**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter deals with the background, problem statement of the research, objective of the research, significance of the research, and scope of the research.

1. **Background**

Language is a part of human being. Language and human being cannot be separated each other. This is because, language is an instrument to communicate each other. The main function of language is a tool to make interaction or communication. As human beings, people use language to express their thoughts, feelings, and emotions. Furthermore, it seems impossible for people to interact without language because it occurs on a daily life.

Interaction occurs in daily activities between the people. Dagarin (204:129) states that interaction is mainly achieved by two means of resources: language and non-verbal means of expression. It means that the people interact with other people to express ideas and feelings through both verbally and nonverbally.

The interaction also should appear in teaching and learning process in classroom. Interaction in the classroom is an essential part of teaching and learning process. According to Içbay (2008:1), through interactions in the classroom, the participants share what they know, how they do what they know, what they feel, what they think and what they plan to do. The interaction in the classroom are supposed to be polite, to make communication comfortable and to enable students enjoy conversation.
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Politeness is one of social phenomenon that plays important roles in human interaction. Politeness is a strategy of people in being polite to build a harmony in term of communication. Yule (2010:135) defines politeness as showing awareness and consideration of another person’s face. In other words, politeness helps to avoid conflict which possibly happens in daily life. However, the opposite phenomenon of politeness, impoliteness is something that has become more frequent in social interaction today. Murni and Solin (2012:11) state thatas the concern toward politeness increases so as the concern toward impoliteness.

Speaking politely has been one of the main issues on the national education of Indonesian. According to The Act of The Republic of Indonesia Number 20, Year 2003 on National Education System, it mentioned that education means conscious and well-planned effort in creating a learning environment and learning process so that learners will be able to develop their full potential for acquiring spiritual and religious strengths, develop self-control, personality, intelligence, morals and noble character and skills that one needs for him/herself, for the community, for the nation, and for the State. In fact, impoliteness is frequently found in educational environment, especially in the classroom specifically in teaching and learning process.

There are many researches about impoliteness especially analysis of impoliteness widely in social life, but still few analyses about impoliteness in the classroom. Whereas knowledge about impoliteness in educational environment need to be investigated, because it is highly expected that the teachers and students to be polite, respectful in teaching and learning process.

To shape the character of students to be politely should not only pay attention to the forms of politeness, but also the lack of politeness that occurs in the classroom should be used as a study and a model that needs to be avoided by the teacher and students.

Arising from the description above, the researcher was interested in conducting a research entitled “The Analysis of Impoliteness in English Classroom Interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang”. The researcher examined the use of impoliteness by the teacher and students in verbal form in the classroom interaction.

This research investigated the impolite expressions which were used by the teacher and students in the classroom interaction. After conducting this research, the teachers and students were expected to understand the use of impoliteness to other people or hearers especially in verbal form. Moreover, students and teachers could apply a good or appropriate utterances in the classroom during teaching and learning process. Therefore, the students could speak politely to the teachers and his/her friend, while the teacher could speak politely to students in the classroom. In other words, the teachers and students could be polite, respectful, discipline and everything about good thing especially in classroom during teaching and learning process.

1. **Problem Statement**

Based on the background above, the researcher formulates the problem statements as follows:

1. What are expressions used by the teacher and students showing impoliteness in English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang?
2. What are the factors causing the use of impolite expression by the teachers and students in English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang?
3. Why do the students and teacher use impolite expressions in the English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang?
4. What are the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang?
5. **Objective of the Research**

Based on the problem statements above, the objectives of this research are:

1. To find out the expressions which are used by the teacher and students showing impoliteness in English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.
2. To find out the factors causing the use of impolite expression by the teachers and students in English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.
3. To find out why do the students and teacher use impolite expressions in English classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.
4. To find out the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.
5. **Significance of the Research**

Theoretically, the finding of this study is expected to enrich the pragmatics study about Face Threatening Act (FTA), particularly politeness and impoliteness.

The researcher hopes that the result of this research can provide useful information and contribution to the English teachers and students about impoliteness. In this case, the teachers and students can understand the use, causing factors, reasons, and effect of impoliteness to other people or hearers in daily life. Beside that, the teachers and students are expected to apply in classroom by choosing good or appropriate utterances in the classroom during teaching and learning process. The teachers and students could avoid utterances that tend to be impolite and prefer to use a good utterances or more politely. In other words, the teachers and students can be polite, respectful, discipline and everything about good thing especially in classroom during teaching and learning process. So, the national education goals can be achieved.

1. **Scope of the Research**

This research, by discipline concerns with the study of pragmatics. It is specified to an analysis of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

By content, this research emphasized five types of impoliteness based on Culpeper’s theory they are; bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withhold politeness. Furthermore, to be more focus on this study, the researcher focused on the analysis of impoliteness in verbal form to find out; (1) the expressions used by the teachers and students showing impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang (2) the factors causing the use of impolite expression by the teacher and students in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang (3) the reasons students and teacher use impolite expressions in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang (4) the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

By activity, the researcher recorded the classroom activity and interviewed the teacher and students. The researcher examined the impolite expression used by the lecturer and students in the classroom by considering to Culpeper’s theory of the impoliteness strategies; they are; bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withold politeness. The researcher also examined the factors causing the use of impolite expression by the teacher and students in classroom interaction by considering to Mahmud’s study of factors influencing style in communication of politeness study, they are; Social status, age, gender, social distance or familiarity and situation. Moreover, the reasons the teacher and students use impolite expressions and the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction were also examined in this research.

**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This part deals with the previous research findings, some pertinent ideas, and conceptual framework.

1. **Previous Research Findings**

There have been some researches done related to this study, some of them are cited below:

* 1. Omar and Wahid (2010) did a research “A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Some of Harold Pinter's Plays”. This paper aimed to find out the role of impoliteness in interactional communication and its function in Pinter's plays. This research analyzed three plays of Pinter and examines how impoliteness is used to reflect the relationships between the characters. The research found that bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies are used frequently more than others. They also showed the impact of two Worlds Wars on modern man's life. Impoliteness leads to a development in character and plot.
  2. Laitinen (2010) with the study on “The use of impoliteness strategies in the American TV-series *House M.D.”* examined impoliteness strategies in the American TV series *House M.D.* The analysis was qualitative and it is focused on verbal impoliteness. In her research, she found that bald on record strategies and sarcasm were the impoliteness strategies that House used most frequently. She also took a brief look at the patients’ responses to House’s impoliteness and it noticed that most of the patients ignore House’s impolite, sometimes extremely insulting.
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Related to the findings as stated above, researchers have a similarity in conducting the research toward impoliteness which is one of the topics discussed in pragmatics. It is clearly revealed that impolite expression always appear in interaction. This phenomenon reflected the researcher to conducting the same research in the field of impoliteness in classroom interaction. It is aimed at finding out the expressions used by the teachers and students showing impoliteness, the factors causing the use of impolite expression, the reasons why do the students and teacher use impolite expressions and the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

The uniqueness of this research is examined about teachers and students’ impoliteness in verbal form in English classroom interaction. The teachers and students of SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang were observed.

1. **Some Pertinent Ideas**

**1. Politeness**

**a. Definition of politeness**

Politeness is one of the most important aspects of human communication which arise from social interaction. Politeness theory is firstly systematized by Brown and Levinson in 1987. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness theories are developed to account for face to face interaction. Another definition of politeness is stated by Fraser in Hei et al(2012:168), Fraser defines politeness as a property associated with an utterance in which, according to the hearer, the speaker has neither exceeded any rights nor failed to fulfill any obligations.

Politeness helps people to avoid conflict which possibly happens in daily life. Therefore, it is important to understand the norm or rule of politeness and apply it well when the people communicate with others.

**b. Politeness Strategies**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 68), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer’s “face”. Brown and Levinson (1987: 68) then propose possible strategies that interlocutors can use to deal with face threatening acts. Politeness strategies are developed by Brown and Levinson as follows.

* 1. Bald On-record politeness: This strategy is performed in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. This strategy is used in situations where people know each other well or in a situation of urgency.. Examples:

1. When a student forgets to bring his pen and he wants someone sitting next to him lend him a pen, the student could say “*Give me a pen*.”
2. A person may shout, “*watch out*” if they see someone is in danger
   1. Off-record: This strategy is more indirect. The speaker does not impose on the hearer. As a result, face is not directly threatened. This strategy often requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is saying. Off-record strategy is used by the speaker to achieve a communicative intention indirectly. Example:

Here, he will say “*I forgot my pen*” instead of *“Can you lend me a pen?”*

* 1. Positive Politeness: This strategy tries to minimize the threat to the audience’s positive face. This can be done by attending to the audience’s needs, invoking equality and feelings of belonging to the group, hedging or indirectness, avoiding disagreement, using humor and optimism and making offers and promises.

Example:

*“Hey Buddy, I’d appreciate it if you lend me one of your pen because I missed my pen at home”*.

Here, the speaker tries to intimate and treats the hearer as a close friend by addressing the hearer using *“Buddy”.*

* 1. Negative Politeness: This strategy tries to minimize threats to the audience’s negative face. This can be done by being indirect, using hedges or questions, minimizing imposition and apologizing.

Example:

*“Sorry to bother, may I borrow your pen?”*

The speaker saves the hearer’s negative by using apology to imposition *“Sorry to bother”* and using a modal verb *“may”.*

**2. Impoliteness**

**a. Definition of impoliteness**

Culpeper (1996) defines impoliteness as the opposite of politeness. His initial work is based on Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. Furthermore, Bousfield (2008:72) takes impoliteness to be the broad opposite of politeness, in that, rather than seeking to mitigate face-threatening acts (FTAs). According to Mugford (2008:375) impoliteness can be seen in terms of either breaking social norms or being deliberately offensive and disrespectful towards an interactant.

Furthermore, Elen in Omar and Wahid (2010:7) argues that politeness and impoliteness are two sides of a coin. Here, he means that there are always two sides to whatever kind of language behavior we engage in. One side is positive (politeness) and the other is negative (impoliteness). In fact, impoliteness focuses on intention and reception. Thus Culpeper (1996:358) mentions taboo language (swearing, abusive or profane language) as one marker of impolite utterances in English.

Culpeper in Mugford (2008:376) states that impoliteness comes about when (1): the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2). Meanwhile, according to Marlangeon and Juez (2012:76), impoliteness occurs in any of the following instances:

1. When the speaker:
2. Tries to be polite to the hearer, but for hearer, speaker’s manner of expression is reminiscent of improper, indecorous or disrespectful language.

b) Involuntarily offends hearer by:

1. Committing a gaffe or faux pas, or

2. Stinting on the politeness expected by hearer, or

3. Ignoring politeness norms

c) Deliberately uses offensive language toward him/herself with different motivations

d) Very polite or excessively polite to the hearer, in order to hurt or mock him/her.

e) Voluntarily stints on the politeness expected by hearer

f) Deliberately offends hearer with a purpose that may:

1. Damage hearer’s face

2. Defend speaker’s face

2) When hearer:

a) Interprets speaker’s behavior as an intentional face attack that induces him/her to accept the attack or reject it through defence or counter-attack.

b) Remains silent intentionally, in order to indicate disagreement/ discontentment with speaker’s utterance.

**b. Impoliteness Strategies**

Culpeper presents a model of impoliteness that is basically the counterpart of Brown and Levinson’s politeness model. Culpeper takes Brown and Levinson's strategies and inverts them to describe impoliteness and their purpose is to attack the hearer's face instead of trying to save them. Culpeper (1996:356) takes Brown and Levinson's four super-strategies (bald-on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record) and inverts them to describe impoliteness: thus, Culpeper analyses impoliteness as consisting of bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withhold politeness. These strategies are:

1. Bald on record impoliteness. Bald on record impoliteness is seen as typically being deployed where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer. The utterances are deployed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in situations where face is not irrelevant or minimized.

Examples:

*“Shut that door”*

*“Don’t talk”*

*“Do your work”*

1. Positive impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2003:1555), The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee’s positive face wants. The strategy include ignore the other, exclude the other from an activity, be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, seek disagreement, use taboo words, use derogatory remarks.

Culpeper (1996:357) gives a list of examples about this strategy which include:

1. Ignore, snub the other-fail to acknowledge the other's presence.
2. Exclude the other from an activity.
3. Disassociate from the other-for example, deny association or common ground with other, avoid sitting together.
4. Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic.
5. Use inappropriate identity markers- for example, use titles and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.
6. Use obscure or secretive language-for example, mystify the other with jargon or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target.
7. Seek disagreement- select a sensitive topic.
8. Make the other feel uncomfortable-for example, do not avoid silence, joke or use small talks.
9. Use taboo words –swear or use abusive or profane language.
10. Call the other names –use derogatory nominations

Example:

*“You know what that bastard monk said to me ?”*

1. Negative impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2003:1555), the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee’s negative face wants. It attacks the addressee's negative face, which is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction. Culpeper (1996:357) gives a list of examples about this strategy which include:
2. Frighten - instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
3. Condescend, scorn or ridicule - emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).
4. Invade the other's space - literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).
5. Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.
6. Put the other's indebtedness on record, etc'.

Example:

*“You should have told me about that at the time, shouldn’t you, to be truthful?“*

1. Sarcasm or mock politeness. The FTA is performed with the use of obviously insincere strategies. Sarcasm is mock politeness for social disharmony and it is the opposite of banter which means mock impoliteness for social harmony (Culpeper, 2003:1555). Sarcasm constitutes the use of individual or combined strategies and remains on the surface and appears to be appropriate. On the surface level, the utterances sound polite but their meaning is the opposite. Here, the face threatening acts are performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere.

Example:

*“It's funny you never got married, isn't it? A man with all your gifts. Isn't it? A man like you?”*

1. Withhold politeness. The absence of politeness in situations where it is expected. In this strategy, the speaker does not perform a politeness act where the hearer would expect one. Being silent is also withholding politeness. Then, Culpeper (2005: 42) gives the example that “failing to thank someone for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness”.

**3. Factors influencing (im)politeness**

Culpeper connects the use of impoliteness with power. Culpeper (1996: 354) states that impoliteness is more likely to occur when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee. When the speaker is in a higher position he or she can use impoliteness more freely since he or she might have the means to “a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite”. Bousfield and Locher (2008: 8) states that the discussion of power is critically relevant to the phenomena under scrutiny: firstly, there is and can be no interaction without power; secondly, and more pertinently, impoliteness is an exercise of power as it has arguably always in some way an effecton one’s addressees in that it alters the future action environment of one’s interlocutors.

According to Mahmud (2010), there are some factors influencing style in communication, such as social status, age difference, gender difference, social distance or familiarity and situation. The first aspect is social status. Richards and Schmidt (2010:557) define status as higher, lower, or equal position, particularly in regard to prestige, power, and social class. The status of people, when they are communicating in speech or writing is also important as it may affect the speech style they use to each other. In other words, the speech and treatment of people will be different between the people in same status with higher or lower status.

The second aspect is age difference. Mizutani and Mizutani in Mahmud (2010:57) state that differences in age will influence the formality of speakers and hence the degree of politeness. It has become a rule in Japan that older people talk in a familiar way toward younger people, and younger people talk politely to older people. In contrast, people of the same age commonly use familiar speech styles in conversation.

Furthermore, the third aspect is gender difference. Men and women are different in their speaking especially in politeness. Women talk more than men, talk too much, are more polite, are indecisive/hesitant, complain and nag, ask more questions, support each other, are more co-operative than man

The fourth aspect is social distance or familiarity. Akerlof in Suzila and Yusri (2012:128) defines social distance as the extent to which individuals share beliefs, customs, practices, appearances, and other characteristics that define their identity. Furthermore, the ways of people in speaking determined by how familiar a person to interlocuters. The more distant the interlocutors are, the more polite they are likely to talk. Conversely, the more familiar they are, the less polite they talk, marked by very familiar language and less polite expressions.

Finally, the last aspect is situation. In formal situation, people will talk politely whereas in informal situations, speakers tend to use a more familiar style or less polite of speech. furthermore, people also change their style of speech depending on the situation, even when talking with the same person but in different situation.

**4. Face**

1. **Negative and positive face**

Face is a central concept in studying linguistic politeness and it was originally introduced by Erving Goffman in the 1960s. Richards and Schmidt (2010:214) state the definition of face as the positive image or impression of oneself that one shows or intends to show to the other participants*.* Face may imply different kinds of desire or face-wants that people have. When the face is attacked, there would be lack presence of politeness leading to impoliteness in communication. Brown and Levinson (1987) characterize two types of face in terms of participant wants rather than social norms:

* 1. Negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
  2. Positive face: the positive consistent self-image that people have and want to be appreciated and approved of by at least some other people.

1. **Face Threatening Acts**

Fraser (1990:229) states that face is something that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced and any threat to face must be continually monitored during an interaction. And, since face is so vulnerable, and since most participants will defend their face if threatened, the assumption is made that it is generally in everyone's best interest to maintain each other's face and to act in such ways that others are made aware that this is one's intention.

In relation to the concept of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) introduce the term FTA, a face-threatening act, which sometimes cannot be avoided. In fact, the purpose of politeness is to soften face-threatening acts because it is in everyone’s mutual interest to do so (Brown and Levinson 1987:59-60). A face threatening act is a speech act (such as a warning or a threat) that can damage the hearer’s positive or negative face (Brown and Levinson 1987:61). Threats to a negative face are actions by which a person indicates that they do not intend to avoid impending one’s freedom of action. Examples of these are orders, advice, and warnings. Threats to a positive face are actions which indicate that a person does not care about the addressee’s feelings or wants. Examples of these are criticism, disagreements, and mention of taboo topics.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:68), any rational agent wants to avoid FTAs and therefore uses certain strategies to minimize the threat. When a person is about to perform an FTA, they have to estimate the degree of the face threat involved. The less imposition of the act and the less powerful and distant the other person is, the less polite one has to be.

1. **Classroom Interaction**

Richards and Schmidt (2010:289) define interaction as the way in which a language is used by interlocutors. Wikipedia (2014) defines interaction as a kind of action that occurs as two or more objects have an effect upon one another. So, it can be concluded that interaction is the way used by people or things to communicate to each other.

Interaction has a similar meaning in the classroom. Classroom interaction might defined as a two-way process between the participants in the learning process, the teacher influences the learners and vice versa (Dagarin:2004). Furthermore, Dagarin (2004:129) states that the one thing that makes the classroom different from any other social situation is that it has a primary pedagogic purpose. Teachers spend a lot of time talking, lecturing, asking questions, giving instructions, and so on.

Talk about role in classroom interaction, Içbay (2008:2) state that classroom interaction is considered to be one of the sole platforms where any reality about any classroom phenomena is constructed, shared, and made meaningful both to the participants and to the outsiders who take interest in what happens in the classrooms.

Related to classroom interaction in foreign language, Hall and Verlaetse in Consolo (2006:34) state that the role of interaction in additional language learning is important. It is in their interactions with each other that teachers and students work together to create the intellectual and practical activities that shape both the form and the content of the target language as well as the processes and outcomes of individual development.

1. **Pragmatics**

Impoliteness is one of topics discussed in pragmatics. Pragmatics gives clear explanation that it is used to study the language usage, study of speaker meaning, study of contextual meaning, study of how more gets communicated than is said, and study of the expression of relative distance.

According to Findlay (1998:151) pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that is dedicated to the study of language use. Another definition of pragmatics given by Yule (2010:128), she states that pragmatics is the study of “invisible” meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn’t actually said or written.

Rahman (2005:23) states that pragmatics deals with the study of language in use by highlighting the importance of context to reveal the meaning employed in an activity, deed, or practice. Furthermore, Cahyono in Rahman (2005:23) states that the term pragmatics was preliminary developed by Charles Moris who outlined the general shape of a science of signs, or semiotics. In semiotics, there are three branches of inquiry: 1) Syntactics, the study of formal relation of signs to one another; 2) Semantics, the study of the relations of signs to objects to which the signs are capable; and 3) Pragmatics, the study of the relation of signs to interpreters. Some of the aspects of language studied in pragmatics include:

1. Speech Act
2. Locutionary Act refers to the literal meaning of the sentence.
3. Illocutionary Act refers to the intention of the utterances the speaker said.
4. Perlocutionary Act refers to the effect of the utterances said by the speaker on the actions or thoughts of the other person.
5. Deixis: meaning 'pointing to' something. In verbal communication however, deixis in its narrow sense refers to the contextual meaning of pronouns, and in its broad sense, what the speaker means by a particular utterance in a given speech context.
6. Presupposition: referring to the logical meaning of a sentence or meanings logically associated with or entailed by a sentence.
7. Implicature: referring to an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use.
8. **Conceptual Framework**

This part presents conceptual framework, this research investigates based on conceptual framework that has been formulated by the researcher as follows:

**Teaching and Learning Process**

**Classroom Interaction**

**Teacher**

**Students**

**Impolite Expression**

**Negative Impoliteness**

**Withhold Politeness**

**Sacrasm/Mock Politeness**

**Positive Impoliteness**

**Bald on Record**

**The Factors Causing the Use of Impolite Expression**

**Situation**

**Familiarity**

**Gender**

**Age**

**Social status**

**Why do the students and teacher employ impolite expressions**

**The effects of impoliteness toward the interlocutors**

Figure 2.1. Conceptual Framework

**CHAPTER III**

**RESEARCH METHODS**

In this section, the researcher presents research design, operational definition, subject of research, instrument of the research, procedure of collecting data and technique data analysis.

1. **Research Design**

In this research, the researcher used qualitative descriptive method to describe the research questions. According to Hancock (1998:1), qualitative research is concerned with developing explanations of social phenomena. Hancock also states that, qualitative research aims to help us to understand the world in which we live and why things are the way they are. Qualitative research is concerned with process, rather than simple outcomes or product, qualitative research tends to analyze the data inductively. In this case, the researcher used this method to describe the expressions were used by the teachers and students that showing impoliteness, the factors causing the use of impolite expression by the teachers and students, the reasons the students and teacher employ impolite expressions, and the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

1. **Operational Definition**

To obtain a good understanding to this study, it is important to give definition of terms related to this research. The terms are as follows:
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1. Politeness is one of the most important aspects of human communication in order to save other’s face.
2. Impoliteness is the opposite of politeness which is attack the hearer’s face.
3. Impoliteness strategy is strategies which are design to attack the hearer or intlocutor’s face and cause disharmony or conflict in daily life between the people.
4. Interaction is the process of communication between two or more people whether verbally or nonverbally.
5. Classroom interaction is the process of communication between student and teachers whether verbally or nonverbally in the classroom while teaching and learning process.
6. **Subject of the Research**

The researcher applied purposive sampling in collecting the data. The subjects of this research were students and teacher from class XII IPS 3 at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang. The researcher observed one English teacher and 28 students from class XII IPS 3 of SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

1. **Instrument of the Research**

Pertaining to the analysis of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang, the followings are the instruments that the researcher used.

1. Video Recorder

The video recorder used to record the conversation or verbal interaction of teacher and students to identify the occurrence of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang.

1. Interview

The other instrument that used was interview. The interview was conducted after the video recording session. The interview was conducted to identify the factors causing, reasons, and effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 1 Sengkang

1. **Procedure of Collecting Data**
   * + 1. Recording

The recording was performed during teaching and learning process in English class for 4 meetings. After recording the data, the researcher then transcribed the conversation from both teacher and students in the classroom into written form to be analyzed.

* + - 1. Interview

After conducting the video recording session, the researcher was interview the teacher and students to find out the factors causing, reason why do the students and teacher employ impolite expressions, and the effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction.

1. **Technique Data Analysis**

The data was obtained from video recording and interview, and then they were transcribed. The researcher, then, delved into the context of the utterance by examining the words, phrase, and sentence to know what actually the teacher and students meant. Second, the researcher classified the type of impoliteness strategy used by the teacher and the students. Third, the researcher analyzed factors, reasons, and effects of impoliteness in classroom interaction. Finally, the researcher made a number of conclusions based on the result of data analysis to answer the reseach questions.