



The Application of Politeness Strategies Among Teacher and Students in Classroom Interaction at Sma 1

Pamboang, Majene

Andi Mangnguntungi Sudirman

Andiuntung522@gmail.com

Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo, Indonesia

Received : 10 Mei 2018; Accepted : 21 Mei 2018

URL : <http://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ideas>

Abstract

This research aims to find out the politeness strategies between the teacher and students in the classroom. This research employed descriptive qualitative. The participants of this research were two teachers and his/her students at Class XI IPS 1, XI IPA 1 and XII IPS 1 at SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene in the academic year 2012/2013. The data taken from this research are the utterances produced by the teacher and the students during the classroom discussion went out. It was discovered that the politeness strategies which is expressed by the teachers to the students in SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene there were three politeness strategies that as proposed by Brown and Levinson in this research. They are Bald-on Record strategy, Positive Politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy among students, teacher and the observer. So, the four politeness strategy of Brown and Levinson do not found in the classroom interaction among students and teachers in SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene. The uses of possessive pronouns “nya” and “mu” are mostly to show the politeness strategies which is expressed by the teachers to the students.

Keywords: *Politeness Strategies; Classroom Interaction*

Introduction

Language is a system of behavior and we have many different tools at our disposal in this system: voice, facial expressions, gestures and other elements of an individual's conversational style, give each of us clues as to how the other feels about what they are saying. Language expresses how we balance involvement with independence in the world; it can be a means of expressing power or showing solidarity. An ideal communication is expected to follow a general idea about communication.

In daily conversation, however, this ideal communication does not always occur for some reasons. When a conversation doesn't seem to be going well, making minor adjustments in volume, pacing or pitch – speeding up or slowing down, leaving longer pauses or shorter ones - can enable us to get closer to a shared rhythm, which conveys collaboration and synergy rather than antagonism and competition. For politeness reason, for example, some people choose to break the rule of being informative as is required. Instead, they tend to give as much as information they had.

Communication competence should not be confused with language skills that relate to the speaker's ability to express, to produce grammatically correct clauses and sentences. The study of conversational interaction oblige sociolinguists to analyze communication in a variety of situations, so it is almost impossible that the analysis to be restricted to grammar accuracy. The concept of communication competence was first used by Hymes (1972) who asserted that it is essential that the study of communication should include the analysis of linguistic and social factors.

Communicational competence brings into question the social factors involved in language, its basic dimensions being *turn-taking*, *conversational styles* and *asymmetries*.

There are many components that affect the style of a conversation. Gestures, tone, use of language and gender are a few of these factors. Understanding the differences between conversational styles might help improve your relationships with others, business meeting outcomes and how you approach tackling a difficult subject with somebody.

Conversational styles provide a more meaningful feedback when the system needs to know not only the topic of the conversation, but also have an idea of the emotional content of the conversation and the conversational style of the interaction. Positive and negative attitudes can be detected based on the word choice of the speaker. Positive and negative attitudes can be detected based on the word choice of the speaker.

There are two levels of speech that are normally used when we are doing conversation in daily communication, namely, polite speech and familiar speech. Generally, polite speech is used in social situations such as

conversations between acquaintances or strangers. This is usually used in formal situations such as at work or offices. Familiar speech is used in familiar conversations between good friends or family member. This is sometime less polite and less formal.

Being polite is crucial to successful communication with other people and impoliteness negatively influences the way a person is perceived, bringing judgments of being “rude”, “uncooperative” or “offhand” (Watts, 2002:2).

The importance of being polite is caused by the content of conversation, since often what needs to be communicated is unpleasant and threatening to the hearer. Moreover, linguistic politeness is not only employed to mitigate face threatening acts, but the term is also often used for conventionalized forms of linguistic behavior, words like “please”, that occur even if no FTA is present.

During our everyday interactions we can observe that there are notable differences in the communicative behavior and communication styles of men and women. People establish friendship partly by signaling closeness with, and mutual interesting, one another. This kind of friendly behavior is sometimes called being ‘positively polite’ (Brown and Levinson cited in Talbot, 1998:90). Positive politeness involves people in attention to one another’s ‘positive face’: their need to be liked, to be approval of. In fact, though, both positive and negative kinds of politeness make up the vital social lubricants that keep people talking. After all, signaling friendship is every bit as important as signaling respect.

Politeness plays an important role in human communication. The choice of different politeness strategies more or less can throw great impact upon the success of the communication. Such politeness strategies also work in the classroom interaction between teachers and students.

Based on the explanation above, in this research the writer is interested in order to investigate the application of politeness strategies among teacher and students in classroom interaction at SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene. Teacher's politeness strategies refer to verbal strategies employed by teachers, which have a mitigating function generally to stimulate students' motivation or create an enjoyable and harmonious atmosphere in class. Such strategies include four main categories based on the Brown and Levinson Politeness strategy: positive politeness strategies, negative politeness strategies and off-record politeness strategies. The conversation occurs during the classroom meeting will be taken to be the sample of conversation to analyze. This conversation basically deals with the teacher’s explanation and question with the students’ responses in the classroom.

A. Research Question

Based on the background above, the writer attempts to study politeness strategies as found in classroom interaction between the teacher and the

students. This study focuses on one main problem, that is:

1. What are the politeness strategies that can be found in the interaction between the teacher and students in the classroom?

B. The Objective of the Research

The objective of this research is to find out the politeness strategies existing in the transcript of audio recording between the teacher and students in the classroom.

C. The Scope of the Research

This study is under the discipline of applied sociolinguistics area with the special reference to Talk-in interaction in everyday conversations. This study focuses on the politeness strategies as found in the transcript of video recording between the teacher and students in the classroom interactions. In this case, the writer applies the conversational analysis to analyze the data.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Theories of Politeness

A conversation is communication between multiple people which consists of speaker(s) and hearer(s) or addressee(s). Speaker is person who speaks particular words. Hearer is person who hears the words spoken by the speaker. Addressee is person to whom the words addressed. In a conversation, an addressee must be the hearer too, but a hearer is not always the addressee. It depends on the amount of people involved in the conversation. In having conversation, people are advisable to be careful in using strategy in order to maintain the communication. They also must be aware of the politeness strategy to make their communication more acceptable by the others.

The politeness strategy to be used among the speakers and the addressees should cover the needs in communication such mutual understanding, clearness, self esteem, respect, etc. These are Important in order a comfortable circumstances can appear in a conversation. Related to this goal, many theorists have built their ideas and principles in the topic of politeness.

Politeness theory is the theory that accounts for the redressing of the affronts to face posed by face-threatening acts to addressees. First formulated in 1987 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia's perception of politeness. Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003:6). Another definition is "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction". Being polite therefore consists of attempting

to save face for another.

Holmes cited in Mahmud (2010:42) lists the skills that should be possessed by polite speech as effective communicators:

1. Responsive, active listeners, giving support and encouragement to their conversational partners.
2. Agree and confirm points made by their partners, elaborating and developing their partner's points from their own experience.
3. Disagree in a non-confrontational manner, using modified rather than direct disagreeing assertions.
4. Ask facilitative questions which encourage others to contribute to the discussion.
5. Use pragmatic particles which make others feel included.
6. Compliment others and express appreciation frequently.
7. Readily apologies for offences, including interruptions and talking too much; they attenuate or mitigate the force of potentially face-threatening acts such as directives, refusals and criticisms.

According to Watts cited in Mahmud (2010:43), polite language should avoid being too direct or displays respect towards or consideration for others. It can also be described as language which contains respectful forms of address like *sir* or *madam* and polite formulate utterance like *please*, *thank you*, *excuse me* or *sorry* or even elegantly expressed language. People can also consider the polite use of language as "hypocritical", "dishonest", "distant", or "unfeeling".

Definitions of politeness are mostly associated with its functions in conversational interactions in a particular society. Lakoff (1976:64) interprets politeness as 'forms of behaviour which have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction'. She proposes two basic rules for politeness, which she calls rules of pragmatic competence: 'clear' and 'be polite'.

That is why in the field of linguistics the concept of politeness is much more complex. The exact definition and role of politeness in discourse is still a controversial, debated topic, but each new theory has provided a new way to examine not only how politeness is embodied within discourse but also why. We found that Lakoff, Leech and Brown and Levinson were some of the earliest linguists to study politeness.

Lakoff's theory of politeness suggests that people follow a certain set of rules when they interact with each other, which prevent interaction from breaking down. Lakoff proposes that there are two rules of politeness, which aim at minimizing conflict in an interaction.

Leech's theory approaches politeness from a more pragmatic perspective. He begins by establishing two pragmatic systems: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics includes the

speakers' intentions and illocutionary acts. This system accounts for the more linguistics application of politeness. Alternatively, socio pragmatics refers to how the speaker wants to be perceived socially. Leech also introduces two rhetorics for conversation: textual and interpersonal.

Brown and Levinson theorize that face must be continually monitored during a conversation because it is vulnerable. According to Brown and Levinson there are two kinds of face, which reflect two different desires present in every interaction that are : negative face (desire to express one's ideas without resistance), positive face (desire to have one's contributions approved of).

2. The Politeness Strategy

2.1. Brown and Levinson Politeness Strategy

Brown and Levinson cited in Coates (1993:129) define politeness in terms of the concept of face or *Face Threatening Acts* (FTAs).

Brown and Levinson then propose possible strategies that interlocutors can use to deal with face threatening acts. Kumiarrhman (2011) outlines them as follows.

1. *Bald On-record politeness*: This strategy is used in situations where people know each other well or in a situation of urgency. In these instances maintaining face is not the first priority or main goal of a conversation. A person may shout, "Watch out" if they see someone is in danger or a mother may tell her son to "eat your peas" at supper. This strategy does not try to preserve face, but can be used to threaten it if taken out of context.
2. *Off-record*: This strategy is more indirect. The speaker does not impose on the hearer. As a result, face is not directly threatened. This strategy often requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is saying.
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.
4. *Negative Politeness*: This strategy tries to minimize threats to the audience's negative face. An example of when negative politeness would be used is when the speaker requires something from the audience, but wants to maintain the audience's right to refuse. This can be done by being indirect, using hedges or questions, minimizing imposition and apologizing.

3. Politeness Expression

Politeness can be expressed through verbal and non-verbal mean in communicative acts. In relation to verbal strategies, Altman and Riska (1966:2) mention five classes of politeness expressions, they are: graphical, phonetical, lexical, grammatical and stylistical. There is common ways in showing politeness using address behavior. According Braun (1988:13), address behavior is the way speakers use address variants such as words and phrases used for addressing the collocutors. Braun (1988:7-11) furthermore classifies forms of address behavior into three types: pronouns, verbs, and nouns.

House and Kasper (1981:166-170) also provide an interesting typology of linguistic expressions that are frequently used to signal politeness (or impoliteness) in both English and German. They are as follows:

1. Politeness markers: expression to show deference to the addressee and to bid for cooperative behavior such as the use of please, if you wouldn't mind/don't mind, tag questions with the modal verb will/would following an imperative structure.
2. Play-downs: use of the past tense (I wondered if...), progressive aspect together with past tense (I was wondering whether...), an interrogative containing a modal verb (would it be a good idea...), a negative interrogative containing a modal verb (wouldn't it be a good idea if...).
3. Consultative devices, which seek to involve the addressee and bid for his/her cooperation, such as would you mind... or could you...
4. Hedges, the avoidance of giving a precise propositional content and leaving an option open to the addressees to impose his/her own intent such as kind of, sort of, somehow, more or less, rather.
5. Understaters, a means of under-representing the propositional content of the utterance by a phrase functioning as an adverbial modifier or also by an adverb itself such as a bit, a little bit, a second, a moment, briefly.
6. Downtoners, modulate the impact of the speaker utterance such as just, simply, possibly, perhaps, really.
7. Committers, lower the degree to which the speaker commits his/herself to the propositional content of the utterance such as I guess, I think, I believe, in my opinion.
8. Forewarning, making some kind of meta-comment on face-threatening acts, such as pays a compliment.
9. Hesitators, instances of stuttering such as er, uhh, ah.
10. Scope-staters, subjective opinion about the state of affairs such I am afraid you are in my seat.
11. Agent avoiders, suppressing or impersonalizing the agent, such as passive structures or utterances such people don't do X.

Another strategy that can be used to express the politeness expression is

indirectness strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987: 213-225) list some strategies for indirectness such as giving hints, to understate or overstate, being ironic, using metaphors, rhetorical questions and being vague or ambiguous.

Method

The design of this research was descriptive qualitative. In this research design, the writer aims at describing qualitatively the politeness strategies which is found in the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. They were focused on the application of Brown and Levinson's theory on politeness strategies. The subject of this research was two teachers and his/her students at Class XI IPS 1, XI IPA 1 and XII IPS 1 at SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene in the academic year 2012/2013. The data taken from this research are the utterances produced by the teacher and the students during the classroom discussion went out. The data was collected through video recordings in classroom setting from the interaction between the teacher and the students. The data was recorded by using camera digital. The detailed transcription of recordings was worked out in the form of a comprehensive written record to be analyzed. The data were analyzed using conversational analysis which is required to the analytic exploration. Before analyzing and interpreting the data, the writer conducted data reduction and data display. In data reduction, the data were sorted out and classified into the Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategy. Then, the writer interpreted the data to find out the politeness strategies. Triangulation was conducted to recheck data and the interpretation made by the writer in accordance with other sources. The purpose was to check the reliability of data collected and findings. Beside that, it was conducted to reduce the subjectivity of the qualitative content analysis. In this study is source triangulation which is getting a more complete picture of what is being studied and to cross-check information.

Results

Extract 1. Introducing new students (See appendix II)

Before the teaching process is begun, there is a student which asks her teacher about the information for new student in this class.

S : *Bu, Bu ada murid baru*

'Bu (Mam), Bu (Mam), there is a new student'

T : *Ohh, siapa namanya?*

'Ohh, what is your name?'

S : *Hendra*

'Hendra'

T : *Siapa?*

'Who?'

S : *Hendra Bu*

'Hendra mam'

T : *Hendra, dari mana?*

'Hendra, Whrere are you from?'

S : *SMU 3*

'SMU 3'

In the extract above, one of the politeness strategies according to Brown and Levinson is Bald on-Record. This strategy is commonly used by people who know each other very well and are very comfortable in their environment, such as close friends and family. In this case, the student uses Bald on-Record strategy which is expressed the politeness expression of respectful forms of address like "mam" when she is interrupted her teacher. This was much influenced by the school setting in which the student was talking to her teacher. In the other hand, the teacher also uses Bald on-Record strategy which uses polite device possessive pronoun "nya" instead of using possessive pronoun "mu" to ask the name of the new student. Beside that, the teacher also uses hesitators politeness expression like "ohh" when she respons the student information.

Extract 2. Teacher giving command (see appendix II)

The teacher gives command to students to open their book.

T : Ok, Please open your book page 76.. di halaman 76 di task twelve, could you see the conversation the dialogue.. Dilihat di task ke 12, di situ ada dialog di nomor 1 and then the dialogue, le.. take place in the at school yard.. and the second sentence number at the hospital and then the third.. ke 3.. at fashion shop and freetalk house.. Coba dibaca sedikit materimu di situ.. Ada percakapan di situ task ke 12.. Sampe di situ materimu **di**? ok, coba dibuka bukunya, dilihat di task ke 12 percakapan di situ

'Ok, please open your book in page 76 on task twelve, could you see the conversation the dialogue.. look at task 12, the dialogue in number one take place at the school yard.. and the second number at the hospital and then the third.. at fashion shop and freetalk house.. Let's read your material.. There is conversation in the task 12.. Is it your last material, right? Ok, please open your book, look in the task 12 there is conversation there'

(the teacher walking around asked the students) *mana kamusmu? Eh, setiap pelajaran ini harus bawa kamus*

'(teacher walked around and asked the students) where is your dictionary? Eh, you must bring your dictionary for this lesson'

S : <X word X>

'<X word X>'

In the extract above, the teacher uses Bold on-Record strategy and politeness markers expression which uses polite formulate utterance like "Please" and "Could you ..." in the sentence "oke, please open your book" and "could you see the conversation the dialogue" when the teacher give the direction for the students. Then, the teacher also uses "di" in the sentence "*sampe di situ materimu di?*" to make clarification to the students about the last material. In this case, the teacher is directly showed her politeness strategy in give feed back to students. Beside that, based on the sentence "*Eh, setiap pelajaran ini harus bawa kamus*", it can be showed that the teacher uses hesitators' politeness expression like "Eh" when she gives the direct command and informative information to students. Then, the teacher also shows her politeness expression which use possessive pronoun "nya". In the other hand, the teacher used the word "di" at the end of her question: "*sampe di situ materimu di?*". This softened her question with directly asking the students for a response.

Extract 3. The teacher giving command (see appendix II)

In this situation, the teacher explain the material which is about the conversation which related to the last material in page 76, then the teacher gives command to the students to read the conversation.

T : *Di rumah sakit.. at the hospital.. percakapan antara Ms. Febrianti and the nurse atau perawat.. bisa dipahami? Ok, siapa yang bisa baca? Percakapannya terjadi di rumah sakit.. ok, coba angkat tangan.. rise your hand please? Hei, angkat tanganmu yang mau baca*

'In the hospital.. at the hospital.. the conversation is between Ms. Febrianti and the nurse.. can you get it? Ok, who want to read it? The conversation is in the hospital.. ok, please rise your hand.. rise your hand please? Hei, raise your hand please'

S : *(rise her hand)*

'(rise her hand)'

T : *Siapa lagi? Nurabiah.. berpasangan dengan siapa? Hei, hei, hei, hei, siapa lagi? Siapa lagi yang mau berpasangan dengan Febrianti? Show me sebagai Febrianti, siapa lagi yang perawat?.. woi.. nah ok 'whose again? Nurabiah.. whose your partner/ hei, hei, hei, hei, hei, whose again? Whose want be partner with Febrianti? Show me as Febrianti, whose again want to be as the nurse.. woi.. ok'*

In the extract above, the teacher uses negative politeness strategy. In this case, the teacher requires something from the students, but wants to maintain the students' right to refuse. The teacher uses utterances "hei" and "woi" in the sentence "*Hei, angkat tanganmu yang mau baca*", "*Hei, hei, hei, hei, siapa lagi?*" and "*woi.. nah ok*" to express her command for students to make them given attention to the teacher. Based on this sentence, it can be

concluded that as negative politeness which is expressed by teacher. Beside that, it can be assumed that these utterances are impoliteness expression which uses hesitators based on the theory House and Kasper.

Extract 4. Asking to the teacher (See appendix II)

During the learning process, the observer asks the teacher about the time her teaching in this class.

O : *Ibu berapa jam **ki** di sini?*

'Mam, how many time do you here?'

T : *Sampe jam 9*

'until 9 o'clock'

O : *Sampe jam 9 **di**? ehh, mauka ke kelasnya pak <X word X> sebentarpi saya kembali <X word X>*

'until 9 o'clock ? ehh, I want go to the class Mr. <X word X> later I will be back <X word X>'

T : *Ya, lanjut.. masa tidak kentara? **Ahh**? (walking)*

'yes, next. Really, is not clear? **Ahh**? (walking)'

Brown and Levinson (1987) discuss FTA's primarily in relation to speech acts such as request, offers, compliments, criticism and so on which they designate as inherently face-threatening. In the extract above, the observer uses possessive pronoun "**ki**" to show her politeness strategies which related to Bald on- Record strategy which is showed by the teacher with using directly answer to respon the observer question, it can be seen in the sentence "*sampai jam 9*". Even though the age of the observer is younger than the teacher but she showed that she cared and respected with using ergative pronoun "**ki**". And then, the observer also used "**di**" in the sentence "*sampe jam 9 di?*" to make clarification about the information from the teacher. In the other hand, the teacher uses hesitators' politeness expression like "**ahh**" to express her wonder.

Extract 5. Asking to the new student (see appendix II)

In this situation the teacher asks the new student about his own identity and the reason why he moves to this school but the other student gives clarification and confirmation about the new student.

T : *Di mana orangtuanya?*

'where is your parents?'

S : *Tetanggaku bu.*

'my neighbour mam'

T : *Tetangamu?.. Jangan sampai pelarian lagi ke sini.*

'your neighbour?.. I' m afraid you are escapee to move here.

S : *Tanda tangan bu?*

'sign up this mam?'

T : *Ayo coba kita buka bukunya.*
'let's open your book.'

The extract above shows that in the sentence “*Di mana orangtunya*”, “*Tetanggamu?*” and “*Ayo coba kita buka bukunya*”, the teacher uses possessive pronoun “*nya*” and “*mu*” to show her politeness expression when she asks the new students about his own identity. In the other side, the student response the teacher question with uses possessive pronoun “*ku*” in the sentence “*Tetanggaku bu*”. It can be concluded that the teacher and students show Bald on-Record strategy which proposed by Brown and Levison which is the students and the teacher know each other well.

Extract 6. Giving command (see appendix I)

After the teacher checking the students attending to the class, the teacher gives command to the students to open the book which is as material for this class.

T : *Ok, Coba kita, kita liat bukunya.*
'Ok, try [we], look your book'

Ss : <X word X>
'<X word X>'

T : *aa.. coba dibuka di task seven page seventy three. Di task five, task ke 5,6,7 and 8*
'aa..try open task seven page seventy three. On the task 5. Task 5, 6, 7, and 8. Please look at the book, using comparison with using fewer, more and less.. ok. Please look at your book again.'

In the extract above, the teacher said, *coba dibuka di task* seven page seventy three 'try open task seven page seventy three'. This is a polite and conventinally indirect request since the word *coba* “try” gives the chance to consider about the teacher request to the students. It considers the meaning of politeness markers expression like “please”. It can be concluded that in this extract, the teacher uses Bald on-Record strategy when she gives request or command to the students.

Another example of an Indonesian softener word can be seen in the use of *silahkan* “please” in making request. See extract 7 below:

Extract 7. Giving command (see appendix III)

In this situation the teacher asks and gives command to the students to open the final examination teks. Then, the teacher explains about the question and answer in the teks. And there is a girl students respon her teacher question.

T : *kurang, tidak ada yang di ulangi? Silahkan buka soal-soal, yang belum <X words X> Silahkan dikemukakan.. Jadi sama saja antara soal grafik dengan soal table. Grafik, jadi caranya kalo membaca jawaban pada poin a,b,c,d, dan e baca pernyataan di jawaban*

kemudian perhatikan grafiknya, apakah sesuai atau tidak.. Ya, silahkan soal apalagi yang susah dipahami atau dikerjakan pada ujian sekolah yang lalu, karena berdasarkan data yang di saya. sudah analisis jawaban-jawaban anda yang lainnya yang salah. Jadi saya berharap, untuk Ujian Nasional yang akan datang tidak terulang kembali. Sebabnya saya mengemukakan apa yang susah anda kerjakan di ujian nasional, Ujian Sekolah yang lalu...

'less, nobody want to repeat? Please open your materials that not <X words X> please explain that.. So, it is same between grafik and table. Grafik, so the way if you answer option a,b,c,d,and e read the statement and answer then looked the grafik, is it suitable or not.. Yeah, please tell me the difficult material or doing at examination in the past, based on the data that I found. Have you finished analysis your answers that false? So, I hope or the next Nasional Examination didn't like that again. It cause I explain the difficult material in Nasional Examination, the last examination'

S : Ya.
'yes.'

Influenced by the formality of the setting, she applied a polite way of making request in the sentence: "Silahkan buka soal-soal..." and "silahkan soal apalagi yang..". In this extract, the teacher uses the word *silahkan* "please" as softener for her request to the students. Beside that, the teacher also uses *anda* in the sentence "*anda kerjakan di ujian nasional, Ujian Sekolah yang lalu...*" to address the students. The use of this impersonal pronoun creates a more distant and formal relation between the interlocutors or speakers. This is may be influenced by the formality of the situation in the school setting, even though the teacher is older and higher in status than the students. In this case, it can be concluded that the teacher shows Bald on-Record strategy which is consider the polite formulate utterance like "please".

Extract 8. Asking the students (see appendix I)

In this situation the teacher asks the students about the material and the teacher asks some students where their book is.

T : *Coba sini saya lihat materimu* <X word X>
'I want to see your material <X words X>'

S : <X word X>
'<X word X>'

T : *Mana bukumu? Mana bukumu? Mana bukumu?bagaimana caramu tidak ada bukumu. Pindah-pindah.. kasi pinjam dulu bukunya, kamu nama bukumu?*
'where is your book? Where is your book? Where is your book? Why

you don't have your book? Move on.. let's borrow a book to your friend, you, where is your book?'

S : *Tidak ada bu*

'I don't have mam'

T : *kasi pinjam dulu bukumu.. <X word X> pindah-pindah di situ.. <X word X> Ok, buka coba dilihat dulu materinya, saya kasih lima menit. I will give you five minutes to read the text the number 2, the second number.. coba dibaca dulu di situ... comparison yang menggunakan as many dengan as much karena penggunaan as fewer comparison menggunakan as fewer, as less and most sudah dijelaskan di situ, ok, coba dilihat di task ke dua... pake bedak ini Irvan. eh kenapa putih.*

'let borrow your book.. <X word X> Move over there.. <XwordX> Ok, let see your material, I give you five minutes. I will give you five minutes to read the text which is the number 2, the second number. Please read it... there is comparison as many and as much because the using as fewer comparison, as less and most have been explained, ok, let see the task two... You use cream Irvan, eh, why is white.

T and S: (laughing) *hahaha..*

'(laughing) *hahaha..*'

In this extract, it can be shows that the teacher uses Bald on-Record strategy when she gives command to the students. The teacher is directly asks the students to borrow a book to their friend. In this case, the possessive pronoun "**mu**" is mostly used when give the command to the students, it can be seen in the sentence "*coba sini saya lihat materimu <X word X>*", "*mana bukumu?, mana bukumu?, mana bukumu?bagaimana caramu tidak ada bukumu. Pindah-pindah*", "*kamu mana bukumu*" and "*kasi pinjam dulu bukumu..*". In the other hand, the teacher also uses possessive pronoun "**nya**" in the sentence "*kasi pinjam dulu bukunya*". It means that based on the theory of Braun, the teacher uses forms of address behavior in pronouns form, that is possessive pronoun "**mu**" and "**nya**" which is the meaning of "*your*". Beside that, the teacher shows the positive politeness which using humor strategy when she talks with the student namely Irvan. It can be seen in the sentence "*pake bedak ini Irvan, eh kenapa putih*".

Table 1. Summary of Data Display

Brown and Levinson	Extract	Politeness Expression	Sentences
--------------------	---------	-----------------------	-----------

Politeness strategies			
Bald on-Record	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respectful forms of adress: “mam”. (<i>Watts cited in Mahmud, 2010</i>) Using Possessive pronoun “<i>nya</i>” and Hesitators politeness expression: “ohh”. (<i>Braun, 1988; House and Kasper, 1981</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Bu, Bu, ada murid baru</i> <i>Ohh, siapa namanya?</i>
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Polite formula utterance or politeness markers: “please” and “could you...”. (<i>Braun, 1988; House and Kasper, 1981</i>) Hesitators politeness: “eh”. (<i>House and Kasper, 1981</i>) Possessive pronoun “<i>nya</i>”. (<i>Braun, 1988</i>) Utterance “<i>di</i>’”. (<i>Mahmud, 2010:40</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ok, please open your book page 76.. Could you see the conversation the dialogue.. <i>Eh, setiap pelajaran ini harus bawa kamus..</i> <i>Ok, coba dibuka bukunya..</i> <i>Sampe di situ materimu <i>di</i>’?</i>
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ergative pronoun “<i>ki</i>” and utterance “<i>di</i>’”(mahmud, 2010:1, 40) Hesitators politeness expression: “Ahh”. (<i>House and Kasper, 1981</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ibu berapa jam <i>ki</i> di sini?</i> <i>Sampe jam 9 <i>di</i>’?</i> <i>Ya, lanjut.. masa tidak kentara? Ahh?</i>
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possessive pronoun “<i>nya</i>”, “<i>mu</i>” and “<i>ku</i>”(Braun, 1988) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Di mana orangtuanya?</i> <i>Tetanggaku bu.</i> <i>Tetangamu?</i>
	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politeness markers expression: “please” (<i>House and Kasper, 1981</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ok, <u>coba</u> kita, kita liat bukunya</i> <i>Aa.. <u>coba</u> dibuka di task seventy three..</i>
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Polite formula utterance: “please” (<i>Braun, 1988</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Silahkan buka soal-soal..</i> <i>Silahkan soal apalagi yang susah di pahami atau dikerjakan pada ujian sekolah</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonal pronoun: “<i>anda</i>” 	<p><i>yang lalu,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Apa yang susah anda kerjakan diujian nasional</i>
	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possessive pronoun: “<i>mu</i>” and “<i>nya</i>” (Braun, 1988) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Coba sini saya lihat materimu</i> • <i>Mana bukumu? Mana bukumu? Mana bukumu? Bagaimana caramu tidak ada bukumu.</i> • <i>Kasi pinjam dulu bukumu</i> • <i>Kasi pinjam dulu bukunya</i> • <i>Ok, buka coba dilihat dulu materinya</i>
Positive Politeness	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using humor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pake bedak ini Irvan, eh kenapa putih</i>
Negative Politeness	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hesitators politeness expression: “<i>hei</i>” and “<i>woi</i>” (House and Kasper, 1981) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hei, angkat tanganmu yang mau baca</i> • <i>Hei, hei, hei, hei siapa lagi?</i> • <i>Woi.. nah ok.</i>

Discussion

There are so many kinds of ways when the people want to show the politeness expression in conversation. From all of the extracts above, it can be seen that politeness strategy which supposed by Brown and Levinson does not found all of the four strategies. In this case, there are three politeness strategies which are found in this research. They are Bald on-Record, positive politeness and negative politeness amongs students and teacher in classroom interaction.

Bald on-Record politeness was found in extract 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, based on the theory of politeness strategy which is purposed by Brown and Levinson, Bald on-record politeness strategy is used in situation where people when each other well or in a situation of urgency. In this research, Bald on-Record strategy is the politeness strategy which is purposed by the teacher to giving and asking command or request directly to the teacher. In the research for the seven extract above which are considered as Bald on-Record strategy have different kind of politeness expression. Based on the Hause and Kasper (1981:166-170) provide an interesting typology of linguistic expressions that are frequently used to signal piliteness (or impoliteness) in both English and German, politeness markers and hesitators politeness expression.

Politeness markers are found in the extract 2, 6, and 7. In the extract 2, the teacher used the utterance “Please” and “could you”. It can be seen in the sentence “Ok, please open your book page 76..” and “Could you see the conversation the dialogue..”. Then, in the extract 6, the teacher uses the word “*coba*” which is empasized meaning of “please”. It can be seen in the sentence “Ok, *coba* kita, kita liat bukunya” and “Aa.. *coba* dibuka di task seventy three..”. And the extract 7, it is found that the teacher uses the word “*silahkan*” which is

the meaning of "Please" in expression the politeness markers expression. It can be seen in the sentence "*Silahkan buka soal-soal..*" and "*Silahkan soal apalagi yang susah di pahami atau dikerjakan pada ujian sekolah yang lalu,*"

The last, positive politeness strategy is found in extract 8. In this case, the positive politeness strategy is showed by the teacher using humor to talk with the student which namely Irvan because he was late to the class. It can be seen in the sentence "*pake bedak ini Irvan, eh kenapa putih*". It can be concluded that the teacher in this class only showing once the positive politeness strategy.

The negative politeness strategy is found in the extract 3. This is strategy which is purposed by the teacher which using hesitators politeness strategy. In this case, the teacher used utterance "*he*" and "*wo*" which is showed by the teacher with negative face.

According to Braun (1988:7-11), the forms of adress behaviour divided into three types, they are pronouns, verbs and nouns. In this research, the writer found that some of the extracts above are mostly showed by the teacher with using the possessive pronoun "*nya*" and "*mu*". It can be seen in the the extract 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8..

Conclusion

From the findings and discussion of the research, it is found that there are three politeness strategies that as proposed by Brown and Levinson in this research. They are Bald-on Record strategy, Positive Politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy among students, teacher and the observer. So, the four politeness strategy of Brown and Levinson do not found in the classroom interaction among students and teachers in SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene. The uses of possessive pronouns "*nya*" and "*mu*" are mostly to show the politeness strategies which is expressed by the teachers to the students in SMA 1 Pamboang, Majene..

References

- Altman, G and Riska, A. (2006). *Towards a Typology of Courtesy in Language*. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 8 (1): 1-10. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Antrophology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Braun, Friederike. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Antrophology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press. In

- Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Coates, Jennifer. (1993). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. New York: Longman Group UK.
- Du Bois, JohnW, Stephen Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cuming and Danae Paolino. (1993). *Outline of Discourse Transcription*. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- House, Juliane and Kasper, Gabriele. (1981). *Politeness Markers in English and German*. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Kumiarrahman, I. (2011). *Theory of politeness strategy*. Available from [http://www.scribd.com/doc/49819649/theory of politeness strategy/](http://www.scribd.com/doc/49819649/theory-of-politeness-strategy/). Accessed March 20, 2013.
- Lakoff, Robin T. (1976). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Octagon Books. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Mahmud, Murni. (2010). *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Mahmud, Murni. (2010). *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume II*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Mills, Sara. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. UK: Cambridge University Press. In Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology, Volume I*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Talbot, Mary M. (1998). *Language and Gender: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.