 8(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.30813/bricolage.v8i2.3351>
- Rothwell, J. D., & Waters, M. (2022). *It's All Of Our Business: Communicating Competently In The Workplace*. Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Saleh, M., & Baharman, B. (2016). Wujud Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa Dalam Wacana Akademik. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Insani*, 19(1), 42–46. [Google Scholar](#)
- Schroth, H. (2019). Are You Ready For Gen Z In The Workplace? *California Management Review*, 61(3), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006>
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z Goes To College*. John Wiley & Sons. [Google Scholar](#)
- Sembiring, E. M. B. (2022). *Kesantunan Berbahasa Dosen Dalam Berinteraksi Di Kelas Tatap Muka*. Pascal Books. [Google Scholar](#)
- Sembiring, L. B. (2020). *Deskripsi Keterampilan Komunikasi Interpersonal Mahasiswa Bimbingan Dan Konseling Universitas Negeri Malang*. Universitas Negeri Malang. [Google Scholar](#)
- Senowarsito, S. (2013). Politeness Strategies In Teacher-Student Interaction In An Efl Classroom Context. *Teflin Journal*, 24(1), 82–96. [Google Scholar](#)
- Sinring, A., Aryani, F., & Umar, N. F. (2022). Examining The Effect Of Self-Regulation And Psychological Capital On The Students' Academic Coping Strategies During The Covid-19 Pandemic. *International Journal Of Instruction*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15227a>
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally Speaking Second Edition: Culture, Communication And Politeness Theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing. [Google Scholar](#)
- Strawser, M. G., Smith, S. A., & Rubenking, B. (2021). *Multigenerational Communication In Organizations: Insights From The Workplace*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003150831>
- Suhanti, I. Y., Puspitasari, D. N., & Noorrizki, R. D. (2018). Keterampilan Komunikasi Interpersonal Mahasiswa Um. *Seminar Nasional Psikologi Klinis*, 37â, 39. [Google Scholar](#)
- Sujoko, A. (2021). Communication From An Ancient Javanese Perspective: Discovering The Cultural

- Values Conveyed In Serat Wedha Satya By Ranggawarsita. *Italienisch*, 11(2), 372–381. [Google Scholar](#)
- Suler, J. (2004). The Online Disinhibition Effect. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 7(3), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295>
- Susanti, R., Sumarlam, S., Djatmika, D., & Rohmadi, M. (2016). Retorika Interpersonal Pragmatik Dalam Tindak Tutur Direktif Antara Dosen Dan Mahasiswa Dalam Kegiatan Akademik (Studi Kasus Di Politeknik Indonusa Surakarta). *Prosiding Prasasti*, 620–624. <https://doi.org/10.20961/pras.v0i0.1628>
- Suutala, L. (2021). *Esl Politeness: Finnish Exchange Students' Experiences On The Politeness Used In English*. [Google Scholar](#)
- Syafrizal, S., & Putri, F. S. (2020). A Linguistic Politeness: An Analysis Of Gender Differences In Speaking Classroom. *English Education: Journal Of English Teaching And Research*, 5(2), 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i2.14436>
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Dorjee, T. (2018). *Communicating Across Cultures*. Guilford Publications.
- Toder-Alon, A., Brunel, F. F., & Fournier, S. (2014). Word-Of-Mouth Rhetorics In Social Media Talk. *Journal Of Marketing Communications*, 20(1–2), 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2013.797756>
- Togans, L. J., Holtgraves, T., Kwon, G., & Zelaya, T. E. M. (2021). Digitally Saving Face: An Experimental Investigation Of Cross-Cultural Differences In The Use Of Emoticons And Emoji. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 186, 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.09.016>
- Tsoumou, J. M. (2021). A Brief Review Of Expressive Speech Acts And Their Correlations With (Im) Politeness In Covid-19 Era. *Academia Letters*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.20935/AL1715>
- Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology And Social Interest. *The Journal Of Individual Psychology*, 71(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2015.0021>
- Wahyuni, A. (2018). The Power Of Verbal And Nonverbal Communication In Learning. *The 1st International Conference On Intellectuals' Global Responsibility (Icigr 2017)*. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icigr-17.2018.19>
- Watts, R. J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K. (2005). *Politeness In Language*. Mouton De Gruyter Berlin. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199819>
- Wu, S., Lin, T.-C., & Shih, J.-F. (2017). Examining The Antecedents Of Online Disinhibition. *Information Technology & People*, 30(1), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-07-2015-0167>
- Xafizovna, R. N. (2021). The Category Of Politeness In Different Linguocultural Traditions. *Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(2), 1667–1675. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2021.00566.8>
- Yahsya, A. (2020). Politeness Used By Islamic Education Department Administration Staff Of State Islamic University North Sumatra. Postgraduate School Of The State University Of Medan. *Journal Of English Education And Linguistics*, 1(1), 143–159. <https://doi.org/10.56874/jeel.v1i1.139>
- Zharkynbekova, S., & Aimoldina, A. (2022). The Impact Of Socio-Cultural Context On Composing Business Letters In Modern Kazakhstani Business Community: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Journal Of Intercultural Communication Research*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2022.2124304>
- Zhu, J., & Bao, Y. (2010). The Pragmatic Comparison Of Chinese And Western" Politeness" In Cross-Cultural Communication. *Journal Of Language Teaching & Research*, 1(6). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.6.848-851>
- Zhuhra, R. T., Wahid, M. H., & Mustika, R. (2022). Exploring College Adjustment In First-Year Gen Z Medical Students And Its Contributing Factors. *The Malaysian Journal Of Medical Sciences:*



Pandang, A., Umar, N. F., Mantasiah, M., Arifyadi, A., & Amirullah, M.– Factors Influencing the Language...

*Mjms*, 29(1), 126. <https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2021.29.1.12>