Impoliteness Strategies in Efl Context: Teacher – Student Interaction in English for Specific Purposes (Esp) Class

Eko Suwignyo*, Dwi Rukmini, Rudi Hartono, Hendi Pratama

Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa, Pasca Sarjana, UNNES, Jl. Kelud Utara III, Semarang 50237
*Corresponding Author: suwignyo.eko@students.unnes.ac.id

Abstract. The impoliteness can happen in various fields of human life including in the classroom interaction. This study aims to describe the impoliteness strategies used by the teacher and the learners in doing interaction. The data was taken from the teacher and students interaction in English for specific purposes class at ABS school. Then, the data was analyzed using Culpeper's taxonomy (1996). The result shows that bald on record strategy was the most frequently used either by the teacher or students in doing interaction. There was also other strategies such as positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and off record impoliteness. Beside that, the data also shows some responses to the impoliteness such as accepting and countering to the impoliteness. Therefore, the result of this study will be beneficial for the material designer, teachers and also students as references to avoid the impolite act and use the polite ones in doing interaction.

Key words: impoliteness strategy; interaction; ESP class.

INTRODUCTION

Politeness and impoliteness are something which can't be separated between one and another. Certain act takes into consideration as impolite because people understand how to act in polite way. Conversely, people also consider certain act as polite because they know how to act as impolite. Nevertheless, the study related to impoliteness is not too popular compare to politeness point of view (Oboko, U., & Ikechukwu, G., 2020). Some of them concern to analyze impoliteness in political utterances, social media utterances, drama performance, and intercultural interaction (Bustan, E & Alakrash, H., 2020; Oz, M, et al., 2018; Alawawda, M & Hassan, A., 2021; Mugford, G. 2018).

In general, impoliteness can be seen from two different point of view. The first perspective, impoliteness is seen from the speaker standpoint.

In addition, impoliteness is perceived as an act which is purposely designed to attack the hearer face and sometime cause disharmony between them (Cutting, J., et al., 2020; Gustiani, T., et al., 2022; Wijayanto, A., 2019). Culpeper (as cited Amaliah & Muslim, 2021) declared that impoliteness is naturally the opposite of Brown and Levinson's politeness principles which is intentionally designed to attack the hearer face. Therefore, the speakers and the hearers must pay attention to three social factors which can trigger impoliteness in doing interaction. Those are social distance, social power among the participants, and also the rank of imposition in a particular issue (Brown and Levinson as cited Félix-Brasdefer, J & McKinnon, 2016).

Then, Culpeper (as cited Amaliah, E & Muslim, A., 2021) classified the impoliteness strategies as follows:

Table 1. Culpeper's impoliteness taxonomy (1996)

No	Strategy	Explanation
1.	Bald on record impoliteness	This strategy is clearly designed and realized to attack the hearer's face because the speaker doesn't want to maintain the harmony relationship between them.
2.	Positive impoliteness	It is formulated to attack the hearer's positive face such as give inappropriate name, ignoring the hearer, excommunicate to the hearer, etc.
3.	Negative impoliteness	It is a strategy to undermine the hearer's negative face like insulting the hearer, criticize the hearer, and disparage the others.
4.	Mock politeness	It is the impoliteness strategy which is realized in polite way. However, it is obviously politeness in pretense to mock the hearer.
5.	Withhold politeness	It happens when the speaker consciously or unconsciously doesn't want to realize politeness to the hearer as commonly applied.

The second perspective, impoliteness is viewed from social culture point of view. Different from the previous one, impoliteness is seen as a collective value from the cultural backdrop (Spencer-Oatey, H & Kádár, D., 2015; Culpeper, J., 2018; Mugford, G., 2018). In this case, the impoliteness is not viewed from face attack standpoint but it will be assessed from social norms in a particular culture. Certain utterance can be adjusted as polite act for certain culture but it can be impolite for the other cultures (Rababa'h, B & Rabab'ah, G, 2021). Sinkeviciute and Kecskes (2017) also argued that every culture has different impact to the impoliteness. Therefore, it can be assumed that this concept does not assess the impoliteness from the linguistic form of utterances but it is assessed from socio cultural norms. Locher (cited Kecskes, 2017) argued that polite or impolite of utterances is based on the appropriateness of cultural norms when it is used by the speaker.

Impoliteness can happen in various sectors in human life. Education is one of the fields which also potentially realizes impoliteness phenomenon. It can proceed in the classroom interaction between students to students, teacher to students, and students to teacher (Amaliah, E & Muslim, A., 2021). Brown (cited Utami, 2020, p. 12) argued that interaction is the core of communication. It is a process of exchange about thoughts, ideas, and feeling among the participants. Therefore, interaction has a crucial process in teaching and learning process in the class. It has a function as a media for the teacher to deliver the materials and ideas to the students and also used by the students to give feedback or asking dealing with the material to the teacher.

Classroom interaction generally happens in various subject of learning including English for English specific purposes (ESP). It is a part of English language teaching in EFL context and adopted by many schools and universities in Indonesia (Poedjiastutie, D., 2017). Hyland (2019) stated that English for specific purposes (ESP) concerns to teaching and learning English in certain domain focusing on communicative needs and practices for specific circumstance. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate and describe the models of impoliteness realization in ESP classroom interaction at Amsterdam Brilliant School (ABS) in Surakarta. It is an agent engaged in training and workforce distribution services, especially to Cruise Ships both domestic and overseas level.

METHOD

This study belonged to descriptive qualitative research in order to describe the impoliteness phenomenon in the classroom interaction at ABS school. Creswell (2014, p. 183) defined that qualitative approach is a process of inquiry to get an understanding by exploring social phenomenon or human problem using different methodological tradition. It is a process to give solid understanding about particular topic in certain situation, certain activity, and certain circumstance (Leavy, P., 2017, p. 124).

The participants in this study were the students and teacher in English training class at Amsterdam Brilliant School (ABS) school. The students consisted from various ages ranged from 18 to 41 years old coming from different region in East Java, Central Java, and West Java. Then, the data was taken using observation and recording instruments to be transcribed, coded, classified, and analyzed using impoliteness Culpeper's taxonomy.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result of the study shows that there are four impoliteness strategies realized by the teacher and students in English class interaction at ABS school. It is as displayed on the table as follows:

Table 2. Impoliteness strategies applied by teacher and students at ABS school.

Num	Types	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Bald on record impoliteness	5	13
2.	Positive impoliteness	10	25
3.	Negative impoliteness	20	50
4.	Withhold politeness	5	13
Total		40	100

The table above shows that negative impoliteness was the most strategy frequently used with 50%. There are some sub-strategies as a part of negative impoliteness such as;

frightening, scorning, critic, belittle the others and etc.

Data:

(D/T-S/I/1)

Teacher : *Today, we will have an interview practice, all in English. So, just prepare yourself*

guys all.

Student : *What? Oh My God, I'm not ready Miss. I have not learnt all of the materials.*

(D/T-S/I/2)

Teacher : *Hi boy, what are you doing? Why are you smoking here? You know well about*

our English lesson's rule, right? Smoking is not allowed.

Student : *Yes miss, sorry. Only a little.* (Then, he turned off his cigarette).

In addition, the teacher talked in front of the students to give information that she would like to conduct interview practice in English. Unfortunately, teacher's utterances *"so, just prepare yourself guys all"* perceived as threatening act to frighten the students. Therefore, the student gave response by expressing surprise and countering offensive "*What? Oh My God, I'm not ready Miss. I have not learnt all of the materials*.

Another data shows that the teacher was giving critic to her student because he was smoking in the classroom. Nguyen (cited Manurung, L., 2020) defines criticism as an illocutionary act to give negative evaluation to the hearer's action. Beside that, it is also a part of negative impoliteness strategies. In this case, the teacher criticized her student by asking and identifying the problem because smoking in the class was not allowed. Then, it was responded by accepting the impoliteness "*Yes miss, sorry. Only a little*".

The next realized impoliteness strategy was positive impoliteness with 25%. Positive impoliteness is an act intentionally designed to attack the hearer's positive face. It refers to the hearer's pride and desire to be respected.

Data:

(D/T-S/I/3)

Teacher : *Hi, kid. Come on time for the next meeting, please!.*

Student : *Yes Miss, I'm so sorry. I'll try.*

(D/S-T/I/5)

Teacher : *Ok students. That's all for the class tonight. Any questions before I close the class?*

see you next meeting.

Student : *(Student leaves out the class without permission while teacher talking).*

Data (D/T-S/I/3) shows that the teacher realized positive impoliteness by calling inappropriate name *"Hi Kid"* to the student. *"Kid"* is a calling name which isn't proper for college's student and imply insulting the hearer. A college's student belongs to adult learner who totally aware to themselves in the learning process. So, they are not proper anymore to be called *"Kid"* as junior school students.

The next data, positive impoliteness was performed by one of the students by getting out the classroom without permission while the teacher was talking in front of the class. This means that the student ignored the teacher and it is a part of positive impoliteness strategies.

The last, there were bald on record impoliteness and withhold politeness strategies with 13% for each. Bald on record impoliteness means that the speaker intentionally designs an act to attack the hearer's face as the following data:

(D/T-S/I/7)

Teacher : *You see all of my key answer, I knew it. What the hell are you nut?*

Students : *I finish it without looking at yours, Miss.*

Teacher : *Really? But as I know, you always cheating in my English lesson.*

Students : *I always do my task by myself, Miss.*

(D/S-T/I/10)

Teacher : *Ok class, any questions dealing with the material tonight?*

Students : *(Keep silent)*

This happened when the teacher identified her student cheating in doing a test. Teacher's utterance *"You see all of my key answer, I knew it. What the hell are you nut?"* in a high tone indicates that the teacher used impolite way clearly, directly, and ambiguously to interact with her student. Therefore, it can be concluded that this belongs to bald on record impoliteness strategy. Meanwhile, the next data shows that the student's response by performing *(keep silent)* constitute to withhold politeness strategy.

In this case, students supposed to answer the question from the teacher as a part of politeness in communication so that the teacher knew whether the material understood well or not. In fact, the students responded the question in silence way and it could be categorized as impolite way or impolite response.

CONCLUSION

Impoliteness is indispensable part of politeness and it always embed to human interaction including in education. There are four impoliteness strategies realized by teacher and students in English classroom interaction. Those are bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and withhold politeness. Negative impoliteness strategy was frequently used by the teacher in doing classroom interaction and followed by the other strategies as explained above.

This phenomenon should be viewed more in depth regarding education as a process to build human character and to raise human dignity. Furthermore, it was realized in the class for students who would work either in domestic or in overseas level. Therefore, it is suggested to conduct the research in depth to analyze the bottom level concerning to the impoliteness in education sector. In short, this study will be hopefully beneficial for the material designers, teachers, and also students to teach and to select the appropriate utterances in doing communication.

REFERENCES

Alawawda, M., & Hassan, A. (2021). Impoliteness in only drunks and children tell the truth by drew Hayden Taylor. *Linguistics and Culture Review, 5*(1), 195–202. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5n1.1307

Amaliah, E., & Muslim, A. B. (2021). Impoliteness in English as a foreign language virtual classroom: The strategies and its intentions. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020)* (Vol. 546). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.023

Brown, H., (2001). *Teaching by principle and interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman Inc.

Bustan, E, & Alakrash, H., (2020). An analysis of impoliteness strategies performed by Donald Trump tweets addressing the Middle East countries. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 1*(3), 66-74. 15919833

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Culpeper, J. (2018). Taboo language and impoliteness. In *The Oxford Handbook of Taboo Words and Language* (pp. 28–40). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198808190.013.2

Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2020). Politeness and Impoliteness. In *Pragmatics* (pp. 36–46). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003010043-5

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., & McKinnon, S. (2016). Perceptions of impolite behavior in study abroad contexts and the teaching of impoliteness in L2 Spanish. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching, 3*(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2016.1251782

Gustiani, T., et al., (2022). Strategi ketidaksantunan dalam video debat pemilihan presiden tahun 2019. *SeBaSa, 5*(1), 104–119. https://doi.org/10.29408/sbs.v5i1.5501

Hyland, K. (2019). English for specific purposes: Some influences and impacts (pp. 1–17). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_19-1

Hyland, K., (2019). English for specific purposes: Some influences and impacts. *Springer International Handbooks of Education*, 1-17. 10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_19

Kecskes, I. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research, 13*(1), 7–31. https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0019

Leavy, P. (Ed.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.001.0001

Mugford, G. (2018). Critical intercultural impoliteness: "Where are you located? Can you please transfer me to someone who is American?" *Journal of Pragmatics, 134*, 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.0

3.014

Oboko, U, & Ikechukwu, G., (2020). Face threatening and impoliteness strategies in postgraduate students and administrative staff's interactions in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. *Journal of Arts & Humanities, 5*(1). 355188664

Oz, M., Zheng, P., & Chen, G. M. (2018). Twitter versus Facebook: Comparing incivility, impoliteness, and deliberative attributes. *New Media and Society, 20*(9), 3400–3419. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817749516

Poedjiastutie, D. (2017). The pedagogical challenges of english for specific purposes (ESP) teaching at the University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia. *Educational Research and Reviews, 12*(6), 338–349. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.3125

Poedjiastutie, D., (2017). The pedagogical challenges of English for specific purposes (ESP) teaching at the University of Muhammadiyah Malang , Indonesia. *Academic journals, 12*(6), 338-349.

10.5897/ERR2016.3125

Rababa'h, B. B., & Rabab'ah, G. (2021). The impact of culture and gender on impoliteness strategies in jordanian and american tv sitcoms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 11*(2), 151–163. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1102.06

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Kádár, D. Z. (2015). The Bases of (Im)politeness Evaluations: Culture, the moral order and the East-West divide. *East Asian Pragmatics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.v1i1.27762

Utami, P, R., (2020). Classroom interaction in learning English process at SMP Handayani Sungguminasa, https://digilibadmin.unismuh.ac.id/upload/10567-Full_Text.pdf

Wijayanto, A. (2019). Evaluating impoliteness in l2: A study of pragmatic competence of indonesian efl teacher trainees. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 16*(4), 1152–1167. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.6.1152