



Teachers' Impoliteness Strategies in Providing Feedback in a Microteaching Class

Rita Erlinda

Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Batusangkar, Indonesia. E-mail: ritaerlinda@iainbatusangkar.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Impoliteness strategy;
microteaching class; feedback

How to cite:

Erlinda, R. (2022). Teachers' Impoliteness Strategy in Giving Feedback in Microteaching Class. *Langkawi Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 8(2), 98-114

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v0i0.3936>

History:

Submitted: 2022-05-10
Revised: 2022-11-26;
Accepted: 2022-12-12
Published: 2022-12-28

ABSTRACT

The study discusses the impoliteness strategies used by the lecturers when giving feedback to the student-teachers in Microteaching classes. This study adopted a qualitative approach with a documentary analysis design. Data were gathered through recorded classroom interaction from eight microteaching classes when the lecturers gave comments and feedback to the student-teachers. Data were analyzed by using the theory of linguistic impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (2005, 2011). This study's findings show that the lecturers employed positive, negative, and off-record impoliteness strategies when they give comments and feedback on student-teachers' teaching performances. The significant findings of this study show three types of impoliteness strategies employed by the lecturers. Firstly, a positive impoliteness strategy was manifested in three strategies: using inappropriate identity markers, seeking disagreement, and using a derogatory name to call the hearer's name. Secondly, the negative impoliteness strategy was realized in three strategies, such as frightening-instill a belief that action detrimental to others will occur, condescending, scorn, or ridicule in three forms, by emphasizing power, using diminutive to hearer's position, and by belittling, and explicitly associating hearer with negative aspects. Lastly, off-record politeness was found in two different strategies: criticizing-dispraise hearer and hindering-deny turn. This study demonstrates that the lecturers need to consider their utterances in giving comments and feedback to student-teacher because they can impact unpleasant feelings on the lecturers personally and demotivate the students to gain teaching skills better.

1. Introduction

Microteaching is a well-organized teaching training program for prospective teachers with several characteristics, including short lesson plans, a small number of students and short time implementation. Besides, teaching performances are recorded, reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated to provide feedback to prospective teachers (Reddy, 2019) to master basic teaching skills (Sofyan et al., 2019). The microteaching aims to build teaching skills for prospective teachers by providing opportunities to practice teaching skills (Önal, 2019; Bahjat, 2016), by providing more simple teaching and learning situations, learning and practicing at the same time, and providing simulation situations to students (Nugraheni, 2019). The stages or cycles of learning activities in microteaching classes include planning, teaching, criticizing, re-planning, re-teaching, and re-criticizing (Önal, 2019).

In microteaching classes, providing feedback is a crucial stage. In giving feedback, lecturers and peer students provide information to student-teachers about their weaknesses and strengths when practicing teaching skills (Reddy, 2019; Skakunova, 2017). The feedback given must be constructive and based on the results

of observations (Reddy, 2019). However, feedback delivered by lecturers in the Microteaching class is a form of asymmetrical interaction between lecturers and students, one of which can be seen from their turn to speak (Sari, 2020). Lecturers have stronger power than students (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Niño, 2014; Elmabruk & Etarhuni, 2021). The asymmetry of the relationship between lecturers and students allows lecturers to use impoliteness language in delivering feedback (Mirador, 2014; Culpeper & Tantucci, 2021). Providing feedback delivered aggressively with language that attacks the face will impact the feelings of students who feel embarrassed or humiliated so that the purpose of the feedback is not achieved (Ralph, 2014; Skakunova, 2017).

Linguistic impoliteness is a verbal communication strategy that intentionally and aggressively intends to offend the hearers, resulting in disharmony or damage to social relations (Culpeper, 2011; Culpeper & Hardaker, 2017; Locher & Bousfield, 2008; Terkourafi, 2015). Verbal communication is considered impolite if it fulfills two conditions, namely (1) the speaker intentionally attacks the face of the interlocutor, (2) the speech partner perceives that the speaker is deliberately attacking his face, and (3) a combination of the first and second situations (Bousfield, 2008).

Linguistic impoliteness can be expressed through five types of strategies, namely (1) Bald on record impoliteness, (2) positive impoliteness, (3) negative impoliteness, (4) off-record impoliteness, and (5) withhold impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996, 2005; Bousfield, 2008). Bald on record impoliteness is a language politeness strategy where the speaker, through his speech, deliberately attacks the face of the interlocutor, and the listener does not have the authority to reply. Positive impoliteness is a verbal communication strategy in which the hearer deliberately denies the interlocutors' positive face, namely the hearer's desire to be accepted as a person who wants to be respected. Negative impoliteness is a language politeness strategy that intentionally denies the hearer's negative face, namely the desire of the speech partner to be free to do what he wants. This strategy is usually manifested through threatening, ridiculing, condescending, etc. Off-record impoliteness can be interpreted as a verbal communication strategy intended to indirectly attack the interlocutor's face by involving conversational implicatures. Finally, withhold impoliteness is a verbal communication strategy in which the speech partner accidentally does not use verbal politeness markers that should be used in a conversation, for example, thanking the person who gave the gift (Culpeper, 1996, 2005; Bousfield, 2008).

So far, studies that examine linguistics impoliteness tend to chart four issues. First, linguistic impoliteness in literary works such as films (Benabdellah, 2018; Dynel, 2016; Mirhosseini, Mardanshahi, & Dowlatabadi, 2017; Baldó, 2019), novels (Paternoster, 2012; Rahmani et al., 2016; Waliyadin, 2016). Second, linguistic impoliteness in humor discourse (Dynel, 2016; Dynel & Poppi, 2019; Kotthoff, 2009; Mavrigiannaki, 2020; Sinkeviciute, 2013). Third, linguistic impoliteness in comments and tweets on social media (Anwar, 2019; Bustan & Alakrash, 2020; Shaari & Kamaluddin, 2019; Shinta, Wahyuni, & Padang, 2018; Subyantoro & Apriyanto, 2020; Teneketzi, 2021; Vladimirova & House, 2018). Fourth, linguistic impoliteness in-class interactions, such as conflicting conversations in class discussions (Dobs, 2014; Santamaría-García, 2017), and written feedback (Stewart, 2015). From several studies

on linguistics impoliteness on various discourses, no study has discussed linguistic impoliteness in the interaction of lecturers and students in the Microteaching class. This shows that the study of linguistic impoliteness used by lecturers in providing feedback on students' teaching performance in the Microteaching class is interesting to do.

This article aims to complement the results of the study of linguistic impoliteness as one of the discourses in which the participants have an asymmetrical position, namely the interaction between lecturers and students in the Microteaching class, in particular, to map out the language impoliteness strategies used by lecturers in providing feedback. In line with that, this paper focuses its study on what lecturers use forms of impoliteness strategies in providing feedback in the Microteaching class.

This research is very important to do to prove that the impoliteness of the lecturer's language when conveying criticism and evaluation of the teaching performance of students who are practicing teaching skills in Microteaching class can embarrass students so it will affect the motivation and enthusiasm of students to practice for the better performance. Even, it can cause a feeling of displeasure with the lecturer personally. Therefore, the lecturer's communication strategy in conveying criticism or evaluation of the student's teaching performance can be conveyed politely without attacking the student's face by not demeaning the student's personality, but focusing on things that need to be improved based on the results of observations on the students' teaching performance.

2. Methods

This study examines linguistic impoliteness strategies in interactions between lecturers and students in Microteaching courses. The use of language impoliteness in class interactions studied in a pragmalinguistic approach (Leech, 1989) shows the communication competence of lecturers in providing criticism or evaluation of teaching performances and teaching materials for students as prospective English teachers. Through linguistic impoliteness strategies, lecturers show how a lecturer interacts with students in an asymmetrical relationship, where lecturers have more power than students. This can make lecturers attack students' faces in interactions, especially when lecturers convey criticism, evaluation, or feedback to students.

This study used a qualitative method with a documentary analysis design (Creswell, 2012). This study relied on primary data in the form of lecturer utterances which contain linguistic impoliteness strategies that occurred in interactions between lecturers and students in the Microteaching class. The research data were obtained by recording the interaction of lecturers when they provided comments and criticism of teaching performance and lesson plans from nine Microteaching groups in the English Teaching Department of IAIN Batusangkar for the 2019/2020 academic year. A lecturer instructor taught each group of Microteaching consisting of 8-10 students.

The data collection process was carried out by assigning students who are participants in Microteaching to record the interaction of lecturers and students in their Microteaching groups using students' mobile phones. In addition, students assigned as data collectors asked permission from the lecturer to record the feedback given by the lecturers because it will make it easier for them to make improvements to teaching performance and revise lesson plans based on comments or notes of improvement given by the lecturers.

The data recordings were then transcribed and analyzed by following the three stages of qualitative data analysis (Miles et al., 2014; Miles & Huberman, 1994) – data condensation/reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions & verification. By consulting the theory of impoliteness strategies initiated by (Culpeper, 1996, 2005), utterances containing linguistic impoliteness strategies were coded according to the type of impoliteness strategy. Each type of impoliteness strategy found was given a different color. This was done to make it easier for researchers to classify linguistic impoliteness strategies. Next, impoliteness strategies were presented in the table according to their types. Furthermore, the data that has been classified were analyzed and interpreted.

3. Findings

The results show that there are three realizations of linguistic impoliteness strategies that occur in the interactions of lecturers and pre-service students in the Microteaching class, namely (1) realization of positive impoliteness strategies, (2) realization of negative impoliteness strategies, and (3) realization of off-record impoliteness strategies.

3.1. Positive Impoliteness Strategies

A Positive impoliteness strategy is a verbal communication strategy that intentionally offends the interlocutor by attacking his cheerful face. In providing feedback to students, there were three ways that lecturers attacked students' positive faces, namely (a) using inappropriate identity markers, (b) seeking disagreement, and (c) using a derogatory name to call the hearer's name.

3.1.1. Using inappropriate identity markers

The positive impoliteness strategy used by lecturers was addressing the students using their unactual identities with an unusual tone of voice. When providing comments and feedback, the lecturer addressed the students with Mr. (*Bapak*), Miss (*Ibuk*), as shown in the following data excerpt (1-4).

- (1) Lecturer : ...*Tidak usah bilang eeee kalau salah. Lanjut saja, jangan ketahuan kalau **bapak** itu salah. Jadi, steps dalam rpp seperti ini, namun salah dalam praktek urutan. Tidak boleh memperlihatkan kesalahan kita...
[...Don't say eeee if you are wrong. Go ahead, don't give sign if **Bapak** doing wrong. So, the steps in RPP are like this, but in practice, the sequence of activities is wrong. Don't show our mistakes....]*
- Student : [diam saja]
[just silent]

In the data excerpt (1), the lecturer provided feedback to students to convey the mistakes made by a student in teaching practice. The student said *..eeee salah..* when he made a mistake while chuckling. When conveying feedback to the students, the lecturer addressed the student with the greeting of *Bapak* (Mr.) using a distinctive intonation. The lecturer addressed him by a nickname when interacting with students before giving feedback. Lecturer called her student *Bapak* in the data excerpt (1) "*don't get caught if Bapak (you) are wrong*". This utterance is intended to inform us that when making mistakes in the learning process, try not to be known by others because of our doubts.

- (2) Lecturer : ... Berikutnya, **Ibuk** banyak menghadap ke papan tulis nampaknya
[...Next, it seems *Ibuk* is facing the blackboard a lot]
Student : [diam saja]
[just keep silent]

The context of the data example (2) is that the lecturer provided comments and feedback to students who tried to apply teaching skills, but she has not applied teaching skills according to the lecturer's direction. The lecturer commented on some of the mistakes made by the student. One of them was the student who mostly faced the blackboard during teaching performance. The lecturer gave feedback to the student by addressing her as *Ibuk* with a different intonation and voice pressure than usual.

- (3) Lecturer : ***Ibuk korupsi buk, 4 menit lewatnyo buk.***
[*Ibuk did corruption, buk, 4 minutes passed, buk*]
Student : Ya Buk
[Yes, Miss]

The data excerpt (3) context is that the lecturer provided feedback to the student when the student implemented the lesson plans past the set time limit. In addition, the lecturer greeted the student as *Ibuk* while she was laughing. This is used to insinuate that student-teachers always remember the time allotted when they appear to teach.

- (4) Lecturer : ... Sourcesnya apa, headlinenya apa, sehingga anak betul-betul sanggup memutuskan untuk membuat sebuah teks berita yang akurat. Jadi kalau tidak lengkap untuk apa **buk reni** suruh karena nanti nilainya tidak sempurna, iya kan? Nah, Buk Ren.... Itu yang bisa ibu komentari.
[... What sources, and what headlines, so that students can decide to make an accurate "news" text. So, if it's not complete, why do you ask *buk reni* because later the score won't be perfect? Well, Miss Ren.... That's all I can comment on.]
Student : [diam]
[silent]

The context of the data excerpt (4) is that the lecturer provided comments and feedback to the student whom she deemed were still not applying appropriate steps in practicing the skills of explaining the lesson. The lecturer has reprimanded the student concerned for the same thing several times. Lecturers hoped the same mistakes should not happen again. When the error occurred again, the lecturer greeted the students with the greeting *Buk Reni* with an unusual tone of voice.

3.1.2. Seeking Disagreement

The realization of the positive impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer in giving feedback to the student in teaching performance by showing disagreement with the interlocutor can be seen in the data excerpt (5)-(7), as follows:

- (5) Lecturer : So, do you think that in greeting cards, they will use 'headache' and 'wash'? So, building vocabulary means you need to familiarize your students with the target vocabulary used in your material, ya! Jadi

kalau menurut ibu tidak ada hubungannya antara kata should, wash, headache dengan apa yang akan dikerjakan oleh siswamu.

[So, do you think that in the greeting card, they will use 'headache' or 'wash'? So, building vocabulary means you need to familiarize your students with the target vocabulary used in your material, OK! So if you think there is no relationship between the words, like "should", "wash", "headache" and what your students will do.]

Student : [diam]
[silent]

The data excerpt (5) context is that the lecturer provided comments and feedback to students when they implemented their lesson plans, especially in building their vocabulary. Student-teacher used a vocabulary game for greeting card learning material, but according to the lecturer, the vocabularies used in the game were not relevant to the learning material. The lecturer used the question, "*do you think that in greeting cards they will use 'headache,' they will use 'wash'?*" to show her disapproval of the student-teacher. Then the lecturer confirmed her disagreement by saying, "*According to Ibu (me), there is no relationship between the words 'should', 'wash' and 'headache' with what your students will do.*"

(6) Lecturer : *Yang short message itu...untuk siapa tadi Anda jelaskan? Untuk anak SMA?*

[the short message is...for whom did you explain? For high school students?]

Student : *anak SMP kelas Sembilan*

[the ninth grade of junior high school students]

Lecturer : *Yang Anda ajar anak SMP kelas 9. Perlu Anda membahas selimuuut, ada product, ada selling dan segala macam? Aneh!*

[Did you teach the 9th-grade junior high school students? Do you need to discuss blankets, products, selling, and other things? **Strange!**]

Student : [diam]

The context of the data excerpt (6) is that the lecturer provides comments and feedback on the selection of teaching materials displayed by student-teachers. The lecturer thinks that the material chosen by the student-teacher is irrelevant for grade 9. The lecturer showed his disagreement by asking, "*Do you need to discuss blankets, products, selling, and all kinds of things?*" He ended his question with the word "**Strange**". This shows that the lecturer hopes that the student should not use the chosen material for grade 9.

(7) Lecturer : *You mengkaji tentang?*

[What did you discuss?]

Student : *Describing people*

Lecturer : *Describing people. Dan itu ada percakapan di sana.*

[and there was a conversation there]

Student : *Ya Pak*

[Yes, Sir]

Lecturer : *Kalau dari segi medianya bagus, dari segi warnanya OK, karena memang itu sudah dirancang oleh orang-orang yang bagus untuk*

itu. Nah... kendalanya adalah ketika ini diberikan pada kelas 8, cara ngomongnya terlalu cepat, iya tidak?

[In terms of media, it's good; in terms of color, it's OK, because it's been designed by good people for it. Well... the problem is that when it's given for the 8th grade, the way of speaking is too fast, isn't it?]

Student : Ya Pak
[Yes, Sir]

The context of the data excerpt (7) is that the lecturer provided comments and feedback to the student-teacher about the Listening learning materials and media downloaded from the internet. The lecturer thought that the learning material was not suitable for grade 8 because the dialogue in the recording was too fast, so the students would not be able to listen to the text. The lecturer expressed his disapproval by saying, "*the media is good, the color is OK, but the problem is when it is given to grade 8, the way of speaking is too fast*". This shows that the lecturer hopes that student-teacher should not use the recording in their learning.

(8) Lecturer : *...tetapi yang tidak saya suka adalah anda terlalu malas memindahkannya ke dalam format power point. Itu sangat memalukan.*

[...but what I don't like is that **you are too lazy** to convert it into powerpoint format. **That's so embarrassing.**]

Student : Ya Pak
[Yes, Sir]

The data excerpt (8) context is that the lecturer provides feedback on the student's performance in implementing the lesson plan. In implementing the lesson plan, the student-teacher shows the lesson plans by using LCD in the classroom. Consequently, the students could read the lesson plan. The lecturer thought that it was not appropriate to do by the student-teacher. He suggested to the students that it should not be done by the students when they were practicing the lesson plan.

3.1.3. Using a derogatory name to call the hearer's name

The positive impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer, namely by addressing student-teachers by using a derogatory name, can be described in the data excerpt (9) as follows:

(9) Lecturer : *...tapi ada satu yang mau ibuk komentari di luar itu ya... you jika anak sekolah ini banyak perhatiannya terhadap guru ya, tapi apa you itu jangan membuat apa...*

[...but there is one thing I want to comment on outside of that, right... you, if this schoolchild pays much attention to the teacher, yes, but what are you doing...]

Student : Ya mis.
[Yes, Miss]

Lecturer : *... gelang you itu agak apa... agak gaul gitu.*

[... what kind of your bracelet is that... it's a bit slang.]

Student : Ya mis.
[Yes Miss]

- Lecturer : *Eeee...ibuk-ibuk gaul. Kita kan udah mahasiswa ya jadi ya nggak apa-apa, tapi kalau siswa bisa mengganggu mereka, jadi mereka hanya memperhatikan gelang you aja.*
[Eeee... you are slang. We're already students, so that's okay, but if the students can disturb them, they only pay attention to your bracelet.]
- Student : [diam]
[silent]

The context of the data excerpt (9) is a lecturer gave comments on the bracelet accessories worn by students. The lecturer considered the bracelet an accessory that is unsuitable for a prospective teacher to use in a classroom in front of high school students. The lecturer associates student practitioners who use the bracelet with something negative, like “*slang mommy*”. The lecturer hoped that, as prospective teachers, the students should learn to dress like a teacher.

3.2. Negative Impoliteness strategy

A negative politeness strategy is a speaker's expression or speech that threatens the hearers' negative face. A negative face is a person's need to be independent, free to do something and not imposed by others. In this study, what is meant by a negative impoliteness strategy is the speech of the lecturers that has implications for students of feeling depressed due to the illocutionary force of the lecturers' utterances when giving comments or feedback on the teaching performance of the students in the Microteaching class.

Based on data analysis, there are three types of negative impoliteness strategies used by the lecturers in giving comments and feedback to student-teachers in the Microteaching class, namely (a) threatening the interlocutor that something bad could happen (frighten—instill a belief that actions detrimental to other will occur), (b) asserting the speaker's power to the hearers (emphasize own power), and (c) using speech that is intended to demean the hearers (use diminutive to others' position).

3.2.1. *Frightening – instill a belief that action detrimental to other will occur*

The negative impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer by threatening the interlocutor is presented in the data excerpt (10)-(11), as follows:

- (10) Lecturer : *Bagi saya, kalau kreativitas nan indak ado, ndak akan saya luluskan, serius ko. Kalau kreativitas nan kalian tahan-tahan, pelit dalam menyediakan media dalam belajar mengajar, ndak kan ibu luluskan do tu.*
[For me, if there is no creativity, You will not pass this subject, seriously. On the other hand, if you hold on to your creativity, you are stingy in providing media for teaching and learning, **You won't pass this course?**]
- Student : [diam saja]
[just keep silent]

The context of the data excerpt (10) is that the lecturer provides input and feedback on the appearance of the student practitioners when implementing her lesson plan that was not accompanied by learning media. In previous performances, the lecturer has repeatedly reminded the students concerned to use the media to help her students understand the learning material. However, until the ongoing meeting when this data (10) occurred, the student did not heed it. The lecturer thought that the

student did not want to improve her teaching ability, so she made a threat, as in the data (10).

- (11) Lecturer : ...*Sekarang jujur sama ibu, X (nama mahasiswa) parah banget lo X. Kenapa you tidak menggunakan teknologi dalam mengajar?*
[...Now being honest with your lecturer, X (student name) is bad X. Why don't you use technology in teaching?]
- Student : *materinya nama-nama hari bu*
[the material is the names of the days, ma'am]
- Lecturer : *Ibu tidak menanyakan materi, kenapa you tidak pakai laptop ketika mengajar? Memang gak punya, karena nggak mau atau memang gimana?*
[I didn't ask for the material, why don't you use a laptop when teaching? You don't have one, or because you don't want to or what?]
- Student : *Dengan gambar bisa bu.*
[Pictures can be used, ma'am.]
- Lecturer : *Stop you ngomong, you kalau tidak mau pakai teknologi dalam mengajar you sampai di sini saja micro teaching, you nggak akan saya luluskan, apapun alasan you.*
[Stop talking, if you don't want to use technology in teaching, you just stop here with this microteaching, I won't pass you, whatever your reasons.]
- Student : [diam saja]
[silent]
- Lecturer : ... *Besok kan you mau rekaman untuk komprehensif ndak, itu satu-satunya harapan you, kalau ndak jua berubah, you ulang micro teaching baliak, Ibu serius.*
[... Tomorrow, you want to record your teaching for comprehensive teaching or not, that will be just for your hope. If it doesn't change, you must repeat the microteaching class next year, I'm serious.]

The data excerpt (11) context is that the lecturer provided comments and feedback to a student who never used a laptop in her teaching performance. When the lecturer asked why she did not use a laptop, students answered that it could be done with pictures. The lecturer considered that the images used in the pictures were not suitable and relevant to the learning material. Whereas the material being taught was the names of the days in English. The lecturer hoped that the student-teacher use the laptop because she could play songs about the names of the days, etc. However, the lecturer felt the student did not want to try her best to compile and present quality learning. This was what caused the lecturer to speak in a threatening tone to students with the phrase, "*if you don't want to use technology in teaching, you just come here for microteaching. I will make you do not pass this course, whatever your reasons*".

3.2.2. *Condescend, scorn or ridicule*

There are three types of negative impoliteness strategies that fall into this category, namely (a) speakers assert the power to their speech partners (emphasize their own power), (b) speakers use their speech to demean the hearer's position (use diminutive to other's position) and (c) speakers minimize the role of the speech partner (belittle).

3.2.2.1. *Condescend, scorn or ridicule by emphasizing own power*

The negative impoliteness strategy used by a lecturer in a Microteaching class was by affirming the personal power of the lecturer to the student-teachers as an interlocutor, as in the data excerpt (12).

- (12) Lecturer : *Manga ibuk yang kalian tunggu-tunggu, samantaro you se ndak siap do. Yo ndak masuak aka ko yo. Tu ambo yang you tunggu-tunggu, samantaro you sendiri ndak siap do. Pai lah kalua, lengkapi dulu. Kenapa ibu yang kalian tunggu, sementara anda belum siap. Sangat tidak masuk akal. Saya yang kalian tunggu, sementara kalian belum siap. Pergi keluar kelas, lengkapi dulu*
[Why are you waiting for me when you're not ready? It's very unreasonable. I am the one you are waiting for, while you are not ready. Get out of this class, and complete your tasks first]
- Student : [diam]
[silent]

In the data excerpt (12) context, the lecturer expresses her annoyance to the students by asserting her power over the students. The lecturer came late, and the student took the lecturer to her room. It turned out that after arriving in class, when students were asked to take out stationery and lesson plans, it turned out that the students did not bring them. The lecturer became annoyed because it turned out that the students who had asked the lecturer to come to class as soon as possible were not ready for learning. Here it was obvious that the lecturer asserted that she is a person who has power over her students.

3.2.2.2. *Condescend, scorn or ridicule by using diminutive to hearer's position*

The teacher used the negative impoliteness strategy by lowering the students' position, as shown in the data excerpt (13) as follows:

- (13) Lecturer : *Anda lulus tidak mata kuliah Listening? Listening tu beda, tidak semua membaca itu reading, tidak semua mendengar itu listening, tidak semua ngomong itu speaking, tidak semua menulis itu writing. Awam sekali Anda.*
[Did you pass the Listening course? Listening is different, not all reading is reading, not all listening is listening, not all speaking is speaking, not all writing is writing. **You are layman.**]
- Student : [diam]
[silent]

The context of the data excerpt (13) is that the lecturer gave comments to the student-teacher who does not present the focus of language skills under the learning material displayed. The lecturer assumed that the student did not have sufficient competence to determine language skills that were under the learning material. The lecturer said, "**You are very layman**" which aims to undermine students' ability because students should have mastered such things before joining the Microteaching class.

3.2.2.3. *Condescend, scorn, or ridicule by belittling*

The negative impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer that minimizes the ability of the speech partner is presented in the data excerpt (14) as follows:

- (14) Lecturer : *Memo saja tidak ada lagi kurikulumnya. Memang di kurikulum ada memo?*
 ["Memo" alone no longer exists in the curriculum. Is there a memo in the curriculum?]
- Student : *Ndak Pak*
 [No, Sir]
- Lecturer : *Ndak? Jangan-jangan yang anda cari hanya short message. Anda browsing internet, kemudian ketemu short message sama memo dan itu yang anda...anda...anda ambil. Kalau seperti itu anda mengajar di sekolah nanti, itu sangat memalukan.*
 [Not? Maybe what you are looking for is just a short message. You browse the internet, then you find a short message and a memo, and that's what you...you take. **If you teach like that at school later, it's very embarrassing.**]
- Mahasiswa : [diam saja]
 [silent]

The data excerpt (14) context is that the lecturer commented on the student-teacher who presented learning material about "Memos". It was less relevant to the material in the 2013 curriculum. The lecturer assumed that the student took learning materials without referring to the 2013 curriculum. The lecturer suspected that the student had just gotten the internet learning material. The lecturer regretted that the mentality of students who were not serious like that would be embarrassing later on when teaching in a real class by saying, "**If you teach like that at school later, it will be very embarrassing**".

3.2.3. Explicitly associating Hearer with negative aspects

The negative impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer by associating student-teacher with something negative is presented in excerpt (15) as follows:

- (15) Dosen : *Ado masalah Meta? Manga Meta galak-galak surang? Ambo takuik ambo jo urang galak-galak surang tu, dek ambo ndak ado yang lucu. So, what is your problem? Yang you galak-galakkan apo?*
 [What's the problem with you, Meta? Why are you laughing alone? **I'm afraid of someone who likes to laugh alone.** Nothing funny to me. So, what is your problem? What are you laughing at?]
- Mahasiswa : [diam] [silent]

The context of the data excerpt (15) is that the lecturer admonished the students who played the role of students when a student was in teaching performance. There was a student who laughed alone. The lecturer was disturbed by the student's behavior because she did not respect her friend who was teaching. The lecturer finally interrupted the student-teacher to stop teaching and reprimanded the student with the phrase, "**...I'm afraid of someone laughing alone...**" Through this expression, the lecturer associates the students with a crazy person for laughing alone.

3.3. Off-record Impoliteness strategy

The off-record impoliteness strategy is a strategy of speakers who embarrass the interlocutors through indirect speech acts. Based on data analysis, it was found that there are two types of off-record impoliteness strategies used by lecturers in

interactions in the Microteaching class, namely (1) the speaker criticizes the actions or attitudes of the interlocutor so that he feels embarrassed (criticize – dispraise H, some actions or inactions) by H, or some entity in which H has invested face) and (2) speakers inhibit speech partners from engaging in conversation (hinder – deny turn, interrupt).

3.3.1. *Criticizing – dispraise H, some actions or inaction by H, or some entity in which H has invested face*

The off-record impoliteness strategy used by the lecturer by associating student-teacher with something negative is presented in excerpt (16) as follows:

- (16) Lecturer : *Yang sedihnya ibu di kegiatan penutup itu di-copypaste dari RPP sebelumnya. Jadi materinya tetap recount text. **Itulah salah satu cirinya Winda ibu lihat, setiap bikin RPP pasti ada yang dicopypaste kemudian tidak dicek terlebih dahulu, iya kan?***
[The sad thing for me is that the closing activity was copied and pasted from the previous RPP. So the material was still recount text. **That's one of the characteristics of Winda, I see, every time you made an RPP, there must be a copy-paste and then you don't check it first, right?**]
- Student : Ya Bu
[Yes, Maam]

The context of the data excerpt (16) is that the supervisor provided comments and feedback on the Lesson Plan (RPP) prepared by the student-teacher when she always found the same mistakes repeatedly. The lecturer said, "*That is one of the characteristics of Winda, I see, every time you make an RPP, there must be a copy and paste, then it was not checked*" which means to inform that the student was a careless person because she made mistakes repeatedly due to not checking her documents first. In short, the lecturer provided indirect criticism of the behavior or attitudes of students so that they feel embarrassed for the next performance can be more leverage.

- (17) Lecturer : *Menjelaskan itu mubazir itu, slidenya only one slide the generic structure of recount text from the beginning till the end you show it.*
[Explaining is redundant, there is only one slide about the generic structure of recount text from the beginning till the end that you show.]
- Student : Ya Bu, saya lupa tadi
[Yes ma'am, I forgot]

The data excerpt (17) context is when the lecturer provided comments and feedback to the student-teacher, who only used one slide from the beginning of the explanation to the end of the lesson. Indirectly, the lecturer criticized the students for why she was using only one slide. She had prepared several slides. The lecturer said, "*... the slide is only one slide...about the structure of recount text from the beginning till the end you show it*".

3.3.2. *Hinder – deny turn, interrupt*

The strategy of off-record impoliteness used by the lecturers is not giving a turn to speak to students, which is presented in the data excerpt (18) as follows.

- (18) Lecturer : *...kenapa you tidak pakai laptop ketika mengajar? Memang nggak punya, karena nggak mau atau memang gimana?*

- [...why don't you use a laptop when teaching? You don't have one, because you don't want to or what?]
- Student : Dengan gambar bisa bu... [Pictures can be used too, Maam]
- Lecturer : *Stop you ngomong*
[**Stop speaking**]
- Student : [diam]
[silent]

The data excerpt (18) context is when the lecturer commented on the student by asking why she did not use a laptop in teaching. The lecturer assumed that the student did not want to try her best, so she only taught as it was. When the lecturer asked her, she always gave reasons. The lecturer felt that the reasons put forward by the student only showed that she did not want to listen to other people's suggestions. Because she was irritated and annoyed, the lecturer did not give the student another chance to continue her speech and said, "*stop you talking*".

4. Discussion

This research found three main results. First, the lecturer used a strategy of positive impoliteness by attacking the student-teacher positive face, which was expressed in three ways, namely calling the student with unusual calls, expressing disagreement with what the student-teacher was doing, and calling him with mockery or insults. Second, the lecturer attacked the student-teacher negative face via three strategies: scaring or threatening, belittling or ridiculing, and associating students with something negative (less/not good). Third, the lecturer has shown impoliteness to students when giving comments or feedback by indirectly criticizing or not appreciating and limiting students' freedom to speak.

This study's findings complement linguistic impoliteness theory's strategy in classroom interaction. Many previous researchers have carried out studies of linguistic impoliteness in classroom interactions between teachers and students who adopt Culpeper's theory (1996, 2005). Researchers of linguistic impoliteness in classroom interaction generally focused their research on students' impoliteness strategies both in face-to-face and online classes. In face-to-face class interactions, Dharma (2017) found five impoliteness strategies employed by students based on gender. It includes bald-on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, mock politeness, and withhold politeness. Male students tended to express impolite speech more often than female students. Maulana et al. (2019) also examined student and lecturer impoliteness strategies in classroom interactions. This study found three types of impoliteness strategies employed by the students: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and two impoliteness strategies used by lecturers, namely off-record impoliteness and withhold impoliteness.

In online class interactions during the Covid-19 pandemic, Panjaitan et al. (2021) found eight language impoliteness strategies used by junior high school students in learning English via Zoom, including using inappropriate identity markers, using obscure or secretive language, seeking disagreement, using taboo words, frightening and condescending, scorn or ridicule. The interaction between lecturers and students in the Microteaching class caught the attention of Ady (2015). He examines the politeness strategies used by lecturers in conveying written feedback. This study found

that the most dominant politeness strategy used by lecturers was the bald-on record of politeness for task-oriented, alerting, requesting, and emergency.

The findings of this study confirm that the language impoliteness strategy used by lecturers in providing feedback to students who are practicing teaching influences students' motivation and enthusiasm to perform their best. Therefore, utterances used by lecturers in conveying criticism or input or comments on student performances need to be considered by using expressions that provide clear and concise feedback but need to be considered, lest the feedback given implies unpleasant feelings towards the lecturer for criticizing with threatening hearer's face that can bring up unsympathetic feelings to the lecturer in question achieved (Ralph, 2014; Skakunova, 2017).

5. Conclusion

The impoliteness strategies used by lecturers in classroom interactions when providing feedback on teaching performance and lesson plans for student-teachers in the Microteaching class illustrate the communicative competence of lecturers who show a lack of respect for students through their utterances. This study found eight linguistic impoliteness strategies employed by lecturers, including using inappropriate students' identity markers, seeking disagreement, using derogatory names to call students' names, fighting-instilling a belief that actions detrimental to students will occur, condescending, scorn, or ridicule in three forms – by emphasizing power, by using diminutive to students' position, and by belittling, explicitly associating students with negative aspects, criticizing-dispraise students, and hindering-deny turn.

The findings of this study confirm that linguistic impoliteness has an impact on the ineffectiveness of the message conveyed, reduces students' motivation, and personally leads to a less sympathetic attitude of students toward lecturers. Therefore, lecturers should pay attention to their polite utterances in conveying feedback or criticism to the students. The findings of this study complement the theory of language impoliteness in didactic interactions, especially in Microteaching classes.

This study focused on the impoliteness strategies employed by lecturers in lecturer-student interactions when giving feedback or criticism in Microteaching courses. It is hoped that future researchers will continue this study by exploring students' opinions or perceptions of the linguistic impoliteness of lecturers toward students who receive feedback or criticism from their lecturers. Besides, the lecturers' reasons behind linguistic impoliteness are also better investigated.

References

- Ady, F. I. (2015). *Politeness Strategy Used by Micro Teaching Lecturer in the Written Comments of Mini Teaching Performance*. Sayta Wacana Christian University.
- Agustina, S., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). Politeness and Power Relation in EFL Classroom Interactions: A Study on Indonesian Learners and Lecturers. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(2), 92-100.
- Anwar, M. (2019). Impoliteness in the Indonesian Language on Facebook as A Representation of Cultural Blindness. *Journal of Multicultural Education*.
- Bahjat, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using Microteaching and Thinking style to Develop Teaching Skills in Arab Open University - Jordan Branch. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 15(3), 118-133.
- Benabdellah, F. Z. (2018). Impoliteness Strategies and Gender Differences among

- Disney Modern Protagonists. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v3i4.p40-50>
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01411_9.x
- Bustan, E., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries. *Global Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 1, 66–74.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th Editio). Pearson Education Limited.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 35–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence. In *Cambridge University Press*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Z. Kadar (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)Politeness* (Issue Impoliteness, pp. 199–226). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Culpeper, J., & Tantucci, V. (2021). The Principle of (Im)politeness Reciprocity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 175, 146–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.01.008>
- Dharma, G. P. (2017). *Impoliteness Strategies Used By Male and Female Students in the Classroom Interaction*. 1(2), 2017.
<http://repository.umsu.ac.id/handle/123456789/4100>
- Dobs, A. M. (2014). Identities in conflict: Examining the co-construction of impoliteness and identity in classroom interaction. *Identities in Conflict: Examining the Co-Construction of Impoliteness and Identity in Classroom Interaction*, 2(1), 36–73. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.2.1.02dob>
- Dynel, M. (2016). Conceptualizing conversational humour as (im)politeness: The case of film talk. In *Journal of Politeness Research* (Vol. 12, Issue 1, pp. 117–147).
<https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0023>
- Dynel, M., & Poppi, F. I. M. (2019). Risum teneatis, amici? ☆: The socio-pragmatics of RoastMe humour. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.10.010>
- Elmabruk, R., & Etarhuni, N. (2021). Teacher Power and Gender in the Classroom Discourse of EFL Teacher Educators: Insights from a case study. *Faculty of Arts Journal*, 18, 54–78. <https://doi.org/10.36602/faj.2021.n18.04>
- JANE XAVIERINE A/P M XAVIER THAYALAN. (2017). IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE SOCIAL MEDIA COMMENTS ON THE LOW YAT PLAZA INCIDENT. In *University of Malaya*.
- Kotthoff, H. (2009). Impoliteness and Conversational Joking: On Relational Politics. *Folia Linguistica*, 30(3–4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.1996.30.3-4.299>
- Leech, G. (1989). Principles of Pragmatics. In *Computation of Language*.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-74564-5_12
- Locher, M. A., & Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness and power in language: In D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay*

- with *Power in Theory and Practice* (pp. 1–16). Walter de Gruyter & Co. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344>
- Maulana, S. S., Mahmud, M., & Salija, K. (2019). *Politeness and Impoliteness Expressions of Students and Teacher in English Classroom Interaction at PPs UNM*.
- Mavriagiannaki, C. (2020). Im/politeness, gender and power distance in Lady Windermere's Fan . *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 6(1), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.00045.mav>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (Second Edi). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third Edit). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mirador, J. (2014). Moves, intentions and the language of feedback commentaries in education. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v4i1.599>
- Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness Strategies Based on Culpeper ' s Model : An Analysis of Gender Differences between Two Characters in the movie Mother. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(3), 221–238.
- Niño, P. K. J. (2014). Students' use of power in Foreign Language classroom interaction. *Cuadernos de Lingüística Hispánica*, 24, 123. <https://doi.org/10.19053/0121053x.2763>
- Nugraheni, F. S. A. (2019). Learning difficulties in microteaching class: A case study. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2194(December). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5139803>
- Önal, A. (2019). An exploratory study on pre-service teachers' reflective reports of their video-recorded microteaching. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 806–830. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.631520>
- Pacheco Baldó, R. M. (2019). Impoliteness Strategies and Social Characteristics. An Analysis of Films in Peninsular Spanish and American English Speakers at Work. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 48(6), 608–626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2019.1701065>
- Panjaitan, S. ., Sumarsih, S. ., & Ginting, S. A. (2021). The Realization of Impoliteness Strategies Used By Students in English Online Learning Through Zoom During Pandemic Covid-19. *Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL)*, 591, 480–483. <https://doi.org/10.24114/lt.v18i3.31399>
- Paternoster, A. (2012). Inappropriate inspectors: Impoliteness and overpoliteness in Ian Rankin's and Andrea Camilleri's crime series. *Language and Literature*, 21(3), 311–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947012444221>
- Rahmani, H., Modarresi, Y., Ghiasian, M. S., & Zandi, B. (2016). Politeness and impoliteness in Persian-speaking youngsters' novels. *Language Related Research*, 7(5), 67–90.
- Ralph, E. G. (2014). The Effectiveness of Microteaching: Five Years' Findings. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, 1(7), 2349.
- Reddy, K. (2019). Teaching How to Teach: Microteaching (A Way to Build up Teaching

- Skills). *Journal of Gandaki Medical College-Nepal*, 12(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jgmcn.v12i1.22621>
- Santamaría-García, C. (2017). Emotional and Educational Consequences of (Im)politeness in Teacher–Student Interaction at Higher Education. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 1(3), 233–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-017-0010-2>
- Sari, C. C. (2020). CONVERSATION ANALYSIS: TURN-TAKING MECHANISM AND POWER RELATION IJ CLASSROOM SETTING. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 7(2), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i2.12598>
- Shaari, A. H., & Kamaluddin, M. R. (2019). Buli Siber : Ketidaksantunan Bahasa dan Etika Media Sosial Dalam Kalangan Remaja Malaysia (Cyberbullying in Malaysia : Understanding Youngsters ' Ethics and Impoliteness Strategies in Social Media). *E- Bangi : Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*.
- Shinta, V. M., Wahyuni, D., & Padang, U. N. (2018). Impoliteness Strategies Used By Supporters and Detractors of Ahok in Their Online Comments By Gender. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*.
- Sinkeviciute, V. (2013). Decoding encoded (im)politeness: “Cause on my teasing you can depend.” In *Developments in linguistic humour theory* (Issue im, pp. 263–287).
- Skakunova, V. A. (2017). Microteaching As a Method of Teaching Professional Skills for Pre-Service Language Teachers (on the Example of Professional Course for Bachelor Students). *Bulletin of the South Ural State University Series “Education. Educational Sciences,”* 9(3), 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.14529/ped170310>
- Sofyan, H., Us, T., Wakid, M., & Sulisty, B. (2019). Developing Micro-Teaching Video As Learning Media in Automotive Teacher Education. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1273(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1273/1/012059>
- Stewart, M. (2015). The language of praise and criticism in a student evaluation survey. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 45(June 2015), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.01.004>
- Subyantoro, S., & Apriyanto, S. (2020). Impoliteness in Indonesian Language Hate Speech on Social Media Contained in the Instagram Account. *JOURNAL OF ADVANCES IN LINGUISTICS*. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v11i.8655>
- Teacher Power in EFL Classroom: Associations with Classroom Interaction. (2019). *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jlll/59-02>
- Teneketzi, K. (2021). Impoliteness across social media platforms. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00066.ten>
- Terkourafi, M. (2015). Introduction: Bridging theory and practice in im/politeness research. In M. Terkourafi (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on IM/politeness* (pp. vii–xi). John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Vladimirou, D., & House, J. (2018). Ludic impoliteness and globalisation on Twitter: ‘I speak England very best’ #agglia_Tsipra, #Tsipras #Clinton. *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.005>
- Waliyadin, W. (2016). THE IMPOLITENESS IN THE CHARLIE PIPPIN: A PRAGMATIC STUDY. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 5(2), 93. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv5i21044>