

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Teacher is a person who educates the students; it is a necessity for the students to respect her/him. As what Pasal 12 ayat 2 Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No.20 about National Education System states that all students are obliged to maintain the educational norms to ensure the process and the success of education itself. Ideally, the students have to speak politely to the teacher. Language politeness is needed in every situation, included in the classroom interaction, because it will maintain the harmony of relationship between teacher and students and to avoid the conflict.

However, one can be impolite if s/he cannot identify the context of situation. In the classroom interactions, the students have to avoid of using such an impolite language to the teacher because it can cause disharmony between them. The communicative behavior intending to cause the 'face losses' of a target or perceived by the target to be so is involved in impoliteness. The phenomenon of impoliteness is to do with how offense the language is communicated and taken. As what Culpeper (2005: 38) defines impoliteness is communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony.

Power, which often express through language, seems to have a close relationship with impoliteness. It is the same as what Culpeper (2007:25) argues that impoliteness always involves power. Fairclough (1989:43) states that power exists in various modalities, including the concrete and unmistakable modality of physical force. He makes a distinction between power *in* and power *behind* discourse. Power in discourse

refers to the exercise of power in the language, whilst power behind discourse concerns the constitution of social institution and societies through power relations. Power itself cannot be explained without contextualization. It connects with impoliteness in a number of different ways. It includes the performance/ perception of impoliteness in language and the broader context within which it is performed/perception.

On the other hand, the fact shows that power in and power behind the discourse is not always linear. One aspect of power behind discourse is the participant status. A person who has a power can speak more impolitely in one situation rather than a less powerful person. As what Culpeper (1996:350) states that impoliteness is more likely to occur in situation where there is an imbalance power is reflected in its relatively frequent appearance.

In a classroom interaction, a teacher is a powerful participant who has a power to ask, command, or even forbid something to the students in the classroom. Moreover, it might be possibly happened if a teacher speaks impolitely to the students since he/she is a powerful participant to do that.

It shows that in some situations, the students speak impolitely to the teacher despite of the fact that they are the less powerful participants. It can be seen in one situation which was happened in the classroom observed by the researcher on 9th March 2015 at class XI TKJ (Teknik Komputer dan Jaringan) SMK Swasta PAB (Persatuan Amal Bakti) Lubukpakam,

An IPA teacher (FD) asked the students to finish their assignment. She realized that one of her students doing nothing and preferred disturbing his friends. Then the teacher walked to his seat and asked this question,

Teacher (FD) :”Kenapa belum juga dikerjakan tugasnya?” (Why haven’t you done your tasks?)

Student (MY) : *"Capek lo BUK! Ibuk ini lalap ngasi tugas banyak kurang banyak." (I am so tired Ma'am! You always are giving us the tasks more and more.)*

Based on the context, a student speaks impolitely to the teacher despite of the fact that a teacher must be respected. Those student's utterances make it impolite referring to the context. The social context in the classroom make the teacher should be respected. In that context, the student seeks disagreement to his teacher. Seeking disagreement is one of the output strategies of positive impoliteness. Positive impoliteness is one of five strategies of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper (1996:356) which means to damage the addressee's positive wants.

Another language impoliteness uttered by student to the teacher can be seen in this example observed by the researcher on 13th March 2015 at class XI TKJ (Teknik Komputer dan Jaringan) SMK Swasta PAB (Persatuan Amal Bakti) Lubukpakam

A Social teacher (JS) asked the students to collect their homework. She realized that there were some students who hadn't finished their homework yet. She came to the students' seats and asked one of them,

Teacher (JS) : "Mana PR mu nak?" (Where's your homework?)

*Student (MF) : "Belom siap **aku** buk." (I haven't finished it Ma'am.)*

Teacher (JS) : "Kenapa pulak gak kamu kerjakan?(Why haven't you done it?)

Then the teacher said to all the students,

Teacher (JS) : "Yang gak ngerjain PR, silahkan kerjakan diluar. Nunggu abis pelajaran saya baru boleh masuk lagi." (For those who haven't finished the homework, please do it outside. After I finish my teaching then you can come in again.)

Then some students went outside. That student (MF) also went outside and said,

*Student (MF) : "E... **lapet..lapet**.... mau disamakan pulak negri sama swasta. Ya jelas beda lah buk!" (E... **lappet..lapet**.... you want to equal the state school with the private school. It is clearly different Ma'am!)*

In that situation, the student did negative and positive impoliteness strategies. He did a negative impoliteness strategy since he uttered the pronoun "Aku/I" to his teacher. Culpeper (1996: 356) states that personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'You', is one of

the output strategy of negative impoliteness. In addition, that student also used a taboo word when he said “e....*lapet...lapet....*” to his teacher. The word “*lapet*” is a taboo word since it is profane language to be said to the older person. It should be noted that the situation is formal (he is a student and spoke that sentence to the teacher in the classroom while the teaching learning process happened, not with his friends in the bar), and that the use of taboo word is unilateral. Using taboo word is one of the output strategies of positive impoliteness proposed by Culpeper (1996: 357). The positive impoliteness strategy means to damage the addressee’s positive wants. He attacked the teacher’s positive face. The positive face here means a desire from a person to be respected and needed by others.

These phenomena of language impoliteness in the classroom context are necessary to be studied since the application of impolite language in the classroom can show clearly the discrepancy of power in and power behind discourse as suggested by Fairclough (1989:43).

This study aims at examining the model of ‘impoliteness’, as first proposed by Culpeper (1996) and revised by Culpeper et al. (2003) and Culpeper (2007). In line with Culpeper’s (1996) theory of impoliteness, the researcher is very much interested in conducting a study on types of impoliteness strategies namely Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Sarcasm, and Withhold Politeness used by the students to their teacher in the classroom interaction.

1.2 The Problem of the Study

The problems of the study are formulated as the following:

- a. What types of language impoliteness are used by the students to their teacher in the classroom interaction?
- b. Why do the students do it the way they do?

1.3 The Objective of the Study

This research is aimed at examining the language impoliteness done by the students to their teacher in the classroom interaction. The objectives of the study are elaborated as followed:

- a. To find out the types of language impoliteness which are used by the students to the teacher in the classroom interaction.
- b. To describe the reasons of using language impoliteness which are used by the students to the teacher in the classroom interaction.

1.4 The Scope of the Study

The main aspect of this study is to describe the language impoliteness used by the students to the teacher in the classroom interaction. In this study, the researcher only focuses on the student's reaction to the teacher in (a) instruction (teaching and learning process) and (b) classroom management. The researcher also scope the location of the research is at SMK Swasta PAB (Persatuan Amal Bakti) Lubukpakam.

1.5 The Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are expected to be useful theoretically and practically.

- a. Theoretically, the findings of this study will expand and enrich the application of the impoliteness theory as proposed by Culpeper (1996) specifically the spoken language uttered by the students in the classroom. Impoliteness theory supports some disciplines as the subfield of Linguistics study such as Pragmatics and interactional Sociolinguistics.
- b. Practically, the findings of this study will be useful as a reference for lecturers, teachers, and students in communicating which lead towards how to deal with impoliteness, how impoliteness may potentially be countered, controlled, and managed.

For those who want to conduct further in depth study in language impoliteness, the findings of the research would be their valuable related findings in language impoliteness.