Politeness and Impoliteness Expressions of Students and Teacher in English Classroom Interaction at PPs UNM

Sri Sohriani Maulana
Email: sri.sohriani.maulana88@gmail.com

Murni Mahmud
murnimahmud1973@gmail.com

Kisman Salija
kismansalija@unm.ac.id

English Education Study Program
State University of Makassar, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to find out the expressions of politeness and impoliteness used by students and teacher in classroom interaction. This research applied a qualitative research. The subject of this research was two EFL teachers and two classes at PPS UNM in 2018/2019 academic year.

The findings of this research showed that the participants expressed politeness and impoliteness verbally in the English classroom interaction. Those expressions were categorized in four strategies of politeness and impoliteness. First, bald on record politeness and impoliteness were employed by the students and teacher. Second, off record politeness employed by the teacher. Third, positive politeness and impoliteness employed by the students and teacher. Fourth, negative politeness and impoliteness employed by the students and teacher. The last finding of impolite expression is withhold politeness employed by the students and teacher.

Keyword: Politeness, Impoliteness, Classroom Interaction.

INTRODUCTION

Interaction occurs in daily activities between the people. Dagarin (2004:129) states that interaction is mainly achieved by two means of resources: language and non-verbal means of expression. It means that the people interact with other people to express ideas and feelings through both verbally and non verbally. The interaction also should appear in teaching and learning process in classroom. Interaction in the classroom is an essential part of teaching and learning process. According to Içbay (2008:1), through interactions in the classroom, the participants share what they know, what they feel, what they think and what they plan to do. The interactions in the classroom are supposed to be polite. In order to make communication comfortable and to enable students enjoy the conversation. In the classroom context, especially in a discussion-interaction process, it is important for students to use formal language as an appropriate language used in classroom

interaction. Moreover, for postgraduate student's spoken skill, it is important for them to use formal language to interact among them in the classroom.

Politeness is one of social phenomenon that plays important roles in human interaction. Politeness is a strategy of people in being polite to build a harmony in terms of communication. Yule (2010:135) defines politeness as showing awareness and consideration of another person's face. In other words, politeness helps to avoid conflict which may possibly happens in daily life. However, the opposite phenomenon of politeness, impoliteness is something that has become more frequent in social interaction today. Mahmud and Solin (2012:11) states that as the concern toward politeness increases so as the concern toward impoliteness.

It is clear that the importance of cross-cultural communication is obvious and therefore comparative studies of the conceptualization and manifestations of politeness in different cultures must be regarded as vital in an era of growing internationalization. Moreover, Mahmud (2010) assumes that the roles of linguistic politeness in Indonesia cannot be denied. She states that since the reformation era, many critics have been uttered when Indonesian people talk to each other especially in their daily life

The phenomenon of impoliteness is to do with how offense is conducted upon the language. The impoliteness language will cause social conflict and disharmony between teacher and students. Language impoliteness which is uttered by male and female students is different one to another based on the cultural and social attributes. Students who utter impoliteness to their teacher happened in classroom interaction. Classroom interaction plays an important role in teaching and learning process. It functions to build a pleasant atmosphere in the classroom and encourages students to become effective communicators (Dagarin, 2004: 128).

POLITENESS

The basic concept adopted in this research is politeness which was developed by Brown & Levinson (1987). They assume that each participant is endowed with what they call face, which is developed into negative face and positive face. One's negative face includes claims to territories, to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Ones positive face involves the needs for social approval, or the want to be considered desirable by at least some others. It is based on the presumption that, as part of a strategy for maintaining their own face, the mutual interest of participants in a conversation is to maintain their face from others.

Therefore, in case of communication, people need politeness strategy in order to get a good response from the hearers. Holmes (1992: 296-297) states that being polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship to us, understanding the social values of a society, and understanding the dimension of formality.

Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 68), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's "face". Brown and Levinson (1987 : 68) then propose possible strategies that interlocutors can use to deal with face

threatening acts. In discussing politeness, we deal with "face". Face means public self image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects everyone else to recognize (Yule, 1996: 60). Brown and Levinson states that face is something that was emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be conventionally attended to in interaction (1987: 61). Meanwhile, in many forms of face to face interaction, all participants will be concerned to maintain not only their own face but also the others face. Therefore, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) can be explained as acts that infringe on the hearer" need to maintain his/her self esteem, and be respected. Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTAs.

In relation with this understanding, politeness is an interaction that can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face. The awareness includes the relative power relationship between speaker and hearer, the social distance between speaker and hearer, and the individual ranking of the particular imposition in the social context in which it is used. Brown and Levinson (1987: 70) describe "face" as "the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: negative face and positive face. Negative face is the want of every competent adult member" that his actions be unimpeded by others. Positive face is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others. Brown and Levinson (1987) also state that in human communication, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another's face continuously, and this tendency adds up to politeness. If the hearers" need to maintain his/her self-esteem, and be respected is violated by an act during conversation, they call these acts as "Face Threatening Acts" (FTAs). Brown and Levinson (1987, p.60) offered four politeness strategies in order to deal with these FTAs: "bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and off-record indirect".

Politeness strategies are developed by Brown and Levinson as follows.

1) Bald On-record politeness: This strategy is performed in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. This strategy is used in situations where people know ea

2) Off-record: This strategy is more indirect. The speaker does not impose on thehearer. As a result, face is not directly threatened. This strategy often requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is saying. Off-record strategy is used by the speaker to achieve a communicative intention indirectly. Example: Here, he will say "Iforgot my pen" instead of "Can you lend me a pen?"

3) Positive Politeness: This strategy tries to minimize the threat to the audience's positive face. This can be done by attending to the audience's needs, invoking equality and feelings of belonging to the group, hedging or indirectness, avoiding disagreement, using humor and optimism and making offers and promises. Example:
"Hey Buddy, I'd appreciate it if you lend me one of your pen because I missed my pen at home".
Here, the speaker tries to intimate and treats the heater as a close friend by addressing the heater using "Buddy".

4) Negative Politeness: This strategy tries to minimize threats to the audience's negative face. This can be done by being indirect, using hedges or questions, minimizing imposition and apologizing. Example:
"Sorry to bother, may I borrow your pen? "
The speaker saves the hearer's negative by using apology to imposition "Sorry to bother" and using a modal verb "may".

IMPOLITENESS

Culpeper (1996) defines impoliteness as the opposite of politeness. His initial work is based on Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. Furthermore, Bousfield (2008:272) takes impoliteness to be the broad opposite of politeness, in that, rather than seeking to mitigate face-threatening acts (FTAs). According to Mugford (2008: 375) impoliteness can be seen in terms of either breaking social norms or being deliberately offensive and disrespectful towards an interactant.

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

l) Bald on record impoliteness. Bald on record impoliteness is seen as typically being deployed where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the bearer. The utterances are deployed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in situations where face is not irrelevant or minimized. Examples:
"Shut that door"
"Don't talk"
"Do your work"
Furthermore, it can be concluded that bald on record impoliteness can be realized in the form of using direct, clear, and unambiguous

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

3) Negative impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2003:1555), the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. It attacks the addressee's negative face, which is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction. Sarcasm or mock politeness. The FTA is

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

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

METHOD OF RESEARCH

This research is under area of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is the analysis that focused on the relationship between language and its context. Discourse analysis covers language in use either written text or spoken data, from conversation to a highly established form of conversation.

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

In analyzing the data, the researcher use Miles and Huberman (2014) interactive models. Those are; transcribing, analyzing, categorizing or classifying, and interpreting data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
1. Politeness and Impoliteness Expressions of the Students
Politeness

a. Bald on Record Politeness
Extracts 1: Metaphorical Urgency
T: *now, decided your group name, I'm going to <XwordX>what topic <XwordX>...so what is your group name?*
S18:   *lionfish*
S19:   *lionfish*
S15:   ***Me too in lionfish group, please!!!***
S18:   *iye, masukmeq Kak (Yah, let's Join)*
T: *sorry?*
S19:   *lionfish sir.*

Based on Extracts 1 above, it shows that student 15 (S15) wanted to join Lionsfish group by saying **"Me too in lionfish group, please!!".** It indicates that metaphorical urgency because student 15 know that she will be accepted in Lionfish group and in that group some of the members are her close friends. This strategy describes why orders and begging, which have inverted assumptions about the relative status of S15 and S18.

b. Positive Politeness
Extracts 2: Promise
T: *Yah, any question?... okay, I think that is all. **See you again next week. So*** ***please read about the material**. No more question? ..Delviana Manga is out* *of this class?*
SS: *Yes sir*

Based on Extracts 2, it shows that the teacher told about schedule for next week. The teacher asked them to save it. The students promise to save it. Thus, the teacher's positive face has been fulfilled because the student has appreciated his.

c. Negative Politeness
Extracts 3: Apoligize

S2:   *Mau ka bertanya(I want to ask you?)*
S1:   *Kenapa bertanya sama saya ih (Why do you want to ask Me?)*
S2:   ***Sorry disturbing you**, bdw Tomorrow pade (Sorry for disturbing you, by the* *way, how about tomorrow?)*
S1:   *Sembarang ji (it's up to you)*
S2:   *Ok (Ok)*

Based on Extracts 3 above, the utterance that student said indicates negative politeness. In the conversation, student 2 (S2) asked student 1 (S1) by saying "*Mauka Bertanya* (*I want to ask you?*). But student 1 (S1) felt annoyed by her friend. Finally his friend apologizes by saying "***Sorry disturbing you***"to minimized threats to his friend's face. From the Extracts above there are several sentences that indicated negative politeness. This can be done by being indirect, using hedges or questions, minimizing imposition and apologizing.

Impoliteness
a. Bald On Record Impoliteness
Extracts 4: Asking to be quiet
S6:   *Ssstt, Diamko e (Be quite)*
S7:   *Ributna (It's too busy)*

Based on Extracts 4 above, it shows that student 6 (S6) directly attack their friendsby saying **be quiet** and another students said **ributna**. In this case, student 6 and student 7 felt that the situation in their classroom was very busy and they tried

to make it more comfortable. It indicates that bald on record impoliteness can be relized in the form of using direct, and clear.

b. Positive Impoliteness
Extracts 5: Taboo
T: *it's hard to do this. Some teachers do. You can, i can't. I can, You can't. So how do you build this? ..mungkin perempuan lebih cocok yah. Because they playing with feelings*
S21:   *with feelings*
T: *yah sensitif*
S8:   *Sensitif banget sir*
S9:   ***Apalagi itu sana e***
S10:   *@@@ **awas keluarki aura hantuna** @@@ (be carefully, she will be a ghost)*
S7:   ***Ko kenapa smuakah, kampret**!!! (what's going on?, kampret).*

Based on Extracts 5 above, in the conversation above there were some words that indicate positive impoliteness; some students attack their friends' positive face by saying ***"apalagi itu sana e, awas keluar aura hantuna, (be carefully, she will be a ghost)"***. Then their friend replied by saying ***"ko kenapa smuakah, kampret!!! (what's going on?, kampret)."***. In this case, taboo word attacked the positive students face.

c. Negative Impoliteness
Extracts6: Criticize
S1   *Kau itu begitu (You are like that)*
S2   *Laughing*
S3   ***Kau deh bibirmu nyet (your lips, monkey)***
S2   *Laughing*
S1   ***Make Upmu** (your make up)*

Based on Extracts 6 above, it shows that the student criticize her friends's make up by saying ***"Kau deh bibirmunyet (your lips, monkey) and Make Upmu (your make up)",***. In this case student 3and student 1 did not think about their friend's feeling. They attacked their friends' face with impolite utterences. Therefore, it is impolite, especially in our culture. Calling people or someone with higher role without addressing their title or using sure name is considered as an impolite expression and do not respect the people.

d. Withhold Politeness
Extracts7: Being Silent
S6*:   Ndri. Do you love me?.*
S9*:   (Silent)*

Based on Extracts 7 above, it indicates withhold politeness with realizations by being silent because student 6 (S6) with his self confident said *"Ndri. Do you*

love me?" but the Student 9 (S9) gave no response for that. Therefore, the student ignored her friend by showing her bad face and keep silent.

DISCUSSION

This part illustrated some Extracts of a conversation between students and teacher in the classroom. To find out the types of politeness and impoliteness used by the students and teacher, the researcher did the observation by utilizing observation checklist and video recording to get broad descriptions of the types of politeness and impoliteness that happened in the classroom interaction totally in five meetings.

The first type of politeness strategy is bald on record politeness. The students and the teacher used bald on record politeness. The first finding shows that bald on recorded appear in classroom interaction. Bald on record politeness were employed by both students and teacher. The students and teacher's polite utterances were performed in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. The students and teacher's politeness expressions emerged in Extracts 1. In this sense, all Extracts of student and teacher's politeness were expressed in imperative form. It was classified as bald on record politeness.

The second type of politeness strategy is off record. This strategy can be found in extracts 2. This strategy is more indirect. The speaker does not impose on the hearer. As a result, face is not directly threatened. This strategy often requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is saying. Off-record strategy is used by the speaker to achieve a communicative intention indirectly

The third type of politeness strategy is positive politeness. The expression of students and teacher indicated as positive politeness can be found in extracts 3. The expressions of humor, optimism and making offers and promises were identified as positive politeness' characteristics.

The last type of politeness strategy that the researcher found is negative politeness. The expressions of this strategy can be found in Extracts 4.

The next finding is impoliteness strategy. The findings of impoliteness expression showed that bald on record impoliteness, expressions were in extractss 1. Then, Positive impoliteness emerged in classroom interaction. The expressions of students' utterances indicating positive impoliteness can be found in Extracts 2. The expressions of unsympathetic, in disinterested and derigatory remarks were identified as positive impoliteness's characteristics. In Extractss 3 were expressions of unsympathetic and disinterested. While words *sotta and kampret* in extracts 4 were categorized as taboo and derigatory remarks. Those utterances were identified as impoliteness, because it has a negative meaning and causing disharmony among students, Culpeper (996:357) states that the use of strategies designed to damage the addresses's positive face. The strategy includes ignoring the other, excluding the other from an activity, be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic use in appropriate identity markers, use obscure or strategies designed to damage the addressee's language, seek disagreement, use taboo words, and use derogatory remarks. The next strategy is negative impoliteness and withhold impoliteness. These strategies can be found in extracts 5.

REFERENCES

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. Politeness: Some universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press

Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics 25 (1996) 349-3 6 7. Lancaster University

Culpeper, Jonathan, et a1. 2003. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. Journal of Pragmatics 35 (2003) 1 54311 5 79. Lancaster University

Dagarin, Mateja. 2004. Classroom Interaction and Comunication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign. Elope. English language overseas perspectives and enquiriesvolume 1 1-2: university of Ljubljana.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. Perspectives on Politeness. Journal of Pragmatics 14 (1990). North-Holland

lcbay, Mehmet Ali. 2008. The role of Classroom Interaction in the Construction of Classroom Order: A Conversation Analytic Study: Middle East Technical University.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahmud, Murni. 2010. Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology. Vol. 1, BadanPenerbit UNM

Mahmud, M. (2017). Communicative Styles of English Students at the State University of Makassar. *GEMA Online, Journal of Language Studies*, *17*(1), 223–238

Mahmud, M. (2018). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 8, 597-606. January 2019.

Mugford, Gerrard. 2008. How rude! Teaching Impoliteness in the Second-language Classroom.ELT Journal Volume 62 4. Oxford University Press

Omar, Zeydan K. and Wahid, Sura Abdul. 2010. A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Some of Harold Pinter's Plays. Number 8 Year 3 (2010). Anbar University

Yule, George. 2010. The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.