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ABSTRACT


This research aims at: (1) describing the impoliteness strategies. (2) describing the gender on impoliteness. (3) describing the social position on impoliteness, and (4) describing the social distance on impoliteness in Ron Clark Story movie. The type of research is qualitative method. The qualitative research is carried out by making use of the descriptive method. The object of the research is the impoliteness in Ron Clark Story movie. The data are the utterances involving impoliteness. The writer analyzes the data by using Culpeper’s impoliteness theory and sociology approach. The approaches are used for analyzing the impoliteness, the genders, the social positions, and the social distances in involving impoliteness. Based on the result of the data analysis, the writer finds some impoliteness strategies, gender involves impoliteness, social position involves impoliteness, and social distance involves impoliteness. The data were collected using documentation. There are four kinds of impoliteness strategies used. They are Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, and Withhold Politeness. From the four impoliteness strategies is dominated by the positive impoliteness strategy. There is no difference between male and female in performing impoliteness strategy. All of the genders perform impoliteness. The utterances from male are direct, forceful, and unmitigated. But the writer found the utterance from female characters in Ron Clark Story movie is the same with the utterance from the male characters. The impoliteness is not merely from higher to lower social position. In Ron Clark Story movie, the writer finds that the data are dominated by impoliteness from lower to higher social position. All of the social distances involve impoliteness. The data are led by impoliteness from the characters in less familiar social distance. As a teacher, the writer hopes that the result of this research will be useful to educate her students not to involve impoliteness.
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INTRODUCTION

People propose their wants by uttering. Uttering is hoped to be polite. However, sometimes the interlocutor’s response is not suitable with the speakers’ expectation. The response can make the speakers feel annoyed and disrespected. It can be called the impoliteness.

Culpeper (2010) defined the notion of impoliteness as follows:

‘Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organization, including, in particular, how one person’s or group’s identities are mediated by others in interaction. Situated behaviours are viewed negatively when they conflict with how one expects them to be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought to be. Such behaviours always have or are presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offence. Various factors can exacerbate how offensive an impolite behavior is taken to be, including for example whether one understands a behavior to be strongly intentional or not’.


Based on the previous explanations, the writer needs to conduct research further in regard with impoliteness in a movie. The movie is based on the real life of Ron Clark, the main actor of the movie. It draws the experience of Ron Clark in teaching and facing the various impolitenesses from people near his life in the new places.

The writer used the classification of impoliteness from Culpeper (1996, 2010) to find the strategies of impoliteness used by the characters in the movie.
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Pragmatics

Yule (1996:4) wrote that there are four areas in concerning pragmatics; including:

1. **Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.**
   This area concerns that the meaning of speech it can be based on the speaker interpretation of the speech itself, it by means that what people mean by their utterances than what words of phrases in those utterances might mean by them.

2. **Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.**
   This type of the study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. The speaker has to know with who they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances.

3. **Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.**
   The listeners could make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. It is the type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated.

4. **Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.**
   This perspective then raises the questions of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The fundamental answer is tied to the notion of distance. The distances could be physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. By knowing the distance, the speaker will know how to speak relate to the distance.

B. Pragmalinguistics

Kasper and Roever (in Esmaeili, 2012:82) stated that pragmalinguistics focused on the intersection of pragmatics and linguistic forms and comprises the knowledge and ability for the use of conventions of meanings (e.g the strategies for realizing speech acts) and conventions of forms (e.g linguistic forms implementing speech act strategies). This statement shows about the importance of knowing the forms of linguistics. Linguistics forms are the pattern of the sentence whether in some context, as the example in apologizing, requesting, refusing. The communicants also know how to use the sentences in the right time, the right person.

C. Sociopragmatics

Kasper and Roever (in Esmaeili, 2012:82) asserted that sociopragmatics encompasses the knowledge of the relationships between communicative action and power, social distance, imposition, and the social conditions and consequences of what you do, when, and to whom. In this study, the social
backgrounds are the difference sex, the difference of social position, the
difference of social power, and the difference of social distance.

Hymes (in Wardenah, 1998:242) explicitly explains that a speech event
have some components. These components are developed by Hymes based
on the acronym, SPEAKING. This theory will help the writer in describing the
components of the dialogue. The writer presents those factors as follows:
Setting and scene (S) is the concrete physical circumstance where the speech
takes place. It refers to time and place. Scene refers to the psychological
setting, or the cultural definition of the occasion. Participants (P) are people
involved in a communication including speakers-listener, addresser-addressee,
or sender-receiver. They generally fill certain socially specified roles. Ends (E)
refers to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an
exchange as well as to the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish
on particular occasion. Act sequence (A) refers to the actual form and content
of is said: the precise word used, how they are used, and the relationship of
what is said to the actual topic at hand. Key (K) refers to the tone, manner, or
spirit in which a particular message is conveyed: light hearted, serious,
pedantic, mocking, sarcastic, and pompous and so on. The signaling of keys
maybe marked as nonverbally by certain kinds of behavior, gesture, posture,
or even deportment. Instrumentality (I) refers to the choice of channel, e.g.,
oral, written, or telegraphic, and to the actual forms of speech employed, such
as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. Norms of interaction
and interpretation (N) refer to the specific behavior or properties that attack
to speaking and also how these maybe viewed by someone who does not
shore them. Genres (G) refer to clearly demarcated types of utterance such as
poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, prayers, lecture, and editorial. The writer
gets a note for social background in her thesis. They are the difference gender,
the social position, and the social distance.

D. Speech Acts

Uttering is the speech to act something. Yule (1996:47) said that
speech acts is actions performed via utterances. Both the speaker and the
hearer have to know the outer side of speech to make their communication
has the goal. But sometime, the speech becomes impolite when it threaten
or attacks the other’s face. It is impoliteness.

E. Impoliteness

Culpeper (2010) defined the notion of impoliteness as follows:

‘Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring
in specific contexts. It is sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs
about social organization, including, in particular, how one person’s or
group’s identities are mediated by others in interaction. Situated
behaviours are viewed negatively when they conflict with how one expects
them to be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought
to be. Such behaviours always have or are presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offence. Various factors can exacerbate how offensive an impolite behavior is taken to be, including for example whether one understands a behavior to be strongly intentional or not’.

From the statement, impoliteness happens when the interlocutor do not fulfill the expectations of the speakers. Impoliteness is assumed as the offence some rules. The offence is able to be happened intentionally or unintentionally. The writer notes about impoliteness. Impoliteness can be the offence. The offence is happened when the interlocutor cannot fulfill the speaker’s hope or when the speech is not on the context. Impoliteness can be exited intentionally or unintentionally. The writer will study the impoliteness strategies in Ron Clark Story movie.

RESEARCH METHOD

The type of the writer’s study is a qualitative study. The steps of this qualitative study are as follows: (1) using the descriptive study or literary study, by reading the subtitle of the movie, (2) collecting the data of utterances to find the component of the utterances by using Dell Hymes’s SPEAKING theory, (3) describing the impoliteness strategies in refusal utterances using Culpeper’s theory,(4) describing gender involves impoliteness, (5) describing social position involves impoliteness, (6) describing social distance involves impoliteness. The object of the research is the impoliteness strategies found in Ron Clark Story. The utterances are classified by the social contexts. The social contexts are limited to difference gender, difference of social position, and difference of social distance. The data source is Ron Clark Story movie. The data are the utterances uttered by the characters of the story in the script of the movie. The data collecting uses documentation method. It means observing and reading the script of the movie. Then, the data are written. The writer chooses the utterances and analyzes the impoliteness strategy in them. Then, the writer presents the data in the data display. Analyzes steps are as follows: (1) Describe the types of the impoliteness of the utterances according to Culpeper (1996), (2) describe the gender involves impoliteness, (3) describe the social position involves impoliteness, (4) describe the social distance involves impoliteness.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. FINDINGS

1. The Impoliteness Strategies

The impoliteness strategies can be shown as follows:
Table 1. The Impoliteness Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TYPE AND REALIZATION OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGY</th>
<th>The Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BALD ON RECORD IMPOLITENESS</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECT, CLEAR, AND UNAMBIGUOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>POSITIVE IMPOLITENESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALL THE OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGNORE</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNCONCERNED</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWARING</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNSYMPATHETIC</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE DISINTERESTED</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USE TABOO WORD</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKE OTHER FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABUSIVE WORD</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEGATIVE IMPOLITENESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INVADE OTHER SPACE</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BELITTLE</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE CONTEMPTUOUS</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCORNS</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WITHHOLD POLITENESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAILING TO THANK</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four types of impoliteness strategies found in Ron Clark Story movie. They are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and withhold politeness. In bald on record impoliteness, it is 3 (5%). There are 48 (80%) in positive impoliteness. In negative impoliteness, there are eight data (15%). The last is ‘withhold impoliteness’, there is only 1 (5%). From the data found, most of them are in positive impoliteness. There are 48 data are found in positive impoliteness strategies. The data are performed in ‘call the other name’, ‘ignore’, ‘unconcerned’, ‘swearing’, ‘unsympathetic’, ‘be disinterested’, ‘use taboo word’, ‘make other feel uncomfortable’, and ‘abusive word’. From all of the performances, it is by ‘call the other name’. There are nineteen data. Most of ‘call the other name’ uses ‘fool’, they are seven data. The writer analyzed that from the data means the impoliteness strategies found in Ron Clark Story movie, it is led by positive impoliteness strategy. Many characters use positive impoliteness strategy to threaten the addressee’s positive face.

2. Impoliteness According to the Difference Gender

The classification of impoliteness strategies based on the gender. The genders here are male and female.

The data can be shown as follows:
Table 2. Impoliteness According to Different Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Impoliteness Performances</th>
<th>Strategies and The</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bald on Record</td>
<td>Direct, clear, and</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive Impoliteness</td>
<td>Call the other name</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swearing</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be disinterested</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use taboo word</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make other feels</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abusive word</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Impoliteness</td>
<td>Invade other space</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belittle</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be contemptuous</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scorns</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Withhold Politeness</td>
<td>Fail to thanking</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender involving impoliteness are male and female. The data for male is 31 (51.7%). Bald record impoliteness is 2 (3.3%). Positive impoliteness is 23 (38.4%). The data for negative impoliteness is 5 (9.3%). Withhold politeness is 1 (1.7%). Most of the males use positive impoliteness strategy. They perform ‘call the other name’, it is ‘man’. On the other hand, the data for female is 29 (48.3%). There are many data in ‘ignore’. It is 8 data (13.3%). By glazing from the data, the gender involves impoliteness is led by male. Most of them use positive impoliteness. It is 16 (26.7%). The writer summarized that all of the gender have the same possibility to involve impoliteness. The data said that all of the gender use positive impoliteness strategy more than the other strategies. Although most of all of the gender use positive impoliteness strategies, but the difference is the male performs ‘call the other name’ and the female performs ‘ignore’. The writer got the new views that ‘call the other name’ used by male is suitable with the language by male. It is unmitigated, the addressee know the impoliteness directly. It is because the male characters directly call the addressee with the other name. Most of the male characters use ‘ fool’ in this type of impoliteness. For the female characters, they perform ‘ignore’. ‘Ignore’ for female means they hide their feels, so the writer got opinion that female’s language here has the character of female language, it is mitigated. The addressees have to guess why the speaker ignores them. The writer also found one of the female character uses bald on record impoliteness. Bald on record impoliteness is signed with direct, forceful and unambiguous. Her utterance is rather
3. **Impoliteness According to the Difference Social Position**

The social positions here are higher to lower, the same position, and lower to higher. The data can be shown as follows:

**Table 3. Impoliteness According to Different Social Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Impoliteness Performances</th>
<th>Strategies and The</th>
<th>Social Position</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher to Lower</td>
<td>The Same Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bald on Record Impoliteness</td>
<td>Direct, clear, and unambiguous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive Impoliteness</td>
<td>Call the other name</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swearing</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be disinterested</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use taboo word</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make other feels uncomfortable</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abusive word</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative Impoliteness</td>
<td>Invade other space</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be litle</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be contemptuous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scorns</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Withhold Politeness</td>
<td>Fail to thanking</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer classified three kinds of social position. They are higher to lower, the same position, and lower to higher. The social position induce impoliteness utterance is dominated data from lower to higher social position. There are 42 (70%) data. Most of them use positive impoliteness strategy. The highest performances data is ‘call the other name’. It is 16 (26.7%). For data in the same position are 11 (18.3%). They also use positive impoliteness strategy. The last is from higher to lower. The total data for this social distance is 7 (11.7%). They are dominated in positive impoliteness strategy. Usually the impoliteness is from higher to lower position. It is because they have more power than the other social position. In this study, the writer found the vice versa. The impoliteness is ruled by the lower to higher position.

4. **Impoliteness According to the Difference Social Distance**

The social distances here are as follow: (1) familiar means between the speakers and hearers have known each other in a long time, and they have close emotional relationship. Here, it means from one family, (2) less familiar means between the speakers and hearers have not known each in
a long time, and they do not have close emotional relationship. The writer makes the border. It means from the principal to the teacher, the principal to the students, the teacher to the principal, the teacher to the students, and the students to the teacher, (3) unfamiliar means between the speakers and the hearers do not know each other, and they do not have emotional relationship. It means from teacher to students’ parents and students’ parents to teacher. The data can be shown as follows:

Table 4. Impoliteness According to Different Social Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Impoliteness Performances</th>
<th>Strategies and The Social Distance</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>Less Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bald on Record Impoliteness</td>
<td>Direct, clear, and unambiguous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive Impoliteness</td>
<td>Call the other name</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swearing</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be disinterested</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use taboo word</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make other feels uncomfortable</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abusive word</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative Impoliteness</td>
<td>Invade other space</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belittle</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be contemptuous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scorns</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Withhold Politeness</td>
<td>Fail to thanking</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social distances here are familiar, less familiar, and unfamiliar. The data is 4 (6.7%) for familiar social distance. For less familiar, there are 49 (81.7%). Unfamiliar social distance is 7 (11.7%). The writer finds that the dominated data is in less familiar social distance. Less familiar social distance involves bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and withhold politeness. They are led by positive impoliteness strategy. It is 40 (66.7%). Most of them perform ‘call the other name’. It is 18 (30%). For the writer, less familiar has more potential chance to involve impoliteness. In less familiar social distance, between the speaker and the addressee do not have much pragmatic competence. They do know much the background of them. So, it is the big potential to involve impoliteness.

B. Discussion of the Findings

There are four types of impoliteness strategies that are found in the other characters’ utterances addressed to the main character, Ron Clark, in
Ron Clark Story movie. They are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and withhold politeness. The realization of bald on record impoliteness is in the form of using direct, clear, and unambiguous statement. Moreover, positive impoliteness is realized in the form of calling the other names, ignoring, unconcerned, swearing, unsympathetic, be disinterested, using taboo words, making other feels uncomfortable, and using abusive word. In addition, negative impoliteness is expressed in the form of invading other space, belittling, being contemptuous, and scorns. Finally, the impoliteness strategy is the withhold politeness. It is failing to thank.

Bald on record impoliteness is employed by the speaker when the addressee’s face is at stake; the speaker uses this strategy to threaten the addressee’s face in a straightforward, obvious, unambiguous and brief way (Culpeper, 1996:356). Bald on record impoliteness is appeared in Ron Clark Story movie. It is realized in the form of using direct, clear, and unambiguous statement. The conversation below occurs between Mister Turner and one of the students, Tayshawn Mitchel. Their conversation happens when Mister Turner call Tayshawn with the word ‘Son’.

\[(MT/TM/03/00:08:31)\]


**Tayshawn** : ‘I ain’t no son’.

Bald on record impoliteness is clearly used by Tayshawn when he responds the utterance from Mister Turner. Tayshawn tries to threaten Mister Turner’s face directly. Simply by looking at his utterance, it can be seen that Tayshawn feels annoyed to Mister Turner because of the utterance make a pain in his heart. Tayshawn is an orphan. He lives with his foster parents. Mister Turner says ‘Son’ to deliver polite word, but the reaction from Tayshawn is surprising. It is impolite utterance. Tayshawn Mitchell is a male. The utterance from Tayshawn is direct, clear, and unambiguous. Lakoff and Spender in Sara Mills (2003:165) also argued that male speech was characterized as direct, forceful, and confident, using features such as direct, unmitigated statements and interruption. So, the utterance from Tayshawn is walking the same line with the theory. Lakoff and Spender also argued the female’s language. Lakoff and Spender in Sara Mills (2003:165) argued that women’s language style was further characterized by the use of elements such as hedges, tentativeness, tag-questions which seemed to these theorists to signal indirectness, mitigation, diffidence, and hesitation. But in Ron Clark Story movie, the writer finds that the utterance from female characters is not closer with the theory. It can be seen from the conversation between Ron Clark and Shameika Wallace (Ron’s student). The conversation below happens when Ron is in the classroom and asks his students to stand in a line. Shameika directly refuses his order.

\[(RC/SW/38/00:24:59)\]

**Ron** : Rule number 3... we all line up to go to the lunch room.

**Shameika** : You know what? Here’s my rule...I ain’t standin' in no line.
Shameika delivers bald on record impoliteness because she threatens Ron’s face directly by using refusal sentence to him. She says to Ron “You know what? Here’s my rule...I ain't standin’ in no line.” Shameika clearly gives a refusal to Ron for not to stand in a line. The raising tone in refusing Ron briefly conveys Shameika’s negative attitude to Ron. She forces Ron not to stand in a line. Shameika wants to maintain her wants by threatening Ron’s face. Her utterance is direct, clear, and unambiguous. It is not like the female’s language argued by Lakoff and Spender in Sara Mills.

Culpeper (1996: 356) describes positive impoliteness as the strategy which is intended to damage the recipient’s positive face. The data found in Ron Clark Story movie is dominated by this strategy. The most male characters perform ‘call the other name’. Female characters perform ‘ignore’. The positive impoliteness is dominated with male. Most of them perform ‘call the other name’. They use ‘man’ to call the other name. The writer presents the example. The conversation below happens when Mister Solis and Tayshawn Mitchell in front of the school. Mister Solis asks Tayshawn to get back in the classroom. However, Mister Solis calls Tayshawn with ‘little’.

("MS/TM/01/00:08:25")
Mister Solis : Get back in that classroom! Hey! Hey! Come on, you little...
Tayshawn : Hey, come on, man!

‘Little’ is not the true name of Tayshawn. It is the name given by Mister Solis. It is impoliteness. It will threaten Tayshawn’s face. Mister Solis is Tayshawn’s teacher. His social position is higher than Tayshawn. It is common for higher social position to produce impoliteness to the lower social position. It is the same view with Fairclough’s statement. Fairclough (1989:46) stated that ‘It is useful to distinguish broadly between three types of such constraints - constraints on: contents, on what is said or done; relations, the social relations people enter into in discourse; subjects, or the ‘subjects positions' people can occupy’. But, in Ron Clark Story movie, the writer also finds the data that is not closer with that view. The impoliteness can be produce from lower to higher social position. The example is as follow:

("RC/SW/12/00:13:53")
Ron Clark : ‘Shameika Wallace? I’m Mr. Clark, your new teacher. I called earlier’.
Shameika Wallace: ‘It’s Saturday, fool’

The setting of this conversation is in front of Shameika’s home. The participants are Shameika Wallace and Ron Clark. The end is the respond from Shameika Wallace when Ron Clark comes at her home. The act is direct speech. The key is uncomfortable situation. The instrumentality is oral speech. The norm is to call Ron with the other name. The genre is formal speech.

Ron Clark visits Shameika Wallace on Saturday. He has talked his intention to Shameika before. Before entering the room, Ron has introduced himself to her. He does not get good welcoming. Shameika does not like his visiting. She calls Ron with the other name, it is ‘fool’. It is impolite. As a student, she should to call her teacher by the true name, not the other name. She threatens Ron’s positive face by calling him with the other name.
The negative impoliteness strategy is also dominated by males. The same result in performing are ‘belittle’ and ‘be contemptuous’. According to Culpeper (1996: 356), negative impoliteness is the strategy which is intended to damage the recipient’s negative face. The writer here offers the pattern.

Ron also visits one of his student’s families, Badriyah. Many people welcome him includes her father. The setting is in the living room of Badriyah’s family. Ron never met the student from India. He is excited to know the pronunciation of Badriyah’s name. Ron starts the conversation by asking Badriyah to pronounce her name. This is the conversation.

(RC/B/BF/11/00:13:02)

Ron : You know, I've never had a student from India before. How do you pronounce your name?
Badriyah : Bad-ri-yah. I like to read, especially...
Badriyah’s Father : Quiet, Larki. Men are talking, Okay?

Badriyah are going to pronounce her name, but her father stops her. He talks to her that only men are talking. It is impolite because it can belittle Badriyah as a girl. She has a right to talk to the other people. The utterance from her father will threaten her negative face. His utterance is suitable with the characteristic of male language which is argued by Lakoff and Spender. Lakoff and Spender in Sara Mills (2003:165) also argued that male speech was characterized as direct, forceful, and confident, using features such as direct, unmitigated statements and interruption. Badriyah’s father interrupts Badriyah when she wants to pronounce her name. He also directly and unmitigated does that. The social position of the Badriyah’s father is higher that Badriyah, so it is not wondered that he produce impoliteness. He wants to show his power to her daughter. It is the male egoism. Liu in Culpeper (1996:361) conceptualized the notion of face as consisting of concentric circles with the most face-laden closest to the ego. It means that Badriyah’s father wants to show his face by belittling Badriyah. It is his egoism.

Culpeper (1996: 356) describes withhold politeness as the strategy which is involved when there is the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. The writer finds the only one datum of this type of impoliteness in Ron Clark Story movie. The conversation is between Ron Clark and Tayshawn Mitchell. The conversation happens on Ron’s way to school. The writer finds that the datum is forgetting to deliver thanking. The example is the conversation below.

(RC/TM/55/00:51:07) Ron

: You ok? Tayshawn :
Yeah, I'm cool.

Ron : I wanted to bring you this. Here. You could bring up your math and English with some extra help. Tomorrow's Saturday. I could meet you at the coffee shop by the school. I'll buy you lunch. I'll be there at noon. Noon. (Tayshawn does not say thanking to Ron. He just goes away)

The students finished the daily test. Ron brings the result of the test. One of them belongs to Tayshawn. Ron sees Tayshawn on the way. He calls
Tayshawn and gives the test result to him. Ron also offers helps for learning more Math and English. Ron also offers to buy him lunch on Saturday noon. Tayshawn just takes the test result and turns around without saying anything. He forgets to deliver thanking to Ron. It is impoliteness. The absence of thanking is the type of ‘withhold politeness’. The impoliteness of Tayshawn is related to the characteristics of male’s language. He directly goes away; he thinks that thanking is a phatic. It is not suitable with his ego as a man.

That is the discussion of the findings. Not all of the findings are suitable with the theory. The impoliteness occurs threatening. Although, this movie is based on the true story of Ron Clark, but the true story is created into a film. So, the writer offers opinion that the impoliteness does not threatening the face of the characters of this movie. It is because they are just the actors to act the scenario of the film. But impoliteness are done in the real life, it will threaten the addresssee’s face.

Finally, the writer suggests the readers to use polite utterances in their daily language and there is possibility to analyze the impoliteness by using different function of language and different source.
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