INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIETY, CULTURE & LANGUAGE

Gen-Z, Politeness, and Their Perspectives: A Case Study in Ubud

I Wayan Budiarta[1], I Gusti Ngurah Adi Rajistha[1], Anak Agung Istri Manik Warmadewi[1]
[1]*Universitas Warmadewa, Indonesia*

Abstract Politeness is closely related to how language is used to maintain values and to mitigate conflict in social relationships. Politeness is a way, and at the same time, it can also be a norm. However, we believe that changes in technology, social needs, economy, and even politics could change how we see politeness. This study examined how Generation Z uses politeness in their communication, and aimed to draw the condition of Generation Z in seeing politeness based on their perspective. The data were collected over approximately 3 months. The data sources of this study were conversation recordings among Generation Z, the results of focus group discussions (FGDs), and the results of questionnaires collected from 191 respondents via Google Forms. The obtained data were validated through data triangulation, combining the results of questionnaires, FGDs, and observations. The study showed that Generation Z maintains their relationship by using politeness, protecting the values of the hearer. They believed abbreviations seem neutral, which cannot deliver a polite message, but they argued that emojis/stickers could help deliver politeness. On the other hand, they still commit to their culture as the source of politeness. They argued that they could keep politeness through education and daily practice. Most of them also saw politeness as the use of polite and non-rude words.

Keywords: *Balinese language, Culture, Ubud, Emojis, Gen-Z, Politeness perspectives*

***Corresponding Author:**
I Wayan Budiarta
iw.budiarta@warmadewa.ac.id

Received: August 2, 2025
Revised: October 11, 2025
Accepted: October 26, 2025
First Published: November 10, 2025

© 2026 Budiarta, Rajistha, and Warmadewi.
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

In maintaining relationships as social beings, communication is a fundamental thing that always develops in accordance with the progress of time and technology. However, technological developments sometimes limit the essence of this communication. Communication that is not only related to verbal language but also non-verbal, including expressions and intonation, gives an expressive impression to support the meaning/ information conveyed. Communication that consists of various elements that are basically expressions to convey intention, sometimes cannot be conveyed through technological media. This is caused by various factors in communication that are not limited to the use of language or writing, but also in how

https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2025.2072688.4214

the meaning is conveyed. Of course, this will also affect the use of spoken language by Generation Z, both in using English and Indonesian. Moreover, in a multilingual context, the choice of one language over another to maintain politeness is certainly based on a certain perception (Brown & Kim, 2025). In this case, politeness is a linguistic phenomenon that is interesting to study not only from the perspective of language and culture but also from the perspective of pragmalinguistics, which views politeness from the realization of linguistic elements in polite speech.

The fundamental thing that underlies this research is the erosion of the culture of politeness that is the character of the Indonesian nation. One example is the lack of respect for teachers. One of the causes is the erosion of social values and students' ethics towards teachers due to changing times (Qonitah, 2023). Furthermore, what is meant by politeness and impoliteness actually changes over time (Sifianou, 2024), and there is a paradox that shows politeness is something positive that unfortunately decreases into something negative due to insincerity and hypocrisy (Jucker, 2024). This is a challenge to determine whether the politeness conveyed actually shows something positive or is only to deceive the interlocutor. Moreover, speech that is technically considered impolite, which in certain contexts aims to strengthen social relationships, can give rise to different interpretations depending on the interlocutor involved. Research examining perceptions of politeness itself has been widely conducted. However, there are a few studies that have examined perceptions of politeness and confirmed that the use of indirect language can convey politeness. Yet it is important to note that politeness also requires intonation, word choice, and the cultural values of the speaker (Manaf, 2002). Previous research revealed that Generation Z pays less attention to politeness in language, which could be due to technological developments (Ningsih & Fatmawati, 2024). Thus, previous research provides little insight into linguistic politeness, so further research on Generation Z's perceptions of politeness is needed to find solutions that are more relevant to the conditions of Generation Z and technological developments.

Furthermore, the ever-evolving communication media might influence the use of polite language. Generational differences cannot be ignored when discussing politeness. This provides insight into how certain generations view politeness. Based on the phenomenon of politeness, technological developments, and these generational differences, this research examines how politeness is applied by Generation Z, the way politeness is used to fulfill the politeness maxim, and Generation Z's perspective regarding politeness. To answer the problem formulation, the problem-solving approach used is a qualitative approach by analyzing Generation Z communication. Another aspect that demonstrates the novelty of this research is the unique communication characteristics of Generation Z, which are influenced by technology and social media. Furthermore, local Balinese politeness values have the potential to interact and adapt to Generation Z's communication practices. The potential shift in politeness perceptions is certainly an interesting topic to explore in this research. This certainly provides a new perspective and contribution to the field of linguistics, particularly pragmatics.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Politeness

The politeness was explained by the three general rules: don't impose, give options, and make others feel good (Lakoff, 1973). The politeness principle was then developed to minimize impoliteness to the addressee (Leech, 1983). Politeness could be defined as a way in which someone interacts with others socially to keep harmony and to avoid conflict. Politeness discusses not only attitude but also communication strategy. The theory of politeness was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), focusing on the strategies of saving "face" and the concept of "face" as the core of this theory.

Research on politeness has been conducted repeatedly with varying results. The point of politeness research is that politeness can be formed through appropriate strategies (Leech, 2014). Research on the perception and evaluation of requests on social media in China and Japan shows a relationship between directness/indirectness and politeness/impoliteness (Ren & Fukushima, 2022). The phenomenon of self-abasement was also initially associated with the perspective of sincerity. However, this phenomenon has been re-examined and is a form of politeness, as in Chinese culture (Zhou, 2022). The use of polite language can also be found in socialization videos made by the police. These videos received a positive response from the public, so it is hoped that they can improve good relations between the police and the

community (Lowrey-Kinberg, 2019). Politeness is also highly considered for political purposes, such as the application of positive politeness by the admin of President Jokowi's official account, which creates a positive impression on his followers (Prayitno et al., 2019). The use of emoticons in weblog comments has also been stated to be a medium for politeness. In other words, the use of emoticons is one strategy for achieving polite language (Kavanagh, 2016). Another case of politeness analysis in request utterances was also conducted in Japanese, which tried to apply Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory to local concepts of request utterances (Gagné, 2010). In addition, politeness was also applied by students when communicating with chatbots, with a percentage of 33.8% in the form of on-record indirect strategies and off-record indirect requests (Rajistha & Claria, 2023).

The phenomenon of politeness is always paired with the phenomenon of impoliteness. For example, the use of offensive language directly indicates that the user tends to be offensive and causes offense to the people involved (Haugh et al., 2022). Furthermore, online public shaming (OPS) is a form of impoliteness in communication that can damage harmony and create a negative atmosphere (Blitvich, 2022). This then gives rise to the concept of 'e-mpoliteness' (Andersson, 2024). Research also shows that the interactional practices carried out by interlocutors when managing jealousy reflect that politeness is closely related to jealousy, interpersonal behavior, and (dis)harmony orientation (Zhao & Mao, 2021). Furthermore, research also shows that politeness and impoliteness can also be expressed by animated characters, which can certainly be used as a learning experience for children who watch them (Budiarta & Rajistha, 2018). The theory of politeness could be seen in two different ways: the pragmalinguistic politeness scale and the sociopragmatic politeness scale. Both scales of politeness help us understand how and why people choose to speak in that way. The pragmalinguistic politeness scale focuses on linguistic aspects, and someone with this competency knows how to choose the right words in the right situation. The sociopragmatic politeness scale discusses politeness related to norms in a society, group, or situation. This scale is sensitive to the context and is a bidirectional scale (Leech, 2014).

2.2. General Strategy of Politeness

Leech (2014) reformulates the maxims of politeness and formulates the General Strategy of Politeness (or GSP, see Table 1). To be polite, S (i.e., the speaker) expresses or implies a meaning that associates a favorable value with what pertains to O (i.e., the hearer) or associates an unfavorable value with what pertains to S.

Discussing politeness, Leech (2014) also proposed "pos-politeness" and "neg-politeness" to distinguish them from what Brown and Levinson (1987) understand by positive politeness and negative politeness. The "pos-politeness" involves positive purposes of placing a high value on the other person's qualities, and the "neg-politeness" means mitigating or lessening the degree to which S's goals are imposed on O. Leech (2014) also divided speech events by their illocutionary function into four categories. The categories are as follows:

1. Competitive: the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal, e.g., ordering, asking, demanding, and begging
2. Convivial: the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal, e.g., offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating.
3. Collaborative: the illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal, e.g., asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing.
4. Conflictive: the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal, e.g., threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding.

Table 1
Leech's Component Maxims of the General Strategy of Politeness

Maxims (expressed in an imperative mood)	Related pair of maxims	Label for this maxim	Typical speech event type(s)
(M1) give a high value to O's wants	Generosity, Tact	Generosity	Commissives

(M2) give a low value to S's wants		Tact	Directives
(M3) give a high value to O's qualities	Approbation, Modesty	Approbation	Compliments
(M4) give a low value to S's qualities		Modesty	Self-devaluation
(M5) give a high value to S's obligation to O	Obligation	Obligation (of S to O)	Apologizing, thanking
(M6) give a low value to O's obligation to S		Obligation (of O to S)	Responses to thanks and apologies
(M7) give a high value to O's opinions	Opinion	Agreement	Agreeing, disagreeing
(M8) give a low value to S's opinions		Opinion reticence	Giving opinions
(M9) give a high value to O's feelings	Feeling	Sympathy	Congratulating, commiserating
(M10) give a low value to S's feelings		Feeling reticence	Suppressing feelings

Source: General Strategy of Politeness (Leech, 2014)

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The population of this study was Generation Z in the Ubud tourist area, and the sample was determined using a purposive sampling technique. The total number of participants was 256 (Table 2). The criteria for research participants were Generation Z individuals aged 18-27, residing or actively interacting in the Ubud area, having experience interacting with tourists or people from different cultural backgrounds, and willing to participate in this study.

Table 2
Number of Participants

No.	Method	Number of participants
1.	FGD	6
2.	Observation	63
3.	Questionnaire	191

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Qualitative Instruments

FGD and observation were used to collect the data. The FGD was conducted to explore the Generation Z perspectives on politeness. It was used to guide the moderator in stimulating interaction and discussion among participants. The questions asked were about chatting and face-to-face interaction, abbreviations that are frequently used, markers of politeness, non-verbal factors considered as polite forms, the ways to give criticism or advice, the uses of emojis/stickers, using proper Balinese language, and the effective way to maintain traditional Balinese politeness.

A part of the data was obtained through observation (direct observation) to get a comprehensive and objective picture of the actual interactions and how language was used by the younger generation in everyday communication at the research location, namely in the Ubud area. The observations conducted were non-participant observations. One of the researchers acted as an outside observer, where he was not directly involved in the activities of the participants being observed. Observations were conducted

to obtain a picture of the language used by the younger generation, which was then viewed from the perspective of politeness strategies by Leech.

3.2.2. Quantitative Instrument

Data in the study were also collected through a questionnaire. This method was chosen because it is effective and efficient in collecting data from a large number of respondents. The questionnaire was created on Google Forms. It consisted of questions about the linguistic behavior of Generation Z (N = 4), the politeness perception of Generation Z (N = 4), and politeness in Ubud, Bali (N = 4). The questionnaire consisted of a series of structured questions with a Likert scale and some semi-structured questions to get respondents' perception about politeness (see Appendix 1).

An item analysis was conducted using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation to assess internal validity (item-total correlation), which examines whether each item is consistent with the total scale score. With 30 respondents (df = 28) and a significance level of 0.05, the critical r value was 0.361, based on the Pearson correlation table. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.701, indicating acceptable internal consistency for research purposes.

3.3. Procedure

This field research adopted qualitative and quantitative approaches (Creswell, 2009) to get data regarding the linguistic behavior and views of Generation Z towards politeness. This research was conducted in the Ubud Tourism Area, Bali, to identify and understand the politeness perceptions of Generation Z. Ubud was chosen because it is one of the unique tourism areas with a blend of traditional Balinese culture and quite strong global influences. The data were collected over approximately 3 months in Ubud, Bali. All research procedures were designed and implemented with the highest ethical principles in mind to protect the rights and well-being of all participants, including ethical approval, informed consent, and confidentiality.

The data collection methods used were FGD, observation, and a questionnaire. The FGD was conducted to explore Generation Z's collective perceptions of politeness, elicit diverse perspectives, identify differences of opinion among participants, and understand their views on the fusion of Balinese culture and global/digital influences. The observations were conducted to directly observe Generation Z's linguistic behavior in natural interaction situations. The settings were at residents' houses, schools, and cafes for about 2 months. The observations were conducted on everyday language use to see how they use language, maintain their values, and mitigate the conflict. The observations were conducted using a recording technique. Then, the recordings were transcribed.

The questionnaire was conducted to obtain insights regarding the linguistic behavior of Generation Z, their perception of politeness, and politeness in the context of Ubud. The data were validated through data triangulation, combining the results of FGD, observations, and the questionnaire. Data analysis was conducted using a distributional method in accordance with the research problem formulation, related to linguistic behavior, maxim fulfillment, and perceptions of politeness.

4. Results

Based on the research done, some important points are discussed in this section regarding how Generation Z fulfills the politeness maxims in their daily conversation, how politeness is used by Generation Z, and their perception of politeness. Some examples of utterances are provided to get a clearer overview of how they communicate. Moreover, some important perceptions regarding politeness are also discussed to get their viewpoints.

4.1. Politeness by Generation Z (Observation Data)

Based on the two different ways of seeing politeness (i.e., pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic), this study examines the daily conversations of Generation Z through observations. Some cases of conversations are quoted to show how they communicate with their colleagues. The following conversations give us perspectives on how they maintain the values and mitigate the conflict.

A: *oo hebat keto ya, bisa nah hebat keto bisa nah padahal cang ngabe bola*
Oooo, it's great, what a great movement!! Even though the ball is on my side
[Spoken with a tone that indicates amazement. The emphasis is on the word '*hebat*' (great), which is to indicate something surprising and awe-inspiring.]
B: *bihhh!!! umpan nyender soal e seeerr*
Bihhh!!! The passing is predictable.
[flat and calm tone]

In this dialogue, Person B is the speaker and Person A is the hearer. Person A opens with a strong expression of admiration: "Oooo, it's great, what a great movement!! Even though the ball is on my side." This remark exemplifies Leech's (2014) Approbation Maxim, which encourages speakers to maximize praise and minimize dispraise of others. By highlighting the skill of the player in positive terms, Person A promotes solidarity and creates a supportive atmosphere. The utterance also reflects a clear case of positive politeness, since it enhances the addressee's positive face by showing approval and enthusiasm, while simultaneously inviting shared enjoyment of the game. In this way, A's contribution maintains harmony and builds rapport through praise.

Person B, however, responds with a more critical stance: "Bihhh!!! The passing is predictable." This evaluation partially violates the Approbation Maxim, since it highlights a flaw rather than reinforcing A's praise. Nevertheless, B's utterance aligns with the Agreement Maxim, as it continues the discussion of the game without outright dismissing A's perspective. From a politeness perspective, B employs negative politeness by avoiding direct contradiction; instead of bluntly rejecting A's praise, B frames the critique in a neutral, observational way. The exclamatory style ("Bihhh!!!") further softens the disagreement by presenting it as emotional involvement rather than face-threatening opposition.

The overall interaction illustrates how speakers manage face needs through a balance of maxims and politeness strategies. While A strengthens solidarity by maximizing praise and expressing positive politeness, B introduces critical commentary while simultaneously mitigating its potential threat. B's response blends negative politeness—minimizing direct imposition on A—with a degree of positive politeness, since the comment still reflects engagement with the shared activity. This combination allows the conversation to maintain harmony, even as the evaluation shifts from admiration to critique. Thus, the dialogue demonstrates the dynamic interplay of Leech's (2014) politeness maxims in everyday talk, where praise and criticism coexist without disrupting social equilibrium. From the explanation above, it is very clear that the emphasis of the maxim is on elevating the quality of Person B.

A: *ya kal tenar e?*
He will be famous, won't he?
[flat tone, slight downward intonation]
B: *tergantung jani amen ada manajemen ne.. amen terus ye keto sing mekelo tenar*
It depends on this condition, yes, if there is a management. If he doesn't change, he won't be famous anymore.
[The volume of speech increased slightly, and the speaking speed was fast.]

In this dialogue, Person A is the speaker and Person B is the hearer. Person A raises a question with an element of admiration and expectation: "He will be famous, won't he?" This utterance reflects optimism and implicitly invokes the Approbation Maxim, as it emphasizes the positive potential of the person under discussion. By assuming fame as a likely outcome, Person B maximizes praise and minimizes dispraise, thereby protecting the positive face of the third party. At the same time, A's formulation as a question rather than a statement reflects a mild hedging device, which softens the imposition and respects the interlocutor's freedom to agree or disagree, resonating with negative politeness.

Person B responds with a more evaluative and conditional stance: "It depends on this condition, yes, if there is a management. If he doesn't change, he won't be famous anymore." B's reply introduces a degree of criticism, since it questions the certainty of fame and highlights the individual's need for improvement. In doing so, B partially violates the Approbation Maxim, as the response does not maximize praise but instead emphasizes limitations. However, B's utterance also demonstrates the Agreement Maxim, as it does not reject A's perspective entirely but reframes it within conditional terms.

From a politeness perspective, B employs negative politeness by avoiding outright contradiction; instead of bluntly denying A's optimism, B tempers it with a conditional explanation.

Overall, the interaction illustrates how Leech's (2014) politeness principles function dynamically to balance praise with constructive critique. A employs positive politeness through admiration and the projection of future success, strengthening solidarity and aligning with the hearer's likely expectations. B, meanwhile, blends negative politeness with subtle criticism, ensuring that the disagreement does not threaten A's face while also tempering exaggerated praise. In this way, the exchange demonstrates how speakers can uphold interpersonal harmony by combining maxims—particularly Approbation and Agreement—with both positive and negative politeness strategies. The result is a conversation that acknowledges potential while also introducing caution, maintaining equilibrium between encouragement and realism.

A: *Asane kene nok, "oooh kleng cang ada masalah nak Len harus nawang" keto asane dadine.*
"It feels like this, 'oooh damn, I have problems, people must know, that's how it feels."
[The volume of speech increased slightly, and the speaking speed was fast]
B: *Aeee, harus!! Nak len harus nawang*
"Yes…it's a must!! Other people have to know.
[The intonation rose slightly on the word '*Aeee*' (Yes), followed by a short, quiet laugh].

In this dialogue, A is the hearer and B is the speaker. Person A comments critically on another person's attitude, suggesting that the individual behaves as if every personal problem must be made public: "It feels like this, 'oooh damn, I have problems, people must know, that's how it feels.'" This utterance reflects a negative evaluation, which partially violates the Approbation Maxim, since it maximizes dispraise rather than praise. By mocking the tendency to expose private issues, Person A threatens the positive face of the absent third party. However, Person A frames the critique descriptively and indirectly ("it feels like this"), which softens the criticism and thus aligns with negative politeness, as it avoids confrontation with the subject being mocked.

Person B responds emphatically with agreement: "Yes… must!! Other people have to know." On the surface, this response appears to reinforce Person A's criticism by echoing the idea that the third party insists on exposing problems to others. This alignment reflects Leech's (2014) Agreement Maxim, as Person B minimizes disagreement and strengthens solidarity with Person A. At the same time, the repetition and emphatic tone serve as a form of positive politeness, since Person B builds common ground and humorously mirrors Person A's evaluation. Rather than softening the dispraise, Person B amplifies it through agreement, which reinforces the shared perspective between interlocutors.

Overall, the interaction demonstrates how agreement can function as both a politeness strategy and a vehicle for criticism. Person A initiates a face-threatening act toward the absent third party by mocking their behavior, but mitigates its severity through indirect phrasing (negative politeness). Person B, in turn, reinforces the criticism by maximizing agreement, which enhances interpersonal solidarity with Person A. In this way, the exchange highlights how Leech's (2014) maxims and politeness strategies interact dynamically: praise and sympathy toward the absent figure are minimized, while agreement and shared stance between the two persons are maximized, ensuring harmony within the conversational dyad despite the critical tone.

A: *Aja nok, update story to be aneh menurut rage, kenapa?*
Don't you think updating stories is kind of strange, in my opinion?
[Lowering intonation and speaking softly]
B: *Itulah fungsi Ig second sebenarnya, ehehehehe, fungsi IG second yang sebenarnya to*
That's actually the function of a second Instagram account, ehehehehe, that's the real function of a second Instagram account.
[Intonation rises when uttering *"Itulah fungsi Ig second sebenarnya"*, followed by laughing]

In this dialogue, Person A is the speaker and Person B is the hearer. Person A opens with a critical remark about the act of updating Instagram stories, saying that it seems "strange" from their perspective. This comment functions as a face-threatening act because it implicitly evaluates the behavior of others negatively. However, it mitigates the critical force by framing the statement as a personal opinion ("in my opinion"), which introduces a hedge that allows space for disagreement. This mitigation reflects negative politeness, as A reduces the imposition on the hearer's freedom to hold a different perspective and softens the bluntness of the critique.

Person B responds in a humorous and lighthearted manner: "That's actually the function of a second Instagram account, ehehehehe." This utterance illustrates the Agreement Maxim, since B avoids opposing A's critical stance directly and instead reframes it within a different perspective—that such behavior is precisely what second accounts are for. The laughter marker ("ehehehehe") enhances the sense of shared amusement, which is a clear example of positive politeness. By responding with humor and agreement, B maintains solidarity with A and shifts the tone from potential criticism to playful camaraderie. Thus, B's strategy both reduces potential conflict and reinforces interpersonal rapport.

Taken together, the exchange shows how Leech's (2014) politeness principles operate dynamically in casual conversation. Person A mitigates criticism with hedging, reflecting negative politeness, while Person B counters with humor and agreement, exemplifying positive politeness. These combined strategies demonstrate how speakers balance the need to express personal evaluations with the need to preserve social harmony. By drawing on the Approbation Maxim and the Agreement Maxim, the interaction sustains mutual understanding and avoids disharmony, showing the central role of politeness in negotiating potentially face-threatening topics in everyday discourse. The Agreement Maxim is the most dominant in this dialogue, as Person B reinforces Person A's view with humor, thereby maximizing agreement and maintaining harmony.

A: *eheee… bes keto jeleme e ci*
Eheee… that's just how that person is.
[It is begun by laughing, and intonation rises when uttering '*bes keto jeleme e ci'*]
B: *gagah nok, sing? Rage to heran ngae story to ci, gagah ci, kayak perlu… harus ji nak Len nawang masalah ci e*
Isn't it cool, right? I'm surprised she makes stories like that, really showing off, as if it's necessary… everyone must know her problems."
[The volume of speech increased slightly when uttering '*gagah nok, sing?'*]
A: *harus ji nak Len nawang ci, … Klee*
"Yes, everyone must know her, exactly."
[The volume of the voice increased, the intonation rose slightly.]

In this dialogue, A is the hearer and B is the speaker. Person A begins with the statement, "Eheee… that's just how that person is. This utterance reflects the Agreement Maxim, as Person A avoids confrontation or criticism and instead presents the third party's behavior as something natural and not surprising. By normalizing the action, Person A minimizes the potential for disharmony and demonstrates negative politeness, since the statement is indirect and non-imposing. This strategy reduces face-threatening acts and creates a neutral tone that prepares the ground for further discussion.

Person B, however, shifts the exchange toward open criticism by remarking, "Isn't it cool, right? I'm surprised she makes stories like that, really showing off, as if it's necessary… everyone must know her problems." This statement clearly violates the Approbation Maxim, because it emphasizes dispraise rather than praise. Nonetheless, the use of a rhetorical question ("Isn't it cool, right?") functions as a softener, making the criticism less harsh. Finally, Person A closes the exchange by affirming Person B's view: "Yes, everyone must know her, exactly." This reinforcement once again highlights the Agreement Maxim, as Person A aligns with Person B's criticism and strengthens solidarity.

Overall, the interaction shows how politeness strategies can be combined to balance criticism with harmony. Person A's reliance on indirect expression and agreement illustrates both negative politeness (avoiding bluntness) and positive politeness (building solidarity). Even though Person B introduces a violation of the Approbation Maxim, Person A cushions the potential face threat by consistently

maximizing agreement. Thus, the Agreement Maxim stands out as the most dominant principle in this dialogue, since both turns by Person A reinforce harmony and solidarity despite the presence of criticism.

4.2. Politeness Perception

4.2.1. FGD Data

Based on the results of the FGD conducted, Gen Z tends to prefer chatting over face-to-face interaction for several reasons. First, chatting is efficient, fast, and flexible. Second, Gen Z is able to check the text before sending it. Last, it is a common thing for Gen Z who think it is better to virtually connect with others. Moreover, chatting includes sending abbreviations to save time in typing a message. Then Gen Z usually uses abbreviations to make the communication efficient and easier. Some abbreviations used are abbreviations in English, such as OTW, BTW, BRB, IDK, and IDC, and the others are in the Indonesian language, such as wkwk and BRB (*baru bangun* 'just got up').

Gen Z agrees that politeness markers are delivered by employing the words '*mohon*' (please), '*silahkan*' (please), '*terima kasih*' (thank you), and '*maaf*' (sorry). In addition, Gen Z also stated that there is a non-verbal factor affecting the politeness, and it is the intonation. The intonation should be soft. If the communication is held online/chatting, it should be answered directly. Gen Z thinks that reading the text without replying is impolite. The politeness can also be described as the use of emojis/stickers.

In case of ways to give criticism or advice, Gen Z thinks that criticism or advice could be softened by expressing it in a relaxed way, easy language, or no illocutionary acts. Choosing the right place and time is also considered to be an effective way to express criticism or advice. In addition, intonation should be considered in this case.

An interesting result arises when Gen Z says that the Balinese language is not mastered by Gen Z. Most of them say they rarely use the proper Balinese language because of their lack of understanding of this language. Moreover, they use code mixing of Balinese and Indonesian languages in daily conversation because of the place they live. They are afraid of using proper Balinese language due to their limited vocabulary. They argue that using proper Balinese language in traditional village youth groups and temples is one of the ways to practice and improve the use of proper Balinese language.

4.2.2. Questionnaire Data

Based on the data obtained from the questionnaire, the intensity of using social media is the basic thing to explain in detail. Table 3 provides information regarding male and female perceptions to get a clear position on the tendency. Based on Table 3, about 1.05% respondents explained that they never use social media. This statement seems impossible because of the condition of the emerging technology and social relationships at Ubud, as one of the popular tourist destinations. The massive use of WhatsApp is an example explaining that everyone uses this platform to communicate. Based on that, one explanation that can be concluded is the lack of understanding of social media forms. In addition to the table, 49.21% respondents describe that they use social media very often, and about 42.41% respondents often use social media. If we conclude these two frequencies, we know that social media use is dominated by females rather than males.

Table 3
Intensity of Social Media Use

No.	Intensity of Social Media Use	Frequency				Sum	
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Never	1	0.52%	1	0.52%	2	1.05%
2	Rarely	3	1.57%	1	0.52%	4	2.09%
3	Sometimes	9	4.71%	1	0.52%	10	5.24%
4	Often	46	24.08%	35	18.32%	81	42.41%
5	Very Often	29	15.18%	65	34.03%	94	49.21%
	Total	**88**	**46.07%**	**103**	**53.93%**	**191**	**100.00%**

In the case of politeness, there is a habitual action in texting; it is using abbreviations. Some of the common cases usually found in this case are the use of the abbreviation of "*Om Swastyastu* (OSA)" and "*Om Santih Santih Santih Om* (OSSSO)". Based on this case, this research also provides a statement to get their perception on using abbreviations as a polite expression (see Table 4). The result shows that 58.64% respondents seem they have no idea about this; they decided to be neutral. This means abbreviations are not a polite or impolite way to use in texting. One of the possibilities of this case is that texting or chatting is a feature for sending short messages. On the other hand, 28.80% respondents said they agree and strongly agree on abbreviations as a form of polite expression. This tendency might indicate the viewpoints of Generation Z regarding politeness in social media. It can give us an assumption that in a few decades. The use of abbreviations will be normalized as a part of polite expression. However, there are 12.57% respondents expressing disagreement with using abbreviations as part of polite expression. Those numbers show that it is still impolite to use abbreviations in social media. This case might indicate that some people may get lost in meaning and context if abbreviations are used, and this is not a polite way.

Table 4
Use of Abbreviations

No.	Use of Abbreviations	Frequency				Sum	
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Strongly disagree	7	3.66%	4	2.09%	11	5.76%
2	Disagree	9	4.71%	4	2.09%	13	6.81%
3	Neutral	55	28.80%	57	29.84%	112	58.64%
4	Agree	9	4.71%	25	13.09%	34	17.80%
5	Strongly agree	8	4.19%	13	6.81%	21	10.99%
	Total	**88**	**46.07%**	**103**	**53.93%**	**191**	**100.00%**

If abbreviations are mostly seen as neutral by the respondents, the use of emojis or stickers seems to be part of expressing politeness (see Table 5). If we combine the number of respondents showing agreement, we get 51.31% respondents who agree and strongly agree on using emojis or stickers as a part that can help convey politeness; this number is dominated by females, which is about 30.89% of the total respondents. In this case, Generation Z sees that using emojis or stickers in texting could help them express their feeling and at the same time predict what others are feeling. This might be one of the closest reasons behind those numbers. Then, there is a great number of respondents neutral in the use of emojis or stickers to help convey politeness. It is about 42.41% respondents who seem to be neutral. Based on this number, we can know that 16.23% respondents who are neutral on the use of abbreviations changed their opinions. This results in the possibility that emojis or stickers have a greater possibility of being part of a politeness way than abbreviations. However, there is still a small number of respondents arguing against the use of emojis or stickers to convey politeness; it is about 6.28% respondents. This might be because both senders and receivers feel emojis or stickers as special features included in social media, but there is no relation or a must to use them to create polite expression. It is only a part of social media communication to be more expressive and not more polite. In short, this phenomenon could be a prediction that emojis or stickers would be used in a more frequent way to inform senders' feelings and predict receivers' feelings; then, in a few decades, this could be a must as a polite part in texting others.

Table 5
Using Emojis/Stickers Can Help Convey Politeness

No.	Using Emojis/ Stickers	Frequency				Sum	
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Strongly disagree	3	1.57%	2	1.05%	5	2.62%
2	Disagree	2	1.05%	5	2.62%	7	3.66%
3	Neutral	44	23.04%	37	19.37%	81	42.41%
4	Agree	27	14.14%	44	23.04%	71	37.17%
5	Strongly agree	12	6.28%	15	7.85%	27	14.14%
	Total	**88**	**46.07%**	**103**	**53.93%**	**191**	**100.00%**

We expressed some general viewpoints regarding politeness, and this discussion would be more specific in explaining the importance of "*Anggah Ungguhin Basa Bali",* the level of politeness in the Balinese language, according to the respondents in the Ubud area (see Table 6). The interesting point is that none of the respondents seems neutral when we discuss the level of politeness in the Balinese language. However, a small number of respondents argued that the level of politeness in the Balinese language is not important; it is about 2.09% of respondents. What we get from this result is that 2.09% respondents might think Balinese language is the hardest language they are learning compared with Indonesian and English languages, which do not consist of complicated politeness levels in the form of words. This small number informs us of the existence of Generation Z, who face difficulty in using the Balinese language. This number could give us information to develop an interesting way to teach the Balinese language. Still close to the previous statement, 20.95% respondents thought the level of politeness in the Balinese language is quite important. This result shows us that there is a shift in perception of the Balinese language use, and it might be because of economic factors. The employment opportunities provided require the ability to use a foreign language, especially the English language, and this limits the position of the Balinese language to only social relations among Balinese people. The good news is that 76.96% of respondents said this level of politeness in the Balinese language is important and very important. They believe that the Balinese language must be kept as a Balinese characteristic. This result also provides information that Generation Z is still aware of their mother language. They still keep the language as part of their culture; they preserve culture amidst technological and tourism advances.

Table 6
The Importance of "Anggah Ungguhin Basa Bali"

No.	Importance	Frequency				Sum	
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Not at all important	3	1.57%	1	0.52%	4	2.09%
2	Quite important	21	10.99%	19	9.95%	40	20.95%
3	Neutral	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	Important	27	14.14%	46	24.08%	73	38.22%
5	Very important	37	19.37%	37	19.37%	74	38.74%
	Total	**88**	**46.07%**	**103**	**53.93%**	**191**	**100.00%**

The next important discussion regarding politeness is the relevance of Balinese cultural values in shaping polite behavior (see Table 7). This point discusses Generation Z's perspectives on the Balinese culture values. Based on the data, 82.20% respondents argued that Balinese cultural values are still relevant in shaping polite behavior. Most of them agree that Balinese culture provides them with values of politeness that can be applied to everyday life. This result shows that Generation Z in Ubud still maintains its culture in the massive tourism growth. On the other hand, there are still 17.28% respondents who seem to be neutral in discussing this topic. They might have considered that it cannot be separated from developing Ubud as a tourist destination. They might think the Balinese language is not directly involved or rarely involved in communication with tourists because English is the language used, which is not bound by politeness in terms of words. Surprisingly, there is one respondent expressing disagreement about this topic. However, the result is not very influential, and it cannot show a particular tendency.

Table 7
The Relevance of Balinese Cultural Values in Shaping Polite Behavior

No.	Relevance	Frequency				Sum	
		Male	Percentage	Female	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Strongly disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	Disagree	1	0.52%	0	0.00%	1	0.52%
3	Neutral	15	7.85%	18	9.42%	33	17.28%
4	Agree	41	21.47%	50	26.18%	91	47.65%
5	Strongly agree	31	16.23%	35	18.32%	66	34.55%
	Total	**88**	**46.07%**	**103**	**53.93%**	**191**	**100.00%**

We have already discussed the use of abbreviations (see Table 4) to get Generation Z's perspective on abbreviations and politeness. Table 8 provides us with information regarding the top 10 abbreviations used by this generation in Ubud. The first and the last words are the English abbreviations that are commonly used, while the rest are Indonesian slang words. Based on the top 10 abbreviations, it can be concluded that men tend to use expressive or responsive abbreviations more often, often as a refined variation of swear words. For example, males use the words "*anjay*" and "*anjir*" more often than females. The word "*anjay*" is usually used to express amazement, while the word "*anjir*" is used to express surprise. Another popular word, "*ngab,*" is used as a casual greeting among men. Meanwhile, females in this data showed a tendency to use abbreviations that focused more on social relationships and feelings. This is evident in the dominance of words like "*bucin*".

Table 8
The Top 10 Acronyms Used

No.	Acronym	Meaning	Male	Female
1	Otw	on the way	16	14
2	*Anjay*	dog	13	7
3	*Bucin*	love slave	6	10
4	*Mager*	lazy to move	8	7
5	*Wkwk*	term for LOL	6	4
6	*Anjir*	dog	7	3
7	*Gaje*	unclear	5	4
8	*Ngab*	brother	7	0
9	*Salting*	becoming awkward	3	3
10	Btw	by the way	3	3

Politeness is a product of society to maintain social relationships. As a product to maintain social relationships, it is important to keep this culture. Because of this reason, the next point that is urgent to be identified is the way to maintain politeness as part of Balinese culture in Generation Z (see Table 9). Most of them, 66.49% of respondents, believe that the best way to maintain politeness is to educate and to practice polite expression daily. This will increase awareness of polite language, and at the same time, it can maintain social relationships. One important point of this response, which is 9.95% of respondents, is a suggestion that politeness should adapt to the times. This viewpoint predicts the massive effects of globalization on all local aspects, including language. Preserving traditions and cultures seems to be the last way to maintain politeness.

Table 9
Maintaining Politeness

No.	Maintaining Politeness	Frequency	Percentage
1	Education and daily practice	127	66.49%
2	Self-awareness and personal role	30	15.71%
3	Adapting to the times	19	9.95%
4	Communicating politely and correctly	10	5.23%
5	Preserving traditions and culture	5	2.62%
	Total	**191**	**100%**

As we know, politeness can be seen from two points of view, sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics. Based on those viewpoints, Table 10 provides the perspectives of polite communication according to Generation Z. Most of them, 56.55% of respondents, consider polite communication to be a communication that uses polite and non-rude language or expression. Polite communication is also seen as an attitude and behavior by 20.94% of respondents. They also believe that being responsive and communicative are part of polite communication. Polite communication is not only about using greetings and expressions of gratitude, but also about the communication being relaxed and flexible. Based on the result, Generation Z has been seen as polite from two different points of view. Moreover,

polite communication is not only about the language used and attitudes, but it is also about being responsive and communicative.

Table 10
Perspectives on Polite Communication

No.	Perspectives on Polite Communication	Frequency	Percentage
1	Using polite and non-rude language	108	56.55%
2	Attitudes and behavior (empathy, respect, and tolerance)	40	20.94%
3	Being responsive and communicative	20	10.47%
4	Using greetings and expressions of gratitude	14	7.33%
5	Relaxed and flexible communication	9	4.71%
	Total	**191**	**100%**

To close the discussion regarding the perspective of politeness, Table 11 discusses the misunderstanding experiences of Generation Z during communication with their generation, other generations, and tourists. Based on the result, it is only 14.13% of respondents who have experienced a misunderstanding because of cultural differences with tourists, generational/social differences, and other communication issues, such as communication style, word choices, intonation, and facial expression.

Table 11
Misunderstanding Experience

No.	Misunderstanding Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1	Never experienced a misunderstanding	164	85.87%
2	Have experienced a misunderstanding		
	> Cultural differences with tourists	12	6.28%
	> Generational/social differences	9	4.71%
	> Other communication issues	6	3.14%
	Total	**191**	**100%**

5. Discussion

This study points out how politeness is expressed by Generation Z in their social relationship. Politeness discussed in this study focuses on the agreement to fulfill the maxims, in which we can categorize the utterances as polite as long as they can maintain the value of communication and mitigate conflicts among them. In addition, their perspectives regarding politeness, as they are the young generation in Ubud, also provide us with useful data to draw on how they protect their tradition, culture, and language in the quite advanced tourism development, and to predict their future motivation regarding the case of politeness.

Saying the right words in the right context could be the alternative definition of politeness being discussed, in which the basic assumption is about delivered values in communication (Fridolini et al., 2021; Hutahaean et al., 2021; Indahsari & Surjowati, 2021; Syah, 2021; Syahrin, 2016). The relation of the speaker and hearer is one of the points at which a polite or impolite expression is chosen. Words that sound polite in some groups of people may sound impolite if the relationship is not intimate (Aremu, 2016; Thompson & Agyekum, 2016). The tendency to use polite or impolite expressions is also due to certain reasons, and one of them is to make a joke (Kartika & Jumanto, 2024). Although politeness has its absolute form, it also has a relative form. As politeness can be seen from two different ways, sociopramatic and pragmalinguistic politeness scale, polite expression is not all about the expression used or linguistic features applied. This would give us a case in which an expression could be categorized as polite in two different ways. In short, politeness could be seen from the language use, and on the other hand, it is a norm of society. An expression that seems polite in a society could be impolite in another society. That is why the two scales must be considered. Then this would be the consideration of how we see languages as polite or not.

This research implies that politeness means discussing many aspects: their capability and intensity of using social media, Balinese language as their mother language, and polite communication. The result has shown us that Generation Z is closely related to social media platforms, in which the language used might be affected globally. They read and listen to how others use language in social media, and this might affect the way they communicate, for example, by using abbreviations, emojis, or stickers in communication. In addition, this kind of communication might be irrelevant to their mother language, and this situation becomes a challenge for the young generation to keep their mother language. This becomes one important reason to strengthen the values of politeness and noble character (Prayitno et al., 2022).

Research on politeness is a thought-provoking topic. Each society might have its own perspective on politeness, and this becomes an important point in how we see politeness. The emerging development of technology, of course, contributes to language development and the values. The further research that may be an interesting topic to discuss about politeness is politeness and technology, cross-cultural politeness, or research about cyberbullying from the perspective of impoliteness.

Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research was funded by the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology, Republic of Indonesia.

References

Andersson, M. (2024). E-mpoliteness - Creative impoliteness as an expression of digital social capital. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *20*(2), 227–248. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR-2022-0009

Aremu, M. A. (2016). Being politically impolite: A community of practice (CofP) analysis of invective songs of Western Nigerian politicians [Special issue on African cultures and languages]. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *4*(1), 103–116.

Blitvich, P. G. C. (2022). Moral emotions, good moral panics, social regulation, and online public shaming. *Language & Communication*, *84*, 61–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2022.02.002

Brown, L., & Kim, S. (2025). Intercultural Im/politeness: Perceptions of language choice and translanguaging in the Korean community in Australia. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *21*(1), 193–220. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR-2023-0079

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085

Budiarta, I. W., & Rajistha, I. G. N. A. (2018). Politeness in "Adit dan sopo jarwo" animation. *Lingua Cultura*, *12*(1), 25-30. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i1.1822

Budiarta, I. W., Rajistha, I. G. N. A., Jayantini, I. G. A. S. R., & Kasni, N. W. (2025). General politeness and impoliteness in mobile gaming communication. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *13*(1), 132–146. https://doi.org/10.22034/IJSCL.2024.2040802.3691

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Fridolini, F., Arisena, D. A., & Idawati, K. (2021). Politeness strategies analysis reflected in Little Women movie by Greta Gerwig. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, *8*(2), 267–281. https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v8i2.1375

Gagné, N. O. (2010). Reexamining the notion of negative face in the Japanese socio linguistic politeness of request. *Language & Communication*, *30*(2), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2009.12.001

Haugh, M., Kádár, D. Z., & Márquez Reiter, R. (2022). Offence and morality: Pragmatic perspectives. *Language & Communication*, *87*, 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2022.07.005

Hutahaean, D. T., Herman., & Girsang, A. F. F. (2021). An analysis of the politeness strategies utilized by Pesbukers in their variety show. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *13*(1), 39–46. https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v13i1.9218

Indahsari, V. A., & Surjowati, R. (2021). Politeness strategies used in Mata Natjwa program; Cipta kerja: Mana fakta mana duka [Create a work: Where is the fact where is the sadness]. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*, *4*(1), 10–20.

Jucker, A. H. (2024). Conduct politeness versus etiquette politeness: A terminological distinction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *20*(1), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR-2023-0071

Kartika, D., & Jumanto, J. (2024). Refusal politeness within anime: How the Japanese youngsters learn to refuse. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *12*(1), 427–440. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2024.2020706.3353

Kavanagh, B. (2016). Emoticons as a medium for channeling politeness within American and Japanese online blogging communities. *Language & Communication*, *48*, 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2016.03.003

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your P's and Q's. In C. Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman Group Ltd.

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.

Lowrey-Kinberg, B. (2019). Experimental results on the effect of politeness strategies on perceptions of police. *Language & Communication*, *69*, 42–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2019.05.002

Manaf, N. A. (2002). Persepsi kesatuan tindak tutur memerintah dalam bahasa Indonesia [Perception of the unity of governing speech acts in Indonesian]. *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, *4*(2), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.17510/wjhi.v4i2.328

Ningsih, R., & Fatmawati, F. (2024). Realitas kesantunan berbahasa gen-z di era digital [The reality of gen-z language politeness in the digital era]. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, *10*(1), 215–224. https://doi.org/10.30605/ONOMA.V10I1.3167

Prayitno, H. J., Kusmanto, H., Nasucha, Y., Rahmawati, L. E., Jamaluddin, N., Samsuddin, S., & Ilma, A. A. (2019). The politeness comments on the Indonesian president Jokowi Instagram official account viewed from politico pragmatics and the character education orientation in the disruption era. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education*, *1*(2), 52–71. https://doi.org/10.23917/IJOLAE.V1I2.8785

Prayitno, H. J., Markhamah., Nasucha, Y., Huda, M., Ratih, K., Ubaidullah., Rohmadi, M., Boeriswati, E., & Thambu, N. (2022). Prophetic educational values in the Indonesian language textbook: Pillars of positive politeness and character education. *Heliyon*, *8*(8), Article e10016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HELIYON.2022.E10016

Qonitah, N. (2023, October 17). *Dilema zaman modern: Terkikisnya etika pelajar terhadap guru* [Modern age dilemma: The erosion of student ethics towards teachers]. Kompasiana. https://www.kompasiana.com/nurulqonitah_/652df3f3ee794a11b431a802/dilema-zaman-modern-terkikisnya-etika-pelajar-terhadap-guru

Rajistha, I. G. N. A., & Claria, D. A. K. (2023). Strategies for English directives applied by Indonesian students to obtain information from Chatbot. *IJOTL-TL: Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *8*(3), 154–165. https://doi.org/10.30957/IJOLTL.V8I3.749

Ren, W., & Fukushima, S. (2022). Perception and evaluation of requests on social media in Chinese and Japanese. *Language & Communication*, *87*, 231–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2022.09.002

Sifianou, M. (2024). Dangerous politeness? Understandings of politeness in the COVID-19 era and beyond. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *20*(1), 11–37. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR-2022-0011

Syah, N. A. (2021). Politeness strategy performed in Satu Jam Lebih Dekat talk show on TV One: A pragmatic approach. *English Language Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literature*, *2*(1), 18–28.

Syahrin, E. (2016). *Strategi kesantunan sebagai kompetensi pragmatik dalam tindak tutur direktif bahasa Prancis* [Politeness strategies as pragmatic competence in French directive speech acts]. Universitas Negeri Medan.

Thompson, R., & Agyekum, K. (2016). Impoliteness: The Ghanaian standpoint [Special issue on African cultures and languages]. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *4*(1), 20–33.

Zhao, X., & Mao, Y. (2021). How to grapple with the green-eyed monster: A discursive approach to jealousy management in Chinese TV dramas. *Language & Communication*, *79*, 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2021.05.003

Zhou, L. (2022). Self-denigration in Mandarin Chinese: An alternative account from sincerity. *Language & Communication*, *87*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGCOM.2022.05.002

Appendix 1
The Questionnaire

Yth. Bapak/Ibu/Saudara/i Responden,
Kuesioner ini dirancang untuk mengumpulkan data mengenai perilaku linguistik dan persepsi kesantunan Generasi Z di daerah pariwisata Ubud, Bali. Partisipasi Anda sangat berarti bagi penelitian ini. Semua informasi yang Anda berikan akan dijaga kerahasiaannya dan hanya digunakan untuk tujuan penelitian. Mohon jawab setiap pertanyaan dengan jujur dan sesuai dengan pengalaman serta pandangan Anda. Terima kasih atas waktu dan kesediaan Anda.

Dear Respondent,
This questionnaire is designed to collect data on the linguistic behavior and politeness perceptions of Generation Z in the tourist area of Ubud, Bali. Your participation is crucial to this research. All information you provide will be kept confidential and used solely for research purposes. Please answer each question honestly and based on your experiences and perspectives. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Bagian I: Data Demografi Responden (Part I: Respondent Demographic Data)

1. Nama/inisial (*Name/initial*)
2. Jenis Kelamin (*Gender*)
   A. Perempuan (*Female*)
   B. Laki-laki (*Male*)
3. Tahun berapa Anda lahir? (*What year were you born?*)
   A. 1997-2002
   B. 2003-2007
   C. 2008-2012
4. Apa pekerjaan/status Anda saat ini? (*What is your current job/status?)*
   A. Pelajar/Mahasiswa (*Student*)
   B. Pekerja Pariwisata (*Tourism Workers*)
   C. Industri (*Industrial workers*)
   D. Pemerintah (*Government workers*)
   E. IT (*IT workers*)

Bagian II: Perilaku Linguistik Generasi Z (Part II: Linguistic Behavior of Generation Z)

5. Seberapa sering Anda menggunakan media sosial (contoh: Instagram, TikTok, WhatsApp) untuk berkomunikasi sehari-hari? (*How often do you use social media (e.g., Instagram, TikTok, WhatsApp) for daily communication?)*
   A. Tidak Pernah (*Never*)
   B. Jarang (*Rarely*)
   C. Kadang-kadang (*Sometimes*)
   D. Sering (*Often*)
   E. Sangat sering (*Very often*)

6. Saya cenderung menggunakan singkatan atau bahasa gaul (contoh: LOL, BRB, Bucin, Sabi) dalam percakapan sehari-hari. (*I tend to use abbreviations or slang (example: LOL, BRB, Bucin, Sabi) in everyday conversations.)*
   A. Sangat tidak setuju (*Strongly disagree*)
   B. Tidak setuju (*Disagree*)
   C. Netral (*Neutral*)
   D. Setuju (*Agree*)
   E. Sangat setuju (*Strongly agree*)

7. Sebutkan 3-5 kata/frasa bahasa gaul atau singkatan yang paling sering Anda gunakan dalam komunikasi sehari-hari, baik online maupun offline. (*Name 3-5 slang words/phrases or abbreviations that you use most often in everyday communication, both online and offline.)*

8. Seberapa sering Anda berkomunikasi tatap muka dibandingkan melalui pesan teks/chat? (*How often do you communicate face to face versus via text/chat?)*
   A. Tidak pernah tatap muka (*Never meet face to face*)
   B. Jarang tatap muka (*Rarely meet face to face*)
   C. Seimbang (*Balanced*)
   D. Sering tatap muka (*Often meet face to face*)
   E. Sangat sering tatap muka (*Very often meet face to face*)

Bagian III: Persepsi Kesantunan Generasi Z (Part III: Generation Z's Perceptions of Politeness)

9. Saya merasa penting untuk menggunakan bahasa yang santun saat berkomunikasi dengan orang yang lebih tua atau memiliki kedudukan lebih tinggi. (*I feel it is important to use polite language when communicating with people who are older or have a higher position.)*
   A. Sangat tidak setuju (*Strongly disagree*)
   B. Tidak setuju (*Disagree*)
   C. Netral (*Neutral*)
   D. Setuju (*Agree*)
   E. Sangat setuju (*Strongly agree*)

10. Saya menghindari teguran langsung yang berkesan menggurui karena merasa tidak nyaman. (*I avoid direct reprimands that come across as patronizing because I feel uncomfortable.)*
    A. Sangat tidak setuju (*Strongly disagree*)
    B. Tidak setuju (*Disagree*)
    C. Netral (*Neutral*)
    D. Setuju (*Agree*)
    E. Sangat setuju (*Strongly agree*)

11. Menurut Anda, apa ciri utama komunikasi yang dianggap "santun" oleh Generasi Z saat ini? Berikan contoh. (*In your opinion, what are the main characteristics of communication that are considered "polite" by Generation Z today? Give an example.)*

12. Saya merasa penggunaan emoji atau stiker dalam pesan dapat membantu menyampaikan kesantunan. (*I feel that using emojis or stickers in messages can help convey politeness.)*
    A. Sangat tidak setuju (*Strongly disagree*)
    B. Tidak setuju (*Disagree*)
    C. Netral (*Neutral*)
    D. Setuju (*Agree*)
    E. Sangat setuju (*Strongly agree*)

Bagian IV: Kesantunan dalam Konteks Ubud, Bali (Part IV: Politeness in the Context of Ubud, Bali)

13. Seberapa penting menurut Anda untuk menggunakan Bahasa Bali (Anggah Ungguhing Basa Bali) yang sesuai saat berinteraksi dengan masyarakat lokal di Ubud? (*How important do you*

think it is to use appropriate Balinese (Anggah Ungguhing Basa Bali) when interacting with local people in Ubud?)

A. Tidak penting sama sekali (*It doesn't matter at all*)
B. Cukup penting (*Quite important*)
C. Netral (*Neutral*)
D. Penting (*Important*)
E. Sangat penting (*Very important*)

14. Pernahkah Anda mengalami kesalahpahaman atau perbedaan persepsi kesantunan saat berinteraksi dengan wisatawan asing atau orang dari generasi lain di Ubud? Jika ya, ceritakan singkat contohnya. (*Have you ever experienced misunderstandings or differing perceptions of politeness when interacting with foreign tourists or people of a different generation in Ubud? If so, please briefly describe an example.)*

15. Saya percaya bahwa nilai-nilai budaya Bali (seperti *Tri Hita Karana* atau *Anggah Ungguhing Basa Bali*) masih relevan dalam membentuk perilaku santun Generasi Z. (*I believe that Balinese cultural values (such as Tri Hita Karana or Anggah Ungguhing Basa Bali) are still relevant in shaping the polite behavior of Generation Z.)*
    A. Sangat tidak setuju (*Strongly disagree*)
    B. Tidak setuju (*Disagree*)
    C. Netral (*Neutral*)
    D. Setuju (*Agree*)
    E. Sangat setuju (*Strongly agree*)

16. Menurut Anda, bagaimana Generasi Z di Ubud dapat menjaga kesantunan berbahasa tradisional Bali di tengah pengaruh globalisasi dan pariwisata? (*In your opinion, how can Generation Z in Ubud maintain the politeness of traditional Balinese language amidst the influence of globalization and tourism?)*