

Discurso digital de professores: troca de conhecimento e impolidez implicada

Teachers' digital discourse: knowledge exchange and implicated impoliteness

Isabela Soares de Almeida Dias



isabeladias.ufmg@gmail.com

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil.

Fernanda Rodrigues Marçal



fernandarmarcal@gmail.com

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil.

Abstract

This study examines English teachers' digital discourse in online knowledge exchange platforms, focusing on aspects of epistemic authority and implicated impoliteness. Through analysis of texts in two blogs offering proficiency exam preparation tips, the study investigates how teachers' linguistic choices may inadvertently convey impoliteness while attempting to engage learners. The research identifies four key expressions of potential impoliteness: conversational discourse markers, typographic emphasis, authoritative stance indicators, and humorous remarks. These strategies, while aimed at creating an engaging and relatable tone, can sometimes be perceived as patronizing or aggressive. The investigation argues that teachers' presumed epistemic authority may lead to deviations from conversational maxims, resulting in implicated impoliteness. This research contributes to understanding how digital discourse in educational contexts can both facilitate and hinder effective knowledge exchange, highlighting the need for careful consideration of language use in online teaching environments.

Keywords: Knowledge Exchange; Implicated Impoliteness; Teachers' Digital Discourse.

Resumo

Este estudo examina o discurso digital de professores de inglês em plataformas online de troca de conhecimento, focando em aspectos de autoridade epistêmica e impolidez implicada. Através da análise de textos contidos em dois blogs que oferecem dicas de preparação para exames de proficiência, o estudo investiga como as escolhas linguísticas dos professores podem inadvertidamente comunicar impolidez enquanto tentam envolver os aprendizes. A pesquisa identifica quatro expressões-chave de potencial impolidez: marcadores discursivos conversacionais, ênfase tipográfica, indicadores de postura autoritária e observações humorísticas. Estas estratégias, embora visem criar



10.23925/2318-7115.2025v46i1e71049



FLUXO DA SUBMISSÃO:

Submissão do trabalho: 01/04/2025

Aprovação do trabalho: 02/06/2025

Publicação do trabalho: 27/06/2025

AVALIADO POR:

Solange Aranha (Unesp)

Miriam Sester Retorta (UTFPR)

EDITADO POR:

Luciana Kool Modesto-Sarra (PUC-SP)

COMO CITAR:

DIAS, I. S. de A. .; MARÇAL, F. R. . Discurso digital de professores: troca de conhecimento e impolidez implicada . **The Especialist**, [S. l.], v. 46, n. 1, p. 771-788, 2025. DOI: 10.23925/2318-7115.2025v46i1e71049. Disponível em: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/esp/article/view/71049>.

Distribuído sob Licença Creative Commons



um tom informal e acessível, podem por vezes ser percebidas como condescendentes ou agressivas. A investigação argumenta que a presumida autoridade epistêmica dos professores pode levar à não-observância das máximas conversacionais, resultando em impolidez implicada. Esta pesquisa contribui para a compreensão de como o discurso digital em contextos educativos pode tanto facilitar como dificultar a troca eficaz de conhecimento, demonstrando a necessidade de diligência no uso da linguagem em ambientes de ensino online.

Palavras-chave: Troca de Conhecimento; Impolidez Implicada; Discurso Digital de Professores.

1. Introduction

As In recent years, the internet has evolved into a comprehensive repository of knowledge and a vital platform for educational purposes, particularly language learning. Several reputable websites offer valuable resources for English language learners, with content primarily written by teachers. As digital engagement increases, there is a need to better understand the discourse used by English teachers on these platforms, especially concerning knowledge exchange.

In digital knowledge exchange settings, the effective sharing of information requires a specialized set of language skills that cater to the unique demands of the medium. Unlike traditional face-to-face interactions, the asynchronous nature of digital communication presents specific challenges, as immediate exchanges, body language, and cues such as tone and intonation are absent. These characteristics make it essential for teachers to navigate digital platforms adeptly, ensuring that their language is effective even without the aid of non-verbal cues.

It is assumed that the social component of digital interactions significantly influences the linguistic choices made by teachers using blogs as a medium to disseminate knowledge. These teachers are believed to possess a higher level of epistemic authority (Heritage, 2012), owing to their professional background, which may encourage deviations from conversational maxims, especially the maxim of manner (Grice, 1975), which stresses clarity and straightforwardness. These deviations can result in perceived impoliteness (Culpeper, 2010, 2011) in their communication.

As teachers adopt a more relaxed or playful tone, their position as authorities may embolden them to prioritize engagement over adherence to conventional communicative teaching practices. However, this approach can also lead to misunderstandings or discomfort among learners, potentially undermining the effectiveness of the knowledge exchange process.

Therefore, this article aims to examine teachers' digital discourse with the purpose of knowledge exchange. The specific objective is to answer:

1. How is impoliteness manifested in teachers' discourse in digital knowledge exchange settings?

This study analyzes the language used by teachers in two blogs dedicated to sharing learning strategies, rather than direct language lessons. The selected blogs, "CAE Exam Tips"¹ and "FCE Exam Tips"², offer practical learning strategies, tips, and suggestions for students preparing for language proficiency exams. By focusing on these texts, the article explores the distinctive features of teachers' digital language in blogs, contributing to a deeper understanding of how digital discourse facilitates or hinders effective knowledge exchange.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Blogs

Blogs are a form of online publishing used for communication and expression (Puschmann, 2013), becoming increasingly popular since their appearance in the late 1990s. Generally, blogs are seen as a genre of text production (Heyd, 2017). Heyd (2017) views blogging primarily as a social media practice influenced by textual components. Puschmann (2013) identifies common elements in blog posts, such as short paragraphs, sentence fragments, interjections, deictic expressions, and a first-person perspective. Additionally, blogs frequently employ strategies to engage and address readers, enhancing involvement. Heyd (2017) further suggests that blogs can be characterized by the semiotic resources they use, not just written text. The inherently multimodal nature of blogging is crucial for this article.

Scott (2022) asserts that certain elements within written texts effectively guide readers toward the intended meaning of an utterance. This is illustrated through typographic changes, such as varying typefaces that simulate intonational shifts, and the use of capitalization to convey specific stances. Such typographic choices can also emphasize emotional tone or suggest heightened vocal intensity, such as shouting.

¹ <https://www.caeexamtips.com/>, Access in 24 October, 2024

² <https://www.fceexamtips.com/>, Access in 24 October, 2024

Puschmann (2013) discusses the dynamics of blogs as a medium for face work from the author's perspective. He notes that the potential for face-threatening acts (FTAs) is limited due to the relative distance between bloggers and their audience. In the context of their own posts, bloggers maintain a degree of control, while readers retain the choice of whether to access the blog's content. However, this dynamic does not entirely eliminate the potential for readers to feel dissatisfied with the content. Even in blogs, linguistic choices can be perceived as impolite, underscoring the significance of language in digital discourse.

Conversely, this article contends that, despite the limited interaction between blog authors and their readers, there remains a potential for readers to take offense or feel dissatisfaction with the content presented within blogs. While it is acknowledged that the degree of safety differs due to the absence of direct conflict, it is important to recognize that the constrained nature of interaction does not preclude the possibility of linguistic choices being perceived as impolite. The nuances of language used in blog posts can still elicit negative responses from readers, highlighting the significance of linguistic and multimodal choices in digital discourse.

2.2. Impoliteness

Culpeper (2011) defines impoliteness as a negative attitude towards specific behaviors occurring in specific contexts. These behaviors are perceived as impolite when they conflict with social expectations. This definition encompasses multiple aspects of impoliteness, such as context, intentionality, expectations, and emotional consequences.

Culpeper (2011) has also theorized formulae of conventionalized impoliteness and categories of non-conventionalized impoliteness. For this study, the major focus is on non-conventionalized impoliteness, as in the setting of knowledge exchange blogs, it is unlikely that there will be instances of insults, threats or negative expressives. However, there are possibly expressions of implicated impoliteness, which may come in the make of Form-driven, which refers to implicit messages which are triggered by formal surface or semantic aspects of a behaviour and which have negative consequences for certain individuals; or Convention-Driven, in which interpretations triggered through mismatching are more implicit and involve more inferencing

than ones triggered through matching, as targets must spend cognitive effort in resolving internal or external mismatches (Culpeper, 2011).

Power dynamics are another critical aspect of impoliteness. Culpeper (1996) posits that individuals in positions of greater power have more freedom to be impolite. This notion aligns with Locher's (2004) perspective on power, which frames the relationship as asymmetric. In online blogs, teachers hold a more privileged position, asserting their knowledge to learners with lower epistemic authority (Heritage & Raymond, 2015).

Heritage (2012) defines epistemic authority as a relative and relational concept that pertains to access within a particular domain, involving two or more individuals simultaneously. This concept is especially relevant in blog communication, where an individual seeking information typically holds a lower epistemic status compared to the knowledgeable author, who has shared content with information (Cunha, 2023; Heritage, 2002, 2012; Heritage; Raymond, 2005; Oliveira, 2025; Oliveira; Cunha, 2024).

Oliveira (2025) defends that epistemic authority plays an important role in digital interactions. It refers to the recognized right or entitlement of a speaker to hold knowledge within a specific domain. This authority stems from their expertise, experience, or social position and affects the dynamics of interactions as well as the exchange of information among individuals (Oliveira, 2025). In the setting of the knowledge exchange blog, the author is an English teacher, who presumably possesses a higher epistemic status because of their language proficiency and learning strategies knowledge, an attribute that has been socially given to them.

2.2.1. Entertaining Impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness refers to the performative use of impolite language to amuse an audience, often by provoking emotional reactions. As Culpeper (2011) argues, its appeal is not new, as it mirrors the historical fascination with conflict-based entertainment, from Roman gladiator games to modern contact sports.

Entertaining impoliteness in digital contexts, such as social media and online forums, has important social and cultural implications, especially given that blog readers and authors often do not know each other personally. Anonymity and physical distance reduce accountability, which can encourage exaggerated or more extreme expressions of impoliteness. This distancing often

shifts the focus from interpersonal impact to public performance, where provoking reactions and gaining visibility may take precedence.

Culpeper (2011) outlines five sources of pleasure that help explain the appeal of impoliteness as entertainment: emotional stimulation, the aesthetic appreciation of verbal creativity, voyeuristic enjoyment from watching others' reactions, a sense of superiority over others, and the comfort of not being the target oneself. These factors illustrate how impoliteness, when framed for entertainment, can thrive in digital environments that reward visibility while shielding users from direct consequences.

3. Methodology

The selection of the "CAE Exam Tips" and "FCE Exam Tips" blogs was based on their asynchronous, open access, and advisory nature. These blogs serve as platforms for learners preparing for Cambridge proficiency exams, offering a variety of articles, strategic recommendations, and guidance on exam preparation.

Two text sections from each blog were randomly selected, and the screen captures from the web pages were compiled into a document, later transformed into a pdf file. The sections deal with writing and speaking tips for learners preparing for the FCE Exam (Cambridge B2) and listening and speaking tips for the CAE Exam (Cambridge C1) candidates. The web pages hyperlinks have also been saved for further consultation.

Subsequently, the selected texts were analyzed to identify expressions of potential impoliteness in teachers' discourse. Four main forms of expression were identified: conversational discourse markers, typographic emphasis for pragmatic effect, authoritative stance indicators, and humorous remarks.

After the categorization of the examples based on these forms, five examples from each form were selected for a qualitative analysis. These were numbered from 1 to 20. The four main forms of expression, which are used for pragmatic effects, are detailed and exemplified in section 4 (Data Analysis).

3.1. Data Availability Statement

As previously mentioned, the data used for this article was taken from open access sources. By compiling blog articles that are freely available on the web, we ensure that data can be easily accessed by other researchers. This approach promotes verification and validation of the findings by others in the scientific community, adhering to the principles of transparency and replicability.

Access to the blogs is provided through hyperlinks in the Introduction section, and the footnote hyperlinks³ allows access to the randomly selected texts for analysis. By sharing the source of data, we support the continuous enhancement of scientific knowledge. There are no sensitive, ethical, or legal considerations restricting this data, as it is available openly. This commitment to transparency not only enables the research process but also strengthens the reliability and applicability of our study's conclusions.

In addition, it is important to highlight that, since the content of the blogs is publicly accessible without the need for registration, there is no requirement to formally obtain the authors' consent for the blog texts to be analyzed in this study. According to Townsend and Wallace (2016), frameworks regarding internet research cannot be prescriptive, as ethical standards in this type of investigation are dynamic and constantly evolving. The authors argue that each digital context is unique, presenting distinct characteristics and ethical challenges. Among these, the risk of harm is the most important factor to be considered. In this research, we strongly believe that this risk is minimal, given that the blogs are publicly available and their authors likely intend to reach a broad audience.

Similarly, in the widely recognized document on ethical decision-making for internet research, from the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR), Markham and Buchanan (2012) assert that harm is defined contextually, and that ethical principles should be developed inductively rather than universally. This study does not aim to be prescriptive or judgmental but rather to describe how implicated impoliteness is manifested in teachers' discourse, a focus that significantly reduces any potential risk of harm.

4. Data Analysis

³ [Writing — FCE Exam Tips](#) / [Speaking Part 1 — FCE Exam Tips](#) / [CAE Speaking Test Tips - Guaranteed to Improve Your Exam Score](#) / [CAE Listening Test Tips - Guaranteed to Improve Your Exam Score](#)
Accessed in November, 2024

This section presents a qualitative analysis of the four randomly selected texts from "FCE Exam Tips" and "CAE Exam Tips". The titles of the texts are:

- *Writing — FCE Exam Tips*
- *Speaking Part 1 — FCE Exam Tips*
- *CAE Speaking Test Tips - Guaranteed to Improve Your Exam Score*
- *CAE Listening Test Tips - Guaranteed to Improve Your Exam Score*

They were analyzed to identify prevalent linguistic choices that may be interpreted as implicated expressions of impoliteness. Through careful examination, four main forms of discourse have been identified:

- Conversational discourse markers;
- Typographic emphasis;
- Authoritative stance indicators;
- Humorous remarks.

In the subsequent analysis, five examples of each of these forms will be presented, delving into how they function within the texts and their potential implications for discourse. The underlined emphases, highlighted in grey, were added by the authors, to better signal the expressions.

4.1. Conversational Discourse Markers

Table 1. Examples of Conversational discourse markers:

Example 1	The first keyword you should learn is the name of your own job. <u>Don't you think?!</u>
Example 2	<u>Get the idea?</u> As I said before, you're not learning whole speeches, just a few words you can use at the right time.
Example 3	<u>But listen! YOU have to</u> start using these new words. That means saying them in conversations, writing them in emails, and being prepared to make some mistakes.

Example 4	<i>WRONG! You should turn your body slightly towards the other candidate. Look at them and listen to what they are saying. Nod, smile, be interested – the examiner will see this and feel more warmly towards you and more positively about your English.</i>
Example 5	<i>Crazy? Not really. There's a lot of research into body language, but you can see for yourself. Look at this photo. Who looks stressed, struggling to understand? Who looks confident and in control?</i>

Source: The authors - Data available at: <https://www.caeexamtips.com/> / <https://www.fceexamtips.com/> Access in 05 June, 2025

In general, the two selected blogs feature texts written by teachers who adopt a colloquial style intended to resemble informal conversation. Analyzing the first group of examples (Table 1) labeled as Conversational discourse markers, it is noticeable that the teachers employ expressions that encourage an approachable, relaxed, conversational atmosphere. Puschmann (2013) explains that these strategies, used to engage and address readers, as a commonality to the blog genre. In this particular case, it is believed that the teachers aimed to enhance involvement and create a more relatable interaction between teachers and learners.

Zappavigna (2012) posits that there is a type of digital discourse that intentionally aims to foster connection with the audience, and examples 1 to 5 illustrate this perspective. The author further argues that the use of the internet has recently shifted from being primarily a tool for sharing information to serving as an interpersonal resource for enacting relationships, while both functions remain closely interconnected. Examples 1 to 5 are instances of this phenomenon. Although the primary objective of the teachers is to inform and share knowledge, the interpersonal dimension is evident, as they actively seek to engage and connect with the learners.

Examples 1 through 5, may create a sense of proximity between the teachers and the learners, fostering an environment of casual interaction. It is a simulation of a face-to-face conversation, breaking down traditional barriers of formal written communication. Additionally, this strategy may serve affiliative purposes, as it positions the teacher as someone who seeks to connect with the audience on a more personal and conversational level. By inviting learners to mentally respond or agree, the teacher creates an impression of shared understanding and intellectual proximity.

The use of rhetorical questions in examples 1, 2 and 5, further invites the learner into a dialogic engagement with the text. This linguistic strategy functions not only to prompt reflection but also to simulate an interactive exchange, enhancing the sense of involvement between

teacher and learner. Pragmatically, such questions aim to make the educational content more accessible and relatable, potentially increasing engagement and improving retention of information.

However, this approach may also carry the risk of negative interpretations. For instance, in examples 1 and 2, the underlined phrases emphasize knowledge presumed to be obvious by the teacher, which can subtly convey a lack of patience and may be perceived as condescension. In such cases, the affiliative intent may be overshadowed by an unintended patronizing tone. These expressions may thus be perceived as face-threatening, especially if the reader feels positioned as lacking knowledge or common sense. This tension aligns with what Culpeper (1996) describes as "mock politeness," where the surface-level friendliness is undercut by implications that may offend or alienate the learner.

Therefore, while the conversational style can serve important pedagogical and relational functions, their interpretation is highly context-dependent and may fluctuate between affiliation and alienation. This analysis suggests that while conversational markers can enhance engagement, they also carry the risk of being misinterpreted in a way that could detract from the teachers' communicative goals.

In addition, different linguistic strategies can often overlap, reinforcing each other's pragmatic effect. Examples 3 and 4 are instances of conversational markers that are simultaneously emphasized typographically, through capitalization. This layering of strategies is a common feature of digital discourse, where visual cues are used to enhance or replicate prosodic features of speech. This specific approach is examined in more detail in the following section.

4.2. Typographic emphasis

Table 2. Examples of Typographic emphasis:

Example 6	<u>READ THE TASK AND DO EXACTLY WHAT IT SAYS</u>
Example 7	This is a conversation I have <u>ALL THE TIME</u> with new students: What is your job? Oh! How to say it in English?
Example 8	In FCE, you shouldn't speak like a robot. So <u>don't</u> write down answers to questions and memorise them. Instead, learn a few <u>keywords</u> and speak naturally, like you would in your own language.
Example 9	You <u>have to</u> write about pollution and the environment, and you have to include 3 points. 2 of those points <u>must be</u> transport and rivers and seas. If you don't include transport you <u>can't</u> get full marks in the exam. If you don't write about damage to the environment, you <u>can't</u> get full marks.
Example 10	So, the absolute number 1 most important lesson to learn about the speaking test is never leave dead air. If you forget a word, <u>keep talking</u> . If you realise you just made a big grammar mistake, <u>keep talking</u> . If no-one is smiling at you and you think you are doing badly – <u>KEEP TALKING!</u>

Source: The authors - Data available at: <https://www.caeexamtips.com/> / <https://www.fceexamtips.com/> Access in 05 June, 2025

Another common form of expression identified in the teachers' discourse is Typographic emphasis, used for pragmatic effect, as illustrated by examples 6 through 10 (Table 2), provided previously. In these instances, the teachers employ capitalization (Examples 6, 7, 10) and boldface text (Examples 8, 9, 10) to highlight specific points. Although capitalization may often be interpreted as shouting, Scott (2022) asserts that this is not always the case. The author posits that readers are required to pragmatically infer the rationale behind the use of capital letters, or any other typographic element for that matter, in the particular context of the text. The author adds that in order to get readers to successfully infer the intended meaning of an utterance, authors can make use of different styles of text presentation and typography (Scott, 2022).

According to Scott (2022), based on relevance theory, writers should avoid imposing unnecessary cognitive burdens on their readers. Therefore, when a writer does employ strategies such as capitalization, or italics and bold typeface, it becomes the reader's responsibility to extract additional meaning, which adds nuances to the written text.

Scott (2022) points out that it is often assumed that the absence of visual, social, and prosodic cues in digital environments reduces the effectiveness of online communication. However, technology and digital interfaces have developed to incorporate features that simulate these layers in written text. As seen in examples 6 to 10, the typographic emphasis conveys strong reinforcement, provides explicit instructions regarding expected actions, and even reveals a hint of the teachers' emotional involvement in their discourse.

Interestingly, instances of Typographic emphasis are found within the examples of Conversational discourse markers (Examples 3 and 4), Authoritative stance indicators (Examples 14 and 15), and Humorous remarks (Examples 19 and 20). This recurrence suggests that Typographic emphasis is a highly prevalent and versatile feature in the blog data, often used to reinforce tone, draw attention, or add expressive nuance across different communicative functions.

Although the content of the texts remains advisory in regard to exam preparation, the heightened typographic emphasis may be perceived as overly incisive, overshadowing the intended supportive nature of the content. The same principle applies to examples 11 to 15, where the authoritative stance used to advise contrasts with the usually supportive stance taken by teachers.

4.3. Authoritative stance indicators

Table 3. Examples of Authoritative stance indicators:

Example 11	<i>It's okay to give short answers here, but <u>I don't let my students say 'yes' or 'no'.</u> Your answer shouldn't be shorter than the question.</i>
Example 12	<i><u>You should definitely learn</u> some nice phrases about hobbies. For example, the phrase 'to be keen on' means 'to like'.</i>
Example 13	<i><u>You must learn</u> how to use these phrases if you want a good grade.</i>
Example 14	<i><u>DON'T BE</u> a robot</i>
Example 15	<i>2. WHY SHOULD I LISTEN TO YOU? <u>Because what I'm telling you is good advice (for free!) and it works.</u> We've helped more than 120,000 Advanced students get a better grade.</i>

Source: The authors - Data available at: <https://www.caeexamtips.com/> / <https://www.fceexamtips.com/> Access in 05 June, 2025

Examples 11 to 15, presented above (Table 3), demonstrate a clear authoritative stance adopted by the teachers, which is expressed through various linguistic strategies. This stance establishes a power dynamic where the teachers position themselves as the undisputed expert, reinforcing their epistemic status (Cunha, 2023; Heritage, 2002, 2012; Heritage; Raymond, 2005; Oliveira, 2025; Oliveira; Cunha, 2024).

The teachers provide students with advice, and this is transcribed through a variety of linguistic strategies that reinforce the authoritative tone of the message. These include the use of an adverb to intensify the firmness of the statement (Example 12); the use of the modal verb “must” (Example 13), which indicates obligation and leaves little room for negotiation; the imperative form (Example 14), presented in all capital letters, further amplifying the sense of urgency and making the directive seem non-negotiable; and finally, a justification of the teacher’s recommendation as being objectively beneficial to learners (Example 15).

Each of these elements individually conveys a strong stance, but collectively, they illustrate a style of giving advice that offers limited autonomy to learners. This kind of authoritative framing may be effective for certain learner profiles, particularly those who respond well to structure and directives, but it also carries the risk of being perceived as overly prescriptive or even authoritarian. In educational contexts that tend to promote learner agency, such discourse

strategies may conflict with the expectations of learners, potentially hindering rapport or reducing receptivity to the advice given.

The teacher seems to be positioning themselves as epistemically superior, probably due to their language proficiency, and experience as a teacher, while learners seeking information would hold lower epistemic status (Cunha, 2023; Heritage, 2002, 2012; Heritage; Raymond, 2005; Oliveira, 2025; Oliveira; Cunha, 2024). While this assertive may be intended to convey care or structure, and work well for some learning styles, the implicit power dynamic embedded in these statements opens space for negative interpretations, especially if the learner values a more dialogic and non-hierarchical form of instruction.

In Example 11, the phrase "I don't let my students" is particularly striking. The use of "let" implies that the teacher possesses the power to permit or forbid certain behaviors, positioning themselves as the regulators of acceptable conduct. This phrasing goes beyond the mere offering of advice or guidance, but it suggests that it is the teacher's prerogative to allow students to do something, reflecting a traditional teaching approach, in which teachers have the sole control and are the undisputed authorities. This reflects a paternalistic approach that might be perceived as overly controlling or infantilizing, particularly when directed toward adult learners, who are expected to be more autonomous and independent learners.

To contrast with the harshness of these suggestions, examples 16 to 20 are humorous remarks. The teachers make use of humor to create an affiliation with learners, which may possibly soften the directness of some of their advice.

4.4. Humorous remarks

Table 4. Examples of Humorous remarks:

Example 16	That means you need to study how to write in different ways. Spot the difference in tone in this [sic] extracts from letters: 1. Yo, John, <u>Guess what? I bunked off school and tramped up and down the beach all day. Great fun! I found some nearly-fresh muffins in a box, so that was lunch sorted. Free food! Niiiiiice.</u> 2. Dear Mr and Mrs Biggins <u>I regret to inform that we have taken the decision to suspend Jack from school for the next week. Not only did he fail to come to school today, but we received a call that <u>he had stolen a container of confectionery from a local business.</u></u>
Example 17	Then learn the jobs of your parents, husband/wife, best friend, etc.

	My mother's a retired teacher. My father's a clown trainer. My husband is a camel trainer.
Example 18	Public speaking is the number one fear in your country. (Death is number 2) We can help!
Example 19	Now use the buttons below to jump to the part you want to focus on, or click 'speaking' at the top of the page to load all the tips in one long, sexy page.
Example 20	The examiners don't want to hear a rehearsed speech. You are not President Obama <u>President Hillary Clinton</u> . You are not a politician or a newsreader. The point of the test is to see how well you would cope in a spontaneous real-life situation.

Source: The authors - Data available at: <https://www.caeexamtips.com/> / <https://www.fceexamtips.com/> Access in 05 June, 2025

Previously presented examples 16 to 20 (Table 4), illustrate the use of playful language intended to facilitate knowledge exchange through humor and casualness. In example 16, the teacher employs letters in the forms of jokes, clearly indicating that such informal tone is inappropriate for the exam task. Example 17 presents another instance where the teacher mentions a "clown trainer" and a "camel trainer." By referencing these unusual jobs in response to a typical exam question about careers, the teacher injects playfulness into the discussion. These are clearly embellished situations, and their unlikeliness may come across as amusing. These humorous attempts may serve a pedagogical purpose that informs what is the acceptable language in formal settings.

In example 18, the teacher highlights public speaking as "the number one fear in the country" using hyperbolic exaggeration. This statement functions to both capture attention and create a humorous perspective on a common anxiety, making the subject more relatable for students. Example 19 features the adjectives "long" and "sexy" to describe a page, an absurd pairing that creates a humorous effect, as pages cannot possess such qualities. Finally, in example 20, the teacher references public figures, President Obama and Hillary Clinton, striking through their names to imply they are not currently presidents. Together, these examples of playful language showcase the teachers' choices in employing humor to add a playful layer to instruction giving and knowledge exchange.

Examples 16 to 20 illustrate how teachers use humor not only to amuse but also to assert their voice and presence in blog texts, and could be interpreted, based on Culpeper's five sources of pleasure that elucidate the appeal of entertaining impoliteness, as instances of aesthetic appreciation of verbal creativity.

Examples 16, 17, 18 and 19 make use of deliberate ludicrous phrasing to evoke aesthetic pleasure through their creative unexpectedness. This clever manipulation of language and form demonstrates a performative layer that goes beyond information delivery, because it can entertain, provoke, and position the teacher as both knowledgeable and amusing.

These examples of aesthetic pleasure in the form of linguistic creativity, reflect the playful wittiness of the teachers. In using this approach, the teachers not only foster engagement but also subtly reaffirm their authority. Entertaining impoliteness functions here as a pedagogical and affiliative strategy, enhancing the learning experience while reinforcing hierarchical, but also, making learning potentially entertaining.

4.5. Analytical Summary

The qualitative analysis of the blog texts has revealed recurring linguistic patterns that could potentially be interpreted as expressions of impoliteness. Through the examination of the language used by teachers to exchange knowledge, four frequent forms have appeared: conversational discourse markers, typographic emphasis, authoritative stance indicators, and humorous remarks. This finding displays how teachers' intent to engage and instruct using linguistic strategies for pragmatic effects, can potentially be seen as negative by learners.

While these linguistic choices aim to create an approachable and dynamic learning environment, they simultaneously risk alienating or patronizing the audience. This tension between engagement and potential offense highlights the importance of carefully considering linguistic choices in educational settings, particularly in digital spaces where tone and intent can be easily misconstrued. As we move towards our concluding remarks, it is crucial to consider the implications of these findings for both educators and learners in digital educational contexts, as well as the broader implications for impoliteness theory in digital communication.

Final Remarks

Based on the analysis of the texts in the blogs, illustrated by the presented examples, it can be concluded that there are indeed expressions of impoliteness present in teachers' digital discourse. This impoliteness is manifested primarily through implicated forms. Specifically, it appears in the use of conversational discourse markers, strong emphasis in the giving of advice and suggestions in an authoritative manner, as well as the incorporation of humor.

The teachers seem to employ these strategies of impoliteness to foster a playful environment, operating under the assumption that they hold a position of epistemic authority. This authoritative stance grants them relative power in the knowledge exchange process, presumably allowing them to employ straightforward unmitigated discourse. However, it is important to note that, within this context, learners have the option to disengage from the text and leave the blog if they perceive threats to their face. Such a choice indicates a shift in power dynamics, as learners may decide not to revisit the website.

These dynamics underscore the critical role that the teachers' linguistic choices play in shaping the learners' experience. It is essential for educators to strive for a balance between offering guidance and ensuring that their communication does not come across as face-threatening or inappropriate. Negotiating this balance is vital in facilitating effective knowledge exchange, as overly assertive or playful discourse can undermine the educational purpose and create barriers to engagement.

This study concludes that teachers' digital discourse in knowledge exchange settings can indeed express impoliteness, primarily through implicated forms such as conversational discourse markers, strong emphasis in advice, and humorous remarks. While these strategies may be employed to foster a playful, engaging environment, supported by the teacher's epistemic authority, they also risk undermining the effectiveness of the knowledge exchange.

Informações complementares:

a) Declaração de contribuição das autoras e dos autores:

Isabela foi responsável pelo planejamento da investigação, coleta de dados, análise dos dados preliminar e da redação da primeira versão do manuscrito. Com base nas observações e revisão de Fernanda, ajustes foram feitos no texto submetido para análise. Fernanda foi responsável pela revisão geral do texto e por contribuições adicionais em seções diversas.

b) Disponibilidade de dados de pesquisa e outros materiais:

Todos os dados necessários para a reprodução das análises estão disponíveis no texto em forma de tabelas, e os links dos sites de onde os dados foram retirados são fornecidos em notas de rodapé. Quatro postagens dos dois blogs em questão (duas de cada) foram registradas por meio de capturas de tela e convertidas em um arquivo PDF, de modo que possam ser acessadas mesmo que os blogs saiam do ar. Os links também foram devidamente salvos. Posteriormente, os dados foram lidos e analisados com base nas teorias apresentadas no capítulo “Literature Review”.

c) Declaração de conflito de interesse:

Declaramos não haver conflitos de interesse.

d) Avaliação por pares:**✓ Avaliador 1:** Solange Aranha (correções obrigatórias)

A proposta de análise de blogs em áreas específicas em relação ao uso de polidez por parte de professores é relevante, atual e necessária em tempos de ensino online e plataformas digitais. A fundamentação teórica é bem específica e limitada, mas atende aos objetivos do artigo. Embora o material esteja disponível online e seja de livre acesso, creio que seja necessária uma consulta aos produtores dos blogs para que os autores estejam isentos em relação ao uso de dados. Sugiro que a pergunta de pesquisa que implica em resposta sim/não seja reformulada ou excluída porque inadequada academicamente e já implicada na segunda pergunta de pesquisa. Sugiro fortemente também que a análise dialogue com outros trabalhos e que os exemplos sejam separados e não apresentados em sequência, para que o leitor entenda cada um em relação com a teoria usada. As relações entre teoria e exemplos devem ser explicitadas pelos autores e não deixadas a cargo do leitor.

✓ Avaliador 2: Miriam Sester Retorta (correções obrigatórias)

Há problemas de língua indicados no corpo do texto. Os exemplos que o autor dá devem ser indicados onde vão aparecer no texto. No corpo do texto há comentários sobre essa sugestão.

Referências

CULPEPER, Jonathan. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. **Journal of Pragmatics**. 25. 349-367. 1996. Disponível

em: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0378216695000143?via%3Dihub> Acesso em 23.nov.2024.

CULPEPER, Jonathan. Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. **Journal of Pragmatics**. 42 (12). 3232-3245. 2010. Disponível

em: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378216610001694> Acesso em 25.nov.2024.

CULPEPER, Jonathan. **Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence** (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press. 2011.

CUNHA, Gustavo X. Relações de discurso, organização tópica e dimensão epistêmica: recursos para a análise da “episteme em ação”. In: TOMAZI, M. M. T. (org.). **Estudos do discurso e compromisso social**. Serra: Editora Milfontes, p. 321-343. 2023.

GRICE, Paul H. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), **Syntax and Semantics**, vol. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 41–58, 1975. 2004.

HERITAGE, John. Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. **Research on Language and Social Interaction**, 45(1), 1–29, 2012. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684> Acesso em: 15 dez.2024.

HERITAGE, John.; RAYMOND, Geoffrey. The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. **Social Psychology Quarterly**, 68(1), 15–38, 2005. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800103> Acesso em: 15 dez.2024.

HEYD, Theresa. Blogs. In C. Hoffman & W. Bubliss (Eds.), **Pragmatics of social media**. De Gruyter, 2017.

LOCHER, Miriam A. **Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreements in Oral Communication**. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2004.

MARKHAM, Annette; BUCHANAN, Elizabeth. Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee. **AoIR**, 2012. Disponível em: <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf> Acesso em: 03 jun. 2025.

OLIVEIRA, Ana Larissa A. M. Reciprocity and epistemicity on screen-based interactions: the case of MOOCs. **Pragmatics and Society**, 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/ps.23143.oli> Acesso em: 06 mar.2025.

OLIVEIRA, Ana Larissa A. M.; CUNHA, Gustavo X. (2024). Relações epistêmicas e impolidez linguística em comentários do twitter/x sobre um debate presidencial. **LINGUAGEM EM (DIS)CURSO (ONLINE)**, v. 24, p. 01-18.

PUSCHMANN, Cornelius. Blogging. In Susan Herring, Dieter Stein and Tuija Virtanen (eds.), **Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication**. Handbooks of Pragmatics 9, 83–108. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2013.

SCOTT, Kate. **Pragmatics online**. London: Routledge, 2022.

TOWNSEND, Laura; WALLACE, Claire. Social Media Research: A Guide to Ethics. **Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)**, UK, 2016. Disponível em: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_487729_smxx.pdf Acesso em: 03 jun. 2025.

ZAPPAVIGNA, Michele. **The Discourse of Twitter and Social Media**. London/New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2012.