

Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies of Individuals with Learning Disabilities on Facebook.

Ainun Arbaina Mohd Zin¹, Nor Azwahanum Nor Shaid^{1*}

¹ Faculty of Education, National University of Malaysia, Malaysia

Corresponding Author:

Nor Azwahanum Nor Shaid

Email: azwahanum@ukm.edu.my

Abstract

Politeness is central to sustaining constructive interaction in both offline and online communication. However, on social media platforms such as Facebook, where anonymity, immediacy, and algorithmic visibility often amplify conflict, impoliteness has become equally salient. While pragmatic studies of politeness and impoliteness in digital discourse are growing, research focusing on individuals with learning disabilities remains scarce. This group faces unique communicative challenges and is often stereotyped as lacking pragmatic competence, yet little empirical evidence documents how they use language in naturalistic online environments. This study addresses this gap by examining the politeness and impoliteness strategies employed by learning disabilities individuals in their Facebook posts. Guided by Leech's (1983) Politeness Maxims and Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness framework, a qualitative descriptive design was applied. Data were drawn from three learning disabilities participants' public Facebook posts over a three- to four-month period, supplemented by semi-structured interviews. Posts were coded to capture six politeness maxims and five impoliteness strategies, while frequency counts were used descriptively to indicate relative tendencies across participants. The findings reveal that politeness strategies dominated overall, with variations in maxim preference: one participant favored Sympathy and Modesty, another employed Tact and Approbation more often, while the third leaned toward Agreement. Although less frequent, impoliteness strategies were present, with sarcasm/mock politeness and negative impoliteness emerging as situational resources. Interview data confirmed that participants viewed politeness as essential for harmony, safety, and identity representation online. This study contributes to pragmatics, disability studies, and digital communication by demonstrating that learning disabilities participants are capable of strategic, context-sensitive language use on social media. It underscores the need for inclusive digital-literacy programs that explicitly address pragmatic norms to support safe and empowering online participation...

Keywords: : politeness, impoliteness, learning disabilities, Facebook, pragmatics, social media

Introduction

Language functions not only as a tool for exchanging information but also as a mirror of culture and a mechanism for regulating social relationships. In many societies, including Malaysia, the use of polite language reflects shared values, norms, and cultural identity. Awang Sariyan (2015) emphasized that linguistic politeness reflects Malay civilization, while Sapir (1921) earlier argued that language and thought are inseparable, positioning politeness as both a linguistic and cognitive phenomenon. Politeness enables speakers to avoid conflict, maintain solidarity, and enhance respect among interlocutors, whereas impoliteness disrupts harmony and undermines interpersonal trust.

The significance of politeness becomes even more pronounced in the digital era. Platforms such as Facebook encourage rapid, often unfiltered interaction, which amplifies both courteous and discourteous communication. Studies have shown that online spaces are fertile grounds for both positive socialization and hostile exchanges. Shaari and Kamaluddin (2019), for example, documented how impoliteness on Facebook can escalate conflict, particularly among Malaysian youth. At the same time, digital platforms can provide spaces for identity construction, empowerment, and community-building, where politeness functions as a resource for expressing solidarity and inclusion.

From a theoretical perspective, politeness and impoliteness have been examined through complementary frameworks. Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle introduced six maxims—Tact, Generosity, Modesty, Agreement, Sympathy, and Approbation—which describe strategies to minimize cost to others and maximize interpersonal harmony. Culpeper (1996), by contrast, outlined impoliteness strategies, including bald-on-record impoliteness,

positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm/mock politeness, and withholding politeness. Both frameworks provide a structured basis for understanding how politeness and impoliteness are enacted in communication, whether offline or online.

Despite extensive studies of these frameworks, research rarely addresses the linguistic practices of individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs). This population is often stereotyped as lacking pragmatic competence, leading to assumptions that they are less capable of managing social norms. Yet, empirical evidence remains limited. The neglect of ILDs in politeness research risks reinforcing deficit-based perspectives, overlooking their agency and creativity as communicators. As social media becomes integral to everyday life, ILDs actively use platforms like Facebook to interact with peers, share experiences, and construct identities. Their ability to employ politeness and negotiate impoliteness is therefore critical to their inclusion and participation in digital communities.

Previous studies related to politeness in Malaysia have largely focused on educational contexts. Husna Faredza et al. (2020), for instance, highlighted that politeness reflects the professional identity of pre-service teachers, who are expected to model courteous behavior in line with cultural and institutional expectations. Similarly, Nurul Ain and Zaitul Azma (2018) explored the pragmatic strategies of students in educational settings, stressing the value of politeness in sustaining academic and social relationships. However, far fewer studies have examined how individuals outside mainstream contexts—particularly ILDs—construct politeness and impoliteness in digital discourse. This underscores the importance of extending research into disability contexts to generate more inclusive perspectives on language use.

Literature Review

Theories of Politeness and Impoliteness

The study of politeness has long been central to pragmatics, with scholars seeking to explain how speakers minimize conflict and maintain harmonious interaction. Leech's (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics* introduced six maxims—Tact, Generosity, Modesty, Agreement, Sympathy, and Approbation—that frame politeness as a cooperative principle in language use. These maxims emphasize reducing self-benefit, elevating others, and creating positive relational effects. Leech's model has been particularly influential because it accounts for the pragmatic strategies used across different cultural and linguistic contexts, including Malay speech communities where respect and harmony are highly valued.

Complementing Leech's framework, Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed the theory of face and politeness strategies, distinguishing between positive politeness (enhancing solidarity) and negative politeness (preserving autonomy). Their model connects politeness directly to the universal human need to maintain "face." Lakoff (1975) and Fraser and Nolan (1981) likewise emphasized politeness as a system of conversational rules or contracts that ensure cooperative interaction.

In contrast, impoliteness has been theorized as the strategic use of language to attack or undermine face. Culpeper (1996) advanced the most widely cited model, categorizing impoliteness into five types: bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. His framework highlights how impoliteness, like politeness, is not random but systematically employed in interaction. Later research, such as Locher and Bousfield (2008), further argued that impoliteness should be studied in its own right rather than merely as a breakdown of politeness, stressing its role in conflict and power dynamics.

Together, these frameworks demonstrate that politeness and impoliteness are not fixed properties of language but dynamic strategies shaped by context, intention, and social norms. This dual perspective is critical for analyzing digital communication, where both solidarity and conflict are amplified by the features of social media. For individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs), these theories provide the foundation to examine how pragmatic strategies are mobilized in Facebook interactions—whether to foster inclusion or to assert individuality in the face of perceived exclusion.

Politeness in the Malaysian Context

In Malaysia, politeness in language is deeply embedded in cultural norms, particularly within the Malay speech community, where *kesantunan berbahasa* is regarded as both a social expectation and a marker of identity. Awang Sariyan (2015) emphasizes that politeness reflects the values of Malay civilization, positioning language as a

medium that embodies cultural refinement and social order. The practice of polite language is not merely optional but is tied to moral and cultural values that regulate everyday interaction.

Research on politeness in Malaysia often highlights its role in education and socialization. Husna Faredza, Nurul Ain, and Zaitul Azma (2020) note that pre-service teachers are expected to display linguistic politeness as part of their professional identity, modeling courteous behavior for students. Their findings show that *kesantunan* is closely linked with professionalism, demonstrating that politeness carries institutional as well as cultural significance. Similarly, Nurul Ain and Zaitul Azma (2018) observed how students employ politeness strategies in academic settings to maintain respect and strengthen peer relationships.

At the same time, studies have drawn attention to the rise of impoliteness in digital contexts. Shaari and Kamaluddin (2019) reported that impolite expressions are prevalent on Facebook among Malaysian youth, often escalating interpersonal tensions and leading to online conflict. Their research illustrates how the affordances of social media—anonymity, immediacy, and visibility—can weaken traditional constraints on linguistic behavior, allowing impoliteness to surface more openly than in face-to-face contexts.

These findings suggest that while politeness remains a valued cultural norm in Malaysia, the realities of digital communication complicate its practice. Facebook and other platforms expose users to a wider spectrum of pragmatic behavior, where *kesantunan* and *ketidaksantunan* coexist and are negotiated dynamically. For individuals with learning disabilities, who may already face communicative challenges, understanding how politeness norms operate in this environment is essential for meaningful participation and inclusion.

Politeness, Impoliteness, and Social Media

The rapid expansion of social media has transformed communication practices, offering new opportunities for interaction while simultaneously heightening the visibility of politeness and impoliteness strategies. Platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram encourage immediacy and informality, often reducing the filtering mechanisms present in face-to-face conversation. This shift allows users to express themselves more directly, but it also increases the likelihood of miscommunication, conflict, and the deliberate use of impoliteness.

International research has shown that politeness continues to function as a critical resource in online environments. Herring (2013), for example, argues that digital communication reproduces many of the same politeness strategies observed in spoken discourse, such as softening disagreement or reinforcing solidarity through agreement markers. However, the affordances of social media also enable impoliteness to flourish. Culpeper and Hardaker (2017) note that online platforms amplify face-threatening acts through features such as anonymity, rapid turn-taking, and persistent visibility of messages, which can intensify the impact of impolite language.

In Malaysia, studies reflect this global trend. Shaari and Kamaluddin (2019) documented how Facebook users often engage in direct criticism, sarcasm, and mock politeness, illustrating that impoliteness is not only present but can be a salient feature of digital interactions. Their findings resonate with the broader argument that online communication represents a discursive space where social norms are contested and negotiated.

At the same time, social media provides opportunities for positive identity work and inclusion. Politeness strategies, such as expressions of sympathy, agreement, and encouragement, are widely used to build supportive communities. Husna Faredza et al. (2020) point out that even in professional training contexts, digital platforms are used to model courteous interaction, reinforcing the importance of politeness in shaping professional and personal identities.

For individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs), social media can be both enabling and challenging. On the one hand, it offers an accessible space for self-expression and social connection. On the other, it exposes ILDs to the risks of misinterpreting politeness norms or being targeted by impoliteness. Investigating how ILDs themselves employ politeness and impoliteness strategies on Facebook is therefore crucial for understanding both their agency and the challenges they face in navigating digital discourse.

Research Gap and Rationale for the Study

Although the study of politeness and impoliteness has a long tradition in pragmatics, its application to individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) remains limited. Much of the existing scholarship has concentrated on mainstream populations, including students, teachers, and general social-media users (e.g., Husna Faredza et al., 2020; Shaari & Kamaluddin, 2019). These studies have provided valuable insights into how politeness norms are enacted in Malaysian educational and digital contexts, but they do not capture the communicative practices of

marginalized groups such as ILDs. This absence creates a research gap that risks perpetuating deficit-based assumptions and underrepresenting the pragmatic agency of ILDs.

Furthermore, while impoliteness in social media has been extensively documented, few studies have examined how politeness and impoliteness coexist and are strategically used by individuals with distinct cognitive profiles. For ILDs, who may experience communicative challenges yet actively participate in online spaces, social media represents both an opportunity and a potential site of vulnerability. Without empirical evidence of how ILDs use politeness and impoliteness in practice, educational and digital-literacy initiatives may fail to address their specific needs or to recognize their strengths as communicators.

This study therefore aims to fill these gaps by focusing explicitly on ILDs' online discourse. Two objectives guide the research:

To identify the frequency of politeness and impoliteness strategies used by individuals with learning disabilities on Facebook.

To explore the perceptions of individuals with learning disabilities regarding the concept and importance of politeness and impoliteness in Facebook communication.

By addressing these objectives, the study contributes to three domains. First, it enriches pragmatics by applying established theoretical frameworks—Leech's (1983) politeness maxims and Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies—to an underexplored communicative population. Second, it advances disability studies by documenting ILDs' pragmatic competence, countering stereotypes that portray them as socially inappropriate or deficient. Third, it informs practice by highlighting the importance of inclusive digital-literacy education that acknowledges ILDs' communicative strategies and supports their participation in digital communities.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design supported by frequency counts. The purpose was to analyze naturally occurring online discourse and to capture participants' perceptions of politeness and impoliteness. The qualitative approach was chosen to provide depth in describing how individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) use politeness and impoliteness strategies in authentic settings, while descriptive frequency counts offered a way to illustrate distribution patterns across strategies.

Participants

Three individuals with learning disabilities were purposively selected as participants. Selection criteria included: (i) being formally identified as having a learning disability, (ii) active use of Facebook during the data collection period, and (iii) willingness to grant access to their posts and participate in interviews. The participants were one woman with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and two men with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). For confidentiality, pseudonyms were used in all reporting.

Data Collection

Data were collected from participants' public Facebook posts over a three- to four-month period (October–December 2024, extended to January 2025 for one participant to balance activity levels). A total of 189 posts were retrieved: 54 posts from Participant 1, 69 from Participant 2, and 66 from Participant 3. Posts were exported and organized chronologically for coding. To supplement textual data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant, focusing on their perceptions of politeness and impoliteness, their intentions in posting, and their views on the importance of courteous language in online interactions.

Data Analysis

Posts were coded deductively using two established frameworks: Leech's (1983) six politeness maxims (Tact, Generosity, Modesty, Agreement, Sympathy, and Approbation) and Culpeper's (1996) five impoliteness strategies (bald-on-record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm/mock politeness, and withholding politeness). Coding was conducted manually and reviewed iteratively to ensure consistency. Frequency counts were compiled for each strategy to identify patterns across participants. Interview transcripts were analyzed thematically to triangulate quantitative observations and to capture participants' subjective perceptions of (im)politeness in Facebook communication.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical procedures were strictly followed to protect participants' dignity and privacy. Written consent was obtained prior to data collection, and participants agreed to grant access to their Facebook posts and to participate in interviews. Identifying information was anonymized, and pseudonyms were assigned in all analyses and reporting. The study adhered to ethical standards for research involving vulnerable populations, ensuring that participation was voluntary and that data were handled with strict confidentiality.

Findings

This section presents the results of the study in accordance with its two objectives: (i) to identify the frequency of politeness and impoliteness strategies used by individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) on Facebook, and (ii) to explore their perceptions regarding the concept and importance of politeness and impoliteness in online interaction. Data were obtained from content analysis of participants' Facebook posts and triangulated with semi-structured interviews. The analysis is descriptive in nature, with findings organized according to the two objectives of the study.

The study involved three ILD participants who were active Facebook users. Participant 1 (P1) was a female diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), while Participant 2 (P2) and Participant 3 (P3) were males diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Although their disabilities differed, all three participants actively engaged in Facebook communication, making them suitable subjects for examining how politeness and impoliteness strategies are enacted in social media contexts.

Frequency of Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies

The first research objective was to identify the frequency of politeness strategies employed by individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) on Facebook. The data, analyzed using Leech's (1983) six politeness maxims, revealed that politeness strategies were widely used across all three participants, though with distinct individual preferences.

Table 1 Frequency of Politeness Strategies Used by Participants

Politeness Maxim	P1 (n, %)	P2 (n, %)	P3 (n, %)
Tact	5 (13%)	19 (47%)	16 (40%)
Generosity	4 (29%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)
Modesty	8 (40%)	6 (30%)	6 (30%)
Agreement	5 (23%)	4 (18%)	13 (59%)
Sympathy	12 (39%)	8 (26%)	11 (35%)
Approbation	7 (25%)	13 (46%)	8 (29%)
Total	41 (27%)	58 (37%)	56 (36%)

The data demonstrate that politeness strategies were not only present but dominant in the discourse of all three participants (total n = 155). Participant 2 recorded the highest number of politeness instances (37%), followed by Participant 3 (36%) and Participant 1 (27%). Different maxims were prioritized by different participants. Participant 1 favored the *Sympathy* maxim (39%), often using empathetic expressions to show care for others, and the *Modesty* maxim (40%), where self-effacing language was evident. Participant 2 relied heavily on the *Tact* maxim (47%), minimizing impositions in his posts, and the *Approbation* maxim (46%), where he praised and highlighted others' positive qualities. Participant 3 most frequently employed the *Agreement* maxim (59%), showing a strong tendency to affirm and align with shared views, which reflects a consensus-oriented communication style.

Overall, the findings confirm that politeness was the dominant orientation for ILDs on Facebook, with each participant mobilizing different maxims to achieve interpersonal harmony. The variation in maxim preference underscores the individuality of pragmatic choices, showing that ILDs are not a homogeneous group but demonstrate diverse and context-sensitive strategies in digital discourse. In addition to politeness, participants

also employed a range of impoliteness strategies, as classified by Culpeper's (1996) framework. Although less frequent overall compared to politeness, these strategies were present in all participants' discourse and revealed individual differences in their pragmatic choices.

Table 2 Frequency of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Participants

Impoliteness Strategy	P1 (n, %)	P2 (n, %)	P3 (n, %)
Bald on Record	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Positive Impoliteness	4 (13%)	10 (33%)	16 (54%)
Negative Impoliteness	9 (45%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)
Sarcasm / Mock Politeness	3 (14%)	11 (50%)	8 (36%)
Withholding Politeness	3 (23%)	5 (39%)	5 (39%)
Total	21 (23%)	33 (36%)	38 (41%)

Altogether, 92 instances of impoliteness were identified. Participant 3 recorded the highest number of occurrences (41%), followed by Participant 2 (36%) and Participant 1 (23%). The distribution highlights that while politeness remained dominant in the overall dataset, impoliteness was strategically mobilized across contexts.

Participant 1 primarily employed *negative impoliteness* (45%), characterized by direct rejection, dismissiveness, or creating distance from the addressee. She also engaged in withholding politeness (23%), where expected supportive expressions were absent. Participant 2 displayed a preference for *sarcasm/mock politeness* (50%) and to a lesser extent *positive impoliteness* (33%), suggesting an orientation toward irony and humor as indirect strategies for expressing disagreement or criticism. Participant 3, in contrast, showed the greatest reliance on *positive impoliteness* (54%) and *bald-on-record impoliteness* (40%), often producing unmitigated, direct statements that lacked hedging or softening devices.

These findings indicate that impoliteness was not random or uncontrolled but rather contextually driven. For some participants, it functioned as a tool for asserting independence and individuality (P3), while for others, it served as a vehicle for irony, critique, or humor (P2). Although less frequent compared to politeness, impoliteness strategies demonstrate that ILDs possess a nuanced pragmatic repertoire that includes the ability to violate politeness norms for specific interpersonal or rhetorical purposes.

Perceptions of Politeness and Impoliteness

The second research objective was to explore how individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) perceive the concept and importance of politeness and impoliteness in Facebook communication. Semi-structured interviews revealed three overarching themes: (i) politeness as a social value, (ii) politeness as a strategy for self-presentation and safety, and (iii) impoliteness as a situational and purposeful resource.

Politeness as a social value.

All three participants emphasized that politeness is essential for maintaining harmony and ensuring positive interactions online. They associated polite language with respect, empathy, and care for others, describing it as a moral responsibility as well as a cultural expectation. For instance, Participant 1 explained that using kind words on Facebook "makes people feel supported," while Participant 2 noted that politeness prevents unnecessary arguments and sustains friendships. These views align with the broader cultural emphasis on *kesantunan berbahasa* as a marker of civility in Malaysian society.

Politeness as self-presentation and safety

Participants also perceived politeness as a means of shaping how they were seen by others. They expressed awareness that Facebook is a public platform where their posts reflect their identity. Participant 3, for example, noted that being polite online "shows who I am," linking linguistic choices to personal reputation. Additionally, politeness was described as a protective mechanism: it reduced the likelihood of conflict and created a safer communicative environment. This indicates that participants view politeness not only as an interpersonal courtesy but also as a pragmatic strategy for navigating potentially hostile digital spaces.

Impoliteness as situational and purposeful.

Although all participants valued politeness, they acknowledged that impoliteness occasionally served useful functions. Sarcasm, for instance, was described as a way to inject humor or to express disagreement indirectly without escalating conflict. Participant 2 explained that sarcasm allowed him to “make a point without sounding too serious.” Similarly, negative impoliteness was sometimes used to set boundaries or to convey frustration when politeness seemed ineffective. Importantly, participants did not interpret impoliteness as a wholesale rejection of social norms but as a context-dependent strategy.

Overall, the interviews confirm that ILDs recognize the importance of politeness as both a social and personal value. At the same time, they demonstrate awareness that impoliteness can have pragmatic functions, ranging from humor to self-defense. These perceptions highlight ILDs’ pragmatic competence and their ability to navigate the complexities of digital discourse with sensitivity to context, intention, and audience.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into how individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) employ and perceive politeness and impoliteness strategies in their Facebook communication. Overall, the results show that ILDs are pragmatically competent users of language, actively mobilizing strategies to maintain harmony while also deploying impoliteness for situational purposes. This challenges deficit-oriented assumptions and highlights their agency as communicators in digital spaces.

The frequency analysis demonstrated that politeness strategies were more common than impoliteness, with 155 politeness instances compared to 92 of impoliteness. This pattern is consistent with Leech’s (1983) view of politeness as a core principle of interaction and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) claim that speakers are motivated to protect social “face.” While politeness was the default orientation, the variation across participants underscores that ILDs are not a homogeneous group. Participant 1 frequently relied on Sympathy and Modesty, emphasizing empathy and humility; Participant 2 favored Tact and Approbation, minimizing imposition and praising others; while Participant 3 emphasized Agreement, reinforcing group solidarity. These findings resonate with Awang Sariyan’s (2015) argument that *kesantunan berbahasa* is central to Malaysian cultural identity and Husna Faredza et al.’s (2020) observation that politeness reflects professional and social identity in educational contexts.

Although less frequent, impoliteness strategies were not absent. Participant 2 made strategic use of sarcasm and mock politeness, often to express disagreement or inject humor, while Participant 3 used bald-on-record and positive impoliteness to convey directness and assertiveness. Participant 1 displayed instances of negative impoliteness, often in emotionally charged situations. Rather than indicating communicative deficits, these strategies reveal purposeful choices, in line with Culpeper’s (1996) model and Locher and Bousfield’s (2008) argument that impoliteness should be studied in its own right as a meaningful communicative resource.

The interview findings further reinforce this interpretation. Participants described politeness as a social value and moral responsibility, linking it to harmony, respect, and reputation on Facebook. They recognized its role in preventing conflict and creating a safe online environment, echoing Nurul Ain and Zaitul Azma’s (2018) observation that politeness is essential for sustaining social relationships. At the same time, they acknowledged that impoliteness could serve useful functions, such as humor, boundary-setting, or expressing frustration. Importantly, participants did not view politeness and impoliteness as mutually exclusive but as complementary strategies chosen according to context.

Together, these findings extend pragmatic theory into the underexplored domain of disability and digital discourse. They show that ILDs can deploy politeness to align with cultural and social expectations while also exercising impoliteness to assert individuality and agency. For disability studies, this provides evidence against deficit-based assumptions, highlighting the pragmatic competence of ILDs in navigating complex communicative environments. For practice, the study points to the need for inclusive digital-literacy education that recognizes ILDs’ communicative strengths and equips them with tools to manage both politeness and impoliteness in online interactions.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine how individuals with learning disabilities (ILDs) employ and perceive politeness and impoliteness strategies in Facebook communication. Each participant demonstrated individual preferences for particular maxims, showing that ILDs draw on diverse pragmatic resources rather than conforming to a single

pattern. At the same time, impoliteness strategies, though less frequent, were strategically used to serve functions such as humor, critique, or boundary-setting, highlighting the agency and adaptability of ILDs in online discourse. The interview data further underscored the value that ILDs place on politeness, which they associated with respect, safety, and identity construction in digital spaces. Their acknowledgment of the situational utility of impoliteness demonstrates a nuanced understanding of pragmatic choices, reflecting competence in navigating complex communicative contexts. These results extend the application of politeness and impoliteness theory to a marginalized population, challenging deficit-based perspectives and illustrating the communicative competence of ILDs in digital environments.

The study contributes theoretically by showing that politeness and impoliteness among ILDs are not merely reflections of impairment but evidence of pragmatic resourcefulness. It contributes practically by highlighting the importance of inclusive digital-literacy initiatives that support ILDs in managing linguistic norms online. Future research should expand the sample size and explore comparative analyses across disability groups to deepen understanding of pragmatic variation in digital discourse.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and under research grant GG-2024-037. The authors sincerely appreciate this support, which contributed to the successful completion of the study...

References

1. Awang Sariyan. (2015). *Bahasa Melayu, bahasa dunia*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367.
4. Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). *Implications of impoliteness research for online contexts*. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Z. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 561–587). Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Fraser, B., & Nolan, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, 93–109.
6. Husna Faredza, N., Nurul Ain, A., & Zaitul Azma, Z. (2020). Kesantunan bahasa guru pelatih sebagai cerminan profesionalisme. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Melayu*, 10(2), 45–57.
7. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.
8. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
9. 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). Mouton de Gruyter.
10. Nurul Ain, A., & Zaitul Azma, Z. (2018). Strategi kesantunan pelajar IPT dalam interaksi akademik. *Jurnal Bahasa*, 18(1), 65–84.
11. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. Harcourt, Brace & Company.
12. Shaari, A. S., & Kamaluddin, M. A. (2019). Ketidaksantunan berbahasa dalam interaksi di Facebook. *Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 35(1), 104–121...