A campus is the setting where politeness is educated and where the relationship between lecturers and students, and students to students should be well established. This case could lead to the development of society which is moving to a more advanced and modern one. Nowadays, there seems to be a disruption in classroom interaction where impolite utterances are more likely to be used. Based on researcher’s observation, there is a new awkwardness that female more produced the impolite utterances than male. This phenomenon can be found in daily classroom interaction where students perform impolite speech events. The objectives of the study was to find out the types of impoliteness strategies used by male and female students in classroom interaction. The study was descriptive qualitative. The subject of the study was class TI V Regular Sore of STMIK Pelita Nusantara which had been chosen randomly. The data of the study is the impolite utterances of transcripts which is recorded from the conversation in the classroom interaction. The data were identified, analyzed and categorized based on Culpeper’s (1996, 2003), Bousfield’s (2007), and Beebe’s (1995) theory. The findings of the study showed that there were five types of impoliteness strategy found in both data of male and female students, namely: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. Commonly male students is the more frequent produced impolite utterances than female students did. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that overall male and female students had equal chance to perform impoliteness in classroom interaction. Some suggestions are directed to those who are interested in understanding impoliteness strategy as found in practice.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Interaction has important role in communication in human life as stated by Brown (2001: 165), interaction is the heart of communication. A good interaction model could lead to the development of society which is moving to a more advanced and modern one. And it can be done through education and should be started from school. It must be effective and polite. If the class interaction goes well, the knowledge that is given by the lecturers will be received well by the students.

On the other hand, the fact shows that a good interaction could not be applied in the classroom. This case can be seen from the student’s interaction uttered in the classroom; there seems to be a disruption in classroom interaction where impolite utterances are more likely to be used. They are attacking each other’s face. This will affect the harmony of the classroom interaction. This is unfortunate due to the role of student as a good model for the other students. The impolite utterances as can be seen in the following excerpt.

Context: In the teaching learning process, A tried to disturb the girl outside

A: (suit suit (melihat cewek diluar kelas) (“Suit suit” (looking at the girl outside of class))
T: heii...
R: iss, udahlah ko kecil, jekel, hitam, mana adalah cewek yang mau sama kau (“Issss, you are small, ugly, black, no girl liked you’)
A: mana pulak (sambil ketawa) (“Of course no’ ( laughing))
OS: hoooo (menyoraki I) (“Hoooo ( cheering I))
T: (senyum) (smiling)
R: udalah kau gendut, bisinglah (“You’re fat, noisy’)
I: ihh

From the conversation above, lecturer was teaching in class TI V Regular Sore on Monday, November 6th, 2017 at 18.45. R (female) applied the negative impoliteness; condescend, scorn or ridicule, by saying udalah ko kecil, jekel, hitam, mana adalah cewek yang mau sama kau’ and ‘udalah kau gendut, paok pulak, bisinglah’ when looking at I(male) trying to disturb the girl outside.
As Culpeper stated, the utterances above showed that R (male) showed negative behavior and tried to damage the addressee’s negative face wants through condescend, scorn or ridicule. The R’s reason why she produced the impolite utterances was to get the power in which it occurs when there is an imbalance of social structural power. The application of impoliteness in classroom interaction can be worse if the teacher allows it to occur and supports the production of impolite utterances as occured in this phenomenon in which the teacher was just smilling when R attacked I. Besides that, this case proved that there is a finding which is different from the early studies by Lakoff (1975) about gender differences on language. He found that the woman produced less impolite in her speech events this case is supported by most past feminists researches by claiming that women use “powerless” speech, for example, using tentative language features such as tagquestions, deference, modality, hesitation and so on. It is assumed that women are necessarily ‘nicer’ than men that women choose to be more cooperative.

The examples above show that impolite utterances can be uttered by different gender; male or female. Besides that, it can be occurred in classroom interaction. This case could lead to disharmony among them, cause psychological trauma, or students will hold a grudge, and grow niche to vent anger and aggression against other students who are considered weak.

The unconsciousness of student in producing impoliteness during communication can affect to the other students’ mental and attitude. It can break down their mental. Not to mention, there is a tendency that students would unconsciously consider that this kind of behavior is acceptable and therefore try to imitate. They tend to produce impolite utterances and it will lead to the decrease of their value. In further process, it can cause to the less effective classroom interaction and influence the students’ achievement in communicative competence.

Based on the phenomena above, it is interesting to investigate the use of impoliteness strategies used in different gender as this area of study still remains unknown. Therefore, this area of the study is an intriguing academic inquiry and it will focus on the impoliteness strategies in classroom interaction used by the male and female students in order to find out the comparing on gender in applying the impoliteness strategies.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

a. Impoliteness Strategies

The concept of impoliteness is as opposite and negative politeness (Eelen, 2001: 98). When someone acts politely, he/ she is trying to get along with other people and try to ensure that their communication goes on smoothly, as the social goal of politeness is making sure that the social interaction runs smoothly (Watt, Ide and Ehlich: 1992). While, if someone wants to be impolite towards others, he/she is deliberately attacking others with his/her speech. In this case he/she wants to create a social interruption Culpeper (1996: 350). It can be seen from someone’s utterances when he tried to show his/ her impoliteness by producing his/her utterances for creating a social interruption. Then, when someone acts impolitely, he/she is breaking the rules of politeness as if there are no rules of politeness. In this case, he/she could not ruin it because it depends on the existence of impoliteness norms (Wardaugh, 1992: 274-275). In the other side, Herman (1995: 240) adds that interaction would not need to have the politeness rules, if there is no danger of social conflict. Therefore, the politeness rules are necessary to neutralize impoliteness.

According to Culpeper (1996:350) stated that impoliteness can be defined along similar with politeness but contrary lines; it is the use of strategies that are designed to have the opposite effect-that of social disruption, and it involves negative attitudes activated by in-context-behaviors which are associated, along with the person who gave rise to them, with impoliteness metalanguage (e.g. impolite, rude, discourteous, etc.). In this case, impoliteness can cause social conflict and disharmony between the speaker and the listener because they feel attacked by that way. Furthermore, the impolite could be interpreted, given suitable context, for instance, ‘You must have shit for brains’ in itive impoliteness for several reasons: ‘shit’ is a taboo word, the criticism is personalized through the use of ‘you’, and the speaker flouts the maxim of quality to implicate the impolite belief that the person referred to ‘has no intelligence’ Culpeper (2011: 23).

Culpeper (1996: 356) proposes five strategies of language impoliteness. These impoliteness strategies are a means of attacking the hearer’s face. They are:

1. **Bald on record impoliteness** is seen as typically being deployed where there is much face at stake, and where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer and/or where the speaker does not have the power to (safely) utter an impolite utterance. In this case, when someone wants to attack the interlocutors, she publicly attacked...
clearly and directly without any hesitation to her interlocutor. This is due to the intention of the speaker aware that the interlocutor does not have the power to defend itself in such irreverence. That is, the utterance is deployed in a direct, clear and unambiguous and concise way.

2. **Positive Impoliteness** is the use of strategies deployed to damage the recipient’s positive face wants. In this case, the positive face here is the desire of every individual to be respected, valued, wanted and needed by others. Here are some indicators stated by Culpeper (1996: 357) include: ignore, snub the other, exclude the other from the activity, disassociate from the other, bedisinterested, unconcerned, unsympatheti, use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, seek disagreement, make the other feel uncomfortable, use taboo words, and call the other names.

3. **Negative impoliteness** is the use of strategies deployed to damage the recipient’s negative face wants. The following are the indicators of negative impoliteness, namely: frighten, condescend, scorn, or ridicule, invade the other’s space, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronouns ‘I’ and ‘you’.

4. **Sarcasm or mock politeness** is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations. In this case, someone uses this strategy as follow threatening face done by applying politeness strategies that actually just pretending.

5. **Withhold politeness** realized through the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. In this case, it can be seen when someone prefers keep silent (fail to act) to act politeness one.

**b. Classroom Interaction**

The process of communicative involves interaction between at least two people who share the information. As stated by Wagner (1994: 8) that the concept of interaction is defined as reciprocal events that require at least two objects and two actions which occurred when these objects and events naturally influence the others. Furthermore, in doing the communicative approach, it is very important to make the students become more active in the classroom Allwright (1984: 156). This case can be achieved by reducing the amount of teachers talk and increasing the students talk time in classroom. It will make them to interact to the others in the classroom. In this case, teachers normally try to proceed onward of getting learners conversing with one another. Therefore, in order to achieve the communication, interaction must be mutual influence and does not occur only from one side. It means that interaction is the important thing in classroom interaction especially in teaching learning process.

Interaction can contribute to communicate through the provision of negative evidence and the opportunity to modify the output Ellis and Foto (1999: 09). This case can be found in classroom interaction as there are three kinds of classroom interaction, namely teacher to student, student to teacher, student to student.

**3. RESEARCH METHOD**

The study applies descriptive qualitative research design by describing the phenomena of language in society. This research design is used to fulfill the criteria of descriptive adequacy and explanatory adequacy based on Culpeper’s impoliteness theory (1996) by collecting the data, transcribing the utterances used by male and female students in classroom interaction.

The population used in this study is the fifth year students of STMIK Pelita Nusantara. Therefore, the writer took one class of the population as the sample for this study. Random sampling was used in this study. In taking the sample, the writer provided five pieces of paper into a box, in which one of them is written the word “sample” while on the others, are not. Then, the writer asked the chairman of each class to take the folded paper from the box. The chairman which took the paper written “sample” in it is selected as the sample of the study. Therefore, class TI V Regular Sore has been chosen randomly and it was selected as the sample of the study.

The data of this study was the impolite utterances which had been gathered from the transcript of conversation the students in classroom interaction.

The technique of data collection in this study was documentation. After transcribing the utterances, the researcher would sort the utterances which are considered in language impoliteness in order to determine the impolite utterances categorized as the data. Then, the researcher would document the impolite utterances by copying them into the the documentary sheet. The last, the utterances would be analyzed as well.

Instrument of data collection in this study was recording. This study would use a tool or equipment in collecting the data such as camera digital to record the conversation during interacting in the classroom and laptop to transcribe the results of recording.
The data were be analyzed through interactive model of Bogdan and Biklen (1982: 145). It was analyzed by doing some steps as can be seen in he following steps: (1) Organizing and breaking the data into manageable units. (2) Synthesizing the data. (3)Searching for patterns and discovering what was important and what was to be learned. (4) Deciding what will be told others.

### FINDINGS

#### a. Types of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Male and Female Students

After analyzing the data, it was found that there were 104 occurrences of language impoliteness in which each show the types of the impoliteness strategies used by male and female student in the classroom interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of Impoliteness Strategy</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bald on Record Impoliteness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Positive Impoliteness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Negative Impoliteness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sarcasm or Mock Politeness</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Withhold Politeness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 3 observation in the classroom, there were five types of impoliteness strategies that could be found in the classroom interaction, namely 1) bald on record impoliteness, 2) positive impoliteness, 3) negative impoliteness, 4) sarcasm or mock politeness, and 5) withhold politeness. It can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impoliteness Types</th>
<th>Male Students’ Utterances</th>
<th>Female Students’ Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bald on</td>
<td>bagus-bagus, matamu, aku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following points would provide the analysis of the impoliteness forms found in the data.

#### b. Bald on Record Impoliteness (BRI)

There were 3 expressions of Bald on Record Impoliteness (BRI) expressed by male and female students in classroom interaction. Male produced more than female; 2 expression produced by male while 1 expression produced by female. Culpeper (1996) stated bald on record impoliteness is seen as typically deployed where there is much face at stake, and the speaker’s intention to attack the hearer’s face. In this case, one attacked the others clearly and directly.

The following data showed that male and female students expressed Bald on Record Impoliteness in the classroom interaction. It can be seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impoliteness Types</th>
<th>Male Students’ Utterances</th>
<th>Female Students’ Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bald on</td>
<td>bagus-bagus, matamu, aku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Male Student**

**Context**
: NB lashed a book to RD and MRP and it made RD become angry. RD spoke up seriously with a loud tone voice.

**NB**:
: (membanting buku memberi ke wawa dan reza)

**RD**: bagus-bagus kali kau ting

(A3: 602-604)

2) **Female Student**

**Context**
: AM came in to the class and did not care that TR2 had been in the class. AM, worn a messy shirt, came into the class while knocking the door that invited RD to mock him. Whereas TR2 did not respond her.

**NB**: pinjemlah pulpenmu

**DA**: matamu, aku pakek apa.

(A2: 127)

Based on the described data above, it can be seen that there are many cases that make a person attack directly and clearly. This can be seen from the data that have been described above where in the classroom the impolite utterances was found. In this case, students produced impolite utterances directly and clearly which can be categorized that male and female students produced bald on record impoliteness in interacting in the classroom.

### c. Positive Impoliteness (PI)

Of 3 videos analyzed, there were 19 expressions of positive impoliteness (PI) found. There were 6 expressions produced by male students, whereas female students produced 13 expressions of positive impoliteness. The positive impoliteness damages the recipient’s positive face wants (Culpeper, 1996). In this case, it was produced by male and female students in the classroom interaction. They produced the positive impoliteness in many ways as Culpeper (1996) stated that there were some indicators in applying the positive impoliteness strategy, namely: 1) ignores or snub the other, 2) exclude the other from the activity, 3) disassociate from the other, 4) be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, 5) use inappropriate identity markers, 6) use obscure or secretive language, 7) seek disagreement, 8) make the other feel uncomfortable, 9) use taboo words, and 10) call the other names.

The following expressions represent this strategy found in the data used by student in interacting in the classroom. In the following data, there were some data which indicated that students applied the positive impoliteness in showing their disagreement. It can be seen below.

#### 1) **Male Student**

**Context**
: TR1 listened MYA reading carefully, she heard a voice whispering from DA and NB. When asked, they did not admit it, even charges of. Then, she saw AM was talking to stool friends

**TR1**:
: udah kau akbar, sini (‘Have you finished, akbar, come here’)

**AM**:
: kok akulagi buk? (‘Why it is always me, mam?’)

**TR1**:
: ya suruh siapa ko ngomong. Sini kau. (‘Then who told you to always speak. You come here.’)

**AM**:
: (maju ke depan) (‘going forward’)

(A1: 667/ A4:34)

It was seen clearly that the students soughted disagreement by saying “kok akulagi buk?”. It also can be categorized in positive impoliteness as Culpeper stated that there were some indicators which showed positive impoliteness and it was one of them. Related to this data, TR1 was furious because she heard a voice whispering from DA and NB and looked at AM talking to the friend beside her. Then, TR1 called him to read again with pointing AM with her left hand. In this case, AM soughted disagreement when TR1 asked him to read again, and he uttered “kok akulagi buk?”.

#### 2) **Female Student**

**Context**
: NB asked to TR2 about what material would be learned.

**NB**:
: pak, jadi kita belajar apa ini pak? (‘sir,what will we study sir?’)

**TR2**:
: hapal kelen do’a sholat selesai sholat duha? (‘do you remember the prayings after performing duha prayer?’)

**DA**:
: babak pun, bagus ngerjain soal semester pak. (‘sir, much better if we do the questions for the test sir.’)

**TR2**:
: kan itu udah kelen siapkan (‘But you have done them.’)

**NB**:
: belom siap (‘not yet’)

(A2: 161/ A4:51)

This data also showed that male and female student utilized the positive impoliteness in her speech. It can be seen from student’s utterances “babak pun, bagus ngerjain soal semester pak”. It started from DA’s question about what material would be learned. When TR2 asked students to memorize Dhuha prayer, DA expressed her sense of disapproval immediately.
with a loud voice of TR2’s answer, in which it made TR2 becomes angry. In this case, the students also applied seek disagreement in uttering the impolite utterances.

Based on the data found, not only male but also female student produced the positive impoliteness in all of the Culpeper’s indicators, it included the interaction between student to teacher.

d. Negative Impoliteness (NI)

During interaction in the classroom, negative impoliteness was also found. As stated by Culpeper (1996), negative impoliteness was the use of strategies deployed to damage the recipient’s negative face wants. In applying the negative impoliteness, there were some indicators, namely: 1) frighten, 2) condescend, scorn, or ridicule, 3) invade the other’s space, 4) explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect, and 5) put the other’s indebtedness on record. There were 15 expressions found in the data of negative impoliteness as explained in the following in which 7 expressions produced by male, meanwhile female produced more than male, 8 expressions. It can be seen in the following excerpt.

1) Male Student

Context: MRP was angry because DDC threw a soap to MRP.

DDC : (melempar sabun ke arah ridaaan) (‘throwing soap to Riduan’)

MRP : ho kakak cengkal kau ya, tengok kau ya keluar

(‘Ho you stubborn old man, watch yourself out’)

DDC : bising kali kau (‘you’re so noisy’)

(A3:606 / A4:89)

Interaction between student to student also produced the impolite utterances as seen in the data above in which MRP uttered “tengok kau ya keluar main-main ko ya’” showed that he frightened DDC. It started when DDC threw a soap to MRP and it made MRP became angry. In expressing his emotion, he said “tengok kau ya” to DDC as if he frightened MRP to beat up him until died. Not only those, condescend, scorn, or ridicule also applied in students’ interaction as explained in the following data.

The negative impoliteness was also applied in interaction between student to student also happened in the classroom. It can be seen in the following data.

2) Female Student

Context: AM came to NB to cheat the NB’s answer, but NB did not want it occurred, therefore she condescend AM who has big body and low attitude).

NB : awas lah kau gendut, nyontek aja pun kerja kau, kebiasaan. (‘Beware you fat. You can only cheat. That’s your habit’)

AM : L aja loh bi’ (‘only 1, bi’)

(A2: 226/ A4:54)

Context: ML got emotion because DCS throw a pen to ML where ML was reading Al-qur’an. With a high voice, she condescend DCS in expressing her emotion)

DCS : (melemper pulpen) (‘throwing a pen’)

ML : kau ni emanglah idiot ko, kakek lah ko, becak ko (‘you are idiot, you old man, you becak’)

DCS : apa ko ngejek ngejek? (‘What’s with the mocking?’)

(A2: 429, 431/ A4: 66)

Of data 2 and 3 above, it really seen that female student attacked the other student in applying condescend, scorn, or ridicule as indicators of negative impoliteness. The utterances of “awas lah kau gendut, nyontek aja pun kerja kau, kebiasaan” and “kau ni emanglah idiot ko, kakek lah ko, becak ko” were the impolite utterances showed negative impoliteness. In this case, the student tend to condescend, scorn, or ridicule to express her/ his feelings because of her/his emotion. As in the second data, NB got angry because AM cheated her answer. With a high voice, she directly condescend AM whose big body and bad attitude which always cheat to the other by saying “awas lah kau gendut, nyontek aja pun kerja kau, kebiasaan”. Similar like the third data, ML also expressed her angry by saying “idiot, kakek, and becak” which meant that DCS is idiot and stupid because throw carelessly. And she condescend DCS’ parents job, tukang becak. It was really bad utterances which should not be used in the classroom interaction.

e. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness (SP or MP)

Having analyzed the data, 64 expressions of sarcasm or mock politeness by the male and female students were found in the three videos. There were 42 expressions produced by male and 22 expressions produced by female students. Sarcasm or mock politeness is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations. In this case, someone uses this strategy as follow threatening face done by applying politeness strategies that actually just pretending (Culpeper: 1996).
Not only male but also female student mocked the others in the classroom interaction. In the following would provide the sarcasm or mock politeness expressed by student.

1. Male Student

**Context**
AR asked permission to TR2 even though he just went out. AR made TR2 become angry because he asked his permission continuously.

**AR**
kebelet loh pak, masak permisi gak boleh pak, ya pak, permisi gak boleh, udah pulang aja kelen semua ('I was caught short sir, you don’t want to give the permission, yes sir, you all just go home')

**RD**
ngelawan kali kau ('you’re so impolite')

**TR2**
(diam tidak memberi izin) ('silent and do not give the permission')

(A2: 356/ A4: 63)

The data provided above showed that male student mocked the teacher. It can be seen from the utterances produced by male student in which he said “permisi gak boleh, udah pulang aja kelen semua”. It can be categorized in mock politeness because the student mocked teacher by repeating teacher’s utterances. It can be seen in the data that AR made TR2 become angry and said with a low tone and used his hand to send AM go home. In this case, AR mocked TR3 by repeating TR2’s utterances with his high tone and smile face while pointing the other students in the classroom.

Then, the last occurrence was the expression of sarcasm or mock politeness produced by student in the classroom interaction. It can be seen in the following.

2. Female Student

**Context**

: NB sang a song in the classroom for mocking RD because his father’s name was juned. He sang that song while dancing.

**NB**

(juned ned ned ned ned jedun jedun ned ned (menyanyi sambil mengejek nama orang tua reza)) ('juned ned ned ned ned juned ned ned ned' (singing while mocking Reza’s father’s name))

**RD**

:sere sere sere sere sere jualan jus , jus jus jus jus (menyanyi)

sambil mengejek nabillah) ('sere sere sere sere sere selling juice jualan jus jus jus jus' (singing while mocking Nabilla))

(A2: 286/ A4: 58)

By the data above, the utterances of “juned ned ned ned ned jedun jedun ned ned” in the second data can be categorized in mock politeness because the female student expressed it for purposing to mock the other students. In this case, they tended to use a song in mocking the others as can be seen of the data. Related to these data, in the data, NB mocked RD by singing a song for purposing to mock RD’s father name, juned.

f. Withhold Politeness (WP)

Withhold politeness realized through the absence of politeness work where it would be expected (Culpeper: 1996). In this case, it can be seen when someone prefers keep silent (fail to act) to act politeness one. There were 3 data, 2 expressions produced by male and 1 expression produced by female, that could point out the withhold politeness in the classroom interaction.

Not only male but also female student applied the withhold politeness in interacting in the classroom. It can be seen the data below.

1) Male Student

**Context**

: AP tried to get TR2’s permission so that he could go to the toilet. Fact, he went out directly without getting TR2’s permission.

**AP**

(pak permisi ya pak (langsung keluar)) ('excuse me sir' (go out directly))

**TR2**

(diam tidak merespon dan sibuk membaca) ('silent, do not respond and busy to reading')

(A2: 86/A4: 45)

2) Female Student

**Context**

: TR2 expressed her anger by going out. When he walked out, she spoke with low tone as if condescending the students while moving his hand to ask the students getting permission. TR2 was emotion because of looking the bad students’ attitude.

**DA**

: pak, kita ngapain pak? Kok dari tadi diem ajah pak?

**TR2**

: ribut kali kelen, udah pergi semua, udah pergi semua, (pergi keluar kelas karena kesal melihat siswa sedikit di kelas dan pada keluar) (A2: 95-102)
From the data, it could be understood that male and female student also produced withheld politeness in his action. Actually the utterances of “pak permissi ya pak” and “pak, kita ngapain pak? Kok dari tadi diem aja pak?” are the polite utterances but because they were supported by impolite utterances, it can be categorized in withhold politeness in which there was an absence of polite act.

5. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data, conclusions are drawn as the following. There were 5 types of impoliteness strategy used by male and female students in the classroom interaction, namely 1) bald on record impoliteness, 2) positive impoliteness, 3) negative impoliteness, 4) sarcasm or mock politeness, and 5) withhold politeness. Sarcasm or mock politeness was the most dominant strategies used by male and female students in the classroom interaction and the least strategies were bald on record impoliteness and withhold politeness. Commonly male students is the more frequent produced impolite utterances than female students did. In addition, there was a new indicator which showed that the using of pronoun “I and You” could not be categorized as an indicator in applying the negative impoliteness because it was common case in Indonesia culture, especially in North Sumatera.
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