

EXAMINING HOW ENGLISH TEACHERS' REQUESTS ARE USED IN INTERACTIONS WITH STUDENTS IN INDONESIAN CLASSROOMS

Nurul Hasanah¹, Murni Mahmud^{2*}

¹University of Tomakaka, Indonesia

²English Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

E-mail: [1nurulhasanah1@gmail.com](mailto:nurulhasanah1@gmail.com), [2*murnimahmud@unm.ac.id](mailto:murnimahmud@unm.ac.id)

*corresponding author

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the request expressions that English teachers use during EFL classroom interactions. It is essential to use requests in the classroom to foster productive student interaction. Teachers can encourage politeness and discourage unpleasant behavior in the classroom by using requests. This study is qualitative in nature. It was held at a single senior high school in Pangkep, Indonesia's South Sulawesi. Four English teachers are the research subjects. The teaching methods of the four teachers were videotaped, written down, and examined in order to gather data. Four lengthy snippets of the teaching process were recorded, then examined to investigate the request expressions that instructors employ out of courtesy. The information gathered was examined using the politeness procedures proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The study's findings demonstrate that educators used bald, negative, and positive on-record techniques in accordance with Brown and Levinson's theory (1987). Teachers utilize terms like "please," "tolong," "-ki," "dulu," "coba," "ya," "can," "may," "maybe," "a little bit," and "have to" while making requests. In addition, certain direct request expressions (jangan, don't) and terms of address (Nak, Mam, student's name) were employed. Teachers in the class used those expressions as a kind of civility. These results demonstrate the value of civility in classroom interactions. Teachers and students utilize the study's findings as a guide to promote positive interactions in the classroom.

Keywords — Polite, politeness strategies, verbal politeness, requests, gender differences.

INTRODUCTION

It takes a lot of work to teach English as a foreign language in Indonesia. English is considered a challenging subject in many educational levels, where it is taught from elementary school through university. Thus, in an effort to boost the standard of English language instruction, a number of topics have been brought up and explored (Rachmawaty &

Hermagustiana, 2010; Milal, 2011, Syahri, 2013, Mahmud, 2014; Mahmud, 2015; Mahmud, 2017a, 2017b).

It is undeniable that classroom interaction is one of the crucial elements of teaching English that needs to be given priority among these problems. In order to meet each other's needs, teachers and students must establish productive classroom interactions. Effective classroom interaction allows teachers to support students in growing as communicators and allows students to use a variety of techniques to become proficient speakers of a foreign language. Effective communication techniques can help achieve this (Setiawati, 2102; Tan, Nor Fariza & Nayef, 2012; Rido, Noraini, & Nambiar, 2015; Mahmud, 2017a).

Using politeness in classroom interactions is one way to foster successful communication methods. Actually, the teaching and learning process benefited greatly from politeness (Jiang, 2010; Senowarsito, 2013; Mahmud, 2014). Jiang (2010) investigated the presence of politeness techniques in EFL classrooms by observing both teachers and students. According to Jiang (2010), being courteous does foster mutual understanding and a positive relationship between the teacher and the students. It also improves instruction and benefits the students. Finally, politeness fosters effective interaction and a dynamic, friendly environment in EFL classrooms. Senowarsito (2013) looked on classroom civility tactics employed by both teachers and students. Mahmud (2014) also studied how to be nice in the classroom and discovered that teachers follow a lot of rituals to be courteous.

One strategy to create effective communication strategies in the classroom interaction is by applying politeness. Politeness, in fact, played important roles in teaching and learning process (Jiang, 2010; Senowarsito, 2013; Mahmud, 2014). Jiang (2010) studied teacher and students to find out whether politeness strategies exist in EFL Classroom. Jiang (2010) confirmed that politeness does promote the mutual understanding and harmonious relationship between teacher and students; politeness does enhance teaching and benefit the students; politeness does contribute to the effective interaction and friendly, lively atmosphere in EFL classroom. Senowarsito (2013) investigated politeness strategies used by teacher and students in the classroom. Mahmud (2014) also conducted a study in politeness application in the class and found that teachers have many rituals to be polite. Even if they have the authority to control the class, teachers must promote solidarity by being courteous in order to foster positive interactions.

Making requests is one of the politeness techniques that instructors might use in the classroom. Teachers frequently assign or require their pupils to complete a variety of tasks in the classroom, including asking questions and assigning homework that needs to be completed at home or in class. Applying demands for certain activities will reduce classroom rudeness. According to Kim and Wilson (1994), "student compliance is gained through requests." For a number of purposes, including requesting a favor, obtaining authorization, carrying out a duty, and requesting agreement, teachers make requests. Zhang (2012) looked into how teachers used requests and discovered that they had a good emotional impact on students.

Based on these findings, the researchers plan to investigate how teachers use requests in order to obtain a greater understanding of how politeness strategies are implemented in classroom interactions. The researchers focus on one type of statement that is commonly used in education, especially by instructors: requests. The goal of this study is to provide significant contributions to Indonesian English language instruction overall. The research's findings also provide a significant contribution to the field of politeness studies in Indonesia, particularly as it relates to education and teaching English.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the field of linguistics, politeness strategies have actually been studied from a variety of research perspectives (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Holmes, 1988; Gu, 1990; Blum-Kulka, 1992; Kummer, 1992; Sifianou, 1992; Zhan, 1992; Fukusima, 2000; Bharuthram, 2003; Hobbs, 2003; Pizziconi, 2003; Watts, 2003; Lakoff & Ide, 2005; Srinarawat, 2005; Graham, 2007; Mill, 2009; Nor Fariza Mohd. Nor, & Jamaluddin Aziz, 2010; Chiravate, 2011; Najeeb, Maros, & Nor, 2012; Izadi, 2013; Basthomi, 2014; Mahmud, 2014; Tan, Teoh, & Tan, 2016; Fenclova & Horova, 2017; Marlyna Maros & Liyana Rosli, 2017). These investigations all demonstrated the critical functions that manners play in communication.

According to several definitions, politeness includes "honorification" or "honorific" behavior (Scupin, 1988; Agha, 1994), "rational, goal-oriented behavior" (Haverkate, 1988), "politic behavior" (Watts, 1992), and "a diplomatic strategy of communication" (Kummer, 1992). According to Lakoff (1976), it refers to "forms of behavior which have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction." While Holmes (1995) defines politeness as "formal and distancing behavior, which does not intrude or impose and therefore,

to be polite is persistent with respects," Sifianou (1992) defines politeness as "a means to restrain feelings and emotion to avoid conflicts" (p. 82).

It was Brown and Levinson (1987) who originally proposed the idea of politeness techniques. That was changed from the 1967 introduction of the idea of "face" by sociologist Erving Goffman. In terms of civility, this viewpoint has emerged as the most widely accepted one (Fraser, 1990, pp. 228-232). The concept of "face" is the main principle in this theory (Goffman, 1967, p. 5). A face is a representation of one's social traits. Stated differently, the face may represent respect, self-worth, and one's public persona. Every participant in a social process has two needs, according to Goffman (1955): the need to be respected and the need to be free (not troubled). Positive face refers to the first necessity, whilst negative face refers to the second. The negative face represents the need for independence and freedom from authority, while the positive face represents the need for recognition and approval.

One way to show politeness is by applying requests. Requests are by definition speech acts intended to persuade listeners to take a desired action that they otherwise would not have taken (Kim & Wilson, 1994). Making requests is a common and unavoidable social behavior. Requests are made for a number of reasons, including requesting agreement, asking for a favor, obtaining authorization, and satisfying obligations (Kim & Wilson, 1994). Requests are intrinsically imposing and face-threatening, according to politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), because they encroach on hearers' autonomy boundaries and threaten and intrude upon their freedom of action (Kim & Wilson, 1994).

Over the past three decades, requesting has received a lot of scholarly attention in the field of communication. Scholars have theorized implicit theories of requesting (Kim & Wilson, 1994), studied request tactics and contextual influences (Holtgraves & Yang, 1992), and analyzed requesting from a politeness viewpoint (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Chiravate (2011), for instance, looked into how learners used requests as a politeness tactic and discovered that learners of native and non-native speakers used requests differently.

METHODS

This study was qualitative in nature. Qualitative research is defined as "the collection, analysis, and interpretation of comprehensive narrative and visual data in order to gain insights into a particular phenomenon of interest" by Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006, p. 399). The goal

of this study was to gather, examine, and evaluate a variety of data pertaining to a single phenomenon—that is, the usage of requests as etiquette techniques in classroom interactions.

This study was carried out in classroom environments where English is the subject and the medium of instruction. For each teacher, the English class in senior high school lasted ninety minutes. One senior high school (MAN Pangkep), situated in Jl. Poros Makassar-Pare-pare KM. 65, Ma'rang Subdistrict, Pangkajene Kepulauan Regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, was the site of this study.

There were four English teachers who answered. Purposive sampling was used in their selection. Based on initial study, the researchers chose the respondents because they were good key informants who aided in their understanding of a certain issue and were representative of the community. The respondents demonstrated the capacity for introspection and thoughtfulness, as well as the ability to interact with the researchers in an efficient manner and feel at ease in their company while they were at the research location.

Data analysis was done using discourse analysis. The audio recording of the English teachers' instruction at MAN Pangkep served as the main source of data for this study. Four lengthy transcribed snippets from the teaching process were present. Discourse analysis procedures, such as text collection, transcription, translation, identification, interpretation, and reporting of the findings, were used in this study. "The study of language-in-use; the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but to do things" is how Gee (2011, p. 9) defines discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is also described as a process of "entextualization, in which activities include transforming actions into texts and texts into action" by Jones (2011, p. 10). The teaching methods used in the classroom were gathered, translated, and analyzed for this study using Brown and Levinson's politeness tactics (1987). The purpose of this investigation was to investigate in-depth how teachers employed requests as a tactful way to communicate with students in the classroom.

RESULTS

The findings of this research describe the polite expressions used by EFL teachers in request in Indonesian EFL classroom interaction context. The results can be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 1: The use of “*please*”

- T: *Who is absent, sick, permission? Ibu absen dulu pale [I will call the names then].
Please, sit down with your group.*
- S: *With group, Mam?*
- T: *Yes. Presentation, toh [right]? Please, hurry up.*
- Ss: *(Arranging their selves to sit with their groups)*

Extract 2: The use of “*tolong*”

- T: *Finish? Write on your exercise book. Tolong ditulis. Jangan digaris bawah, tapi tulis kalimat yang menggunakan pola “will be + V.ing” berarti future continuous tense.
“Finish? Write on your exercise book. Please write down. Don’t underline, but write down the sentences using pattern “will be + V.ing” that is meant future continuous tense”*
- S: *Begini, Mister?
“Like this, Mister?”*

In extract 1, the teacher (T) wanted to call the names of the students in the registration lists. At the time, some students (S and Ss) were still standing or walking around. The teacher then requested them to sit. In order to be polite, she used an explicit politeness marker “*please*”. This expression was meant to modify her request, although she still used a bare imperative form “*sit down with your group*” and “*hurry up*”. The teacher used the word “*please*” to minimize imposition to the students and therefore made her requests polite.

In extract 2, the teacher used the word “*tolong*” when he asked the teacher to write down the material. This word “*tolong*” in extract 2 above is the same as the use of word “*please*” in extract 1. It just differs in language; one uses Indonesian language and another uses English. The teacher also used the word “*tolong*” to minimize imposition to the students and therefore made her requests polite.

Both of the above extracts (extract 1 and 2) show that teachers were trying to soften their request expressions in the class by using those words. Another way of softening the requests that were used by the teachers in teaching can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 3: The use of “*ki*”

- T: *Sampai disini bisa dipahami?
“Do you understand so far?”*
- Ss: *Yes, Sir.*
- T: *Thank you very much. So, tugasnya di rumah adalah, buat-ki kalimat hortatory exposition.
“Thank you very much. So, your homework is, please make a sentence of hortatory exposition text”*
- Ss: *Dengan tema?*

"With theme?"

T: *Yes of course.*

This research was conducted in Bugis community. One of the uniqueness of Bugis people is that they do not use standard national language in the country, that is Indonesian Language. They used Indonesian Language which has been influenced by Bugis dialect. It is shown in extract 3 above, when the teacher used Indonesian Language in order to give homework to students. The term *"-ki"* is a Bugis suffix added into Indonesian word *"buat"* in utterance *"buat-ki"*. This made the teacher's expression more polite. The use of *"-ki"* is similar to the use of word *"tolong"* in Indonesian Language. So, when it is said *"buat-ki kalimat"*, it will have the same meaning when it is said *"tolong buat kalimat"*. In English, both utterances can be replaced by utterance *"please make a sentence"*. The following extracts (extract 4 and 5) depicts other uses of expressions of requests influenced by speakers' Indonesian language:

Extract 4: The use of *"dulu"*

T: *Ada kembarnya ini hortatory exposition, namanya?*

"There is the same form for this hortatory exposition. How do you call it?"

Ss: *Analytic exposition*

T: *(While writing at the whiteboard) Analytic Exposition. Coba, perbaiki dulu pronunciation-nya, "exposition".*

Analytic Exposition. Try, correct your pronunciation first, "exposition".

Ss: *Exposition*

Extract 5: Another use of *"dulu"*

T: *Hm, siapkan dulu.*

"Hm. prepare the class first"

S: *Attention, please. Stand up, please. Greeting to our teacher.*

Ss: *Assalamu 'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*
"piece be upon you all"

T: *Wa'alaikum salam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*
"piece be upon you all too"

The word *"dulu"* in extract 4 above was used by EFL teachers in request during the teaching and learning process. It was Indonesian style or even Bugis style to soften the speech. The use of word *"dulu"* could minimize the imposition on the request utterance; it seemed on the conversation that the teacher did not force the students to do what he wanted. The word *"dulu"*

was actually could be replaced by the word “*first*” in English, but when it was replaced into English, it replaced the sense of the utterance too.

The word “*dulu*” is not merely used as a strategy to soften the speech. When it is used in the sequence, it is not counted as minimizing the imposition of the hearer anymore. It was shown in extract 5 above that the student wanted to ask something but the teacher did request to him to prepare the class first, then he might ask later after the preparation. When it was used in sequence, the word “*dulu*” was not counted as a way to soften the speech anymore. Otherwise, the teacher gave request to student in a clear and unambiguous way. Another Indonesian language used to soften the requests can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 6: The use of “*coba*”

- T: *Coba baca, Muhammad Qadafi, Muammar Qadafi. Sorry. The text.
“Try to read, Muhammad Qadafi, Muammar Qadafi. Sorry. The text”*
- S: *(Reading the text) The text is a hortatory exposition in spoken form. Its purpose is to persuade the readers that something should or should not be the case. In the above text, the speaker persuades the listeners that it is not good to eat instant noodles regularly and the healthy way to consume instant noodles.*
- T: *Okay. Thank you.*

In extract 6 above, the teacher wanted the students to read, but he minimizes the imposition of the student. The word “*coba*” could be actually translated into the word “*try*” in English, but in this conversation, the teacher used it to soften her speech.

The expressions used by teachers in doing requests explained in the above extracts (extracts 1-6) such as the expressions “*please, tolong, -ki, dulu, coba*” were intended to minimize the imposition over the students when the teachers give request to them. The use of these expressions helped teachers to soften their requests and therefore, they can be indirect. Being soft and indirect by these expressions made teachers’ requests in the class polite. Other ways of using requests can also be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 7: The use of “*can*”

- S: *Ee, (say something smoothly)*
- T: *Can you repeat again?*
- S: *About appeal, Mam?*
- T: *Yes.*
- S: *Ee, Thanks. I would like to say, that appeal is e, suggest people e, to do or not do, not to do e, something. Ee, for their own good.*

Extract 8: The use of “can”

- T: *You can see the material on page 180.*
Ss: *Kurang buku*
“we have few books”
T: *Okay. One of you can take some books on library.*
S: *Me. Me. Me.*

The two extracts above (extract 7 and 8) show the use of “can” as the way to soften the requests. In extract 7, the teacher wanted the student to repeat what he said, but the teacher expressed herself in such a way that her request not to be imposed on, that is, to avoid interfering the student’s freedom of action by using a question “*Can you repeat again?*”. In extract 8, the teacher wanted the students to see the material on the certain page in their book, but he was conventionally indirect by saying “*Okay. One of you can take some books on library*”. The use of “can” in these two extract above minimized the imposition over the hearer. Other examples can be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 9: The use of “may”

- T: *Okay. Well. Ee, okay, now. We want to continue our subject today. So, before we face our material. I would like to divide you into some groups. Maybe, e, start from Wahyullah. You may count, start from you. Just say “one”.*
Ss: *One (one by one student was counting), two, three, four, five.*

Extract 10: The use of “maybe”

- T: *Some of you who wanna retell to me about e, our material today. Maybe the fourth team about appeal?*
S: *Ee, (say something smoothly)*
T: *Can you repeat, again?*
S: *About appeal, Mam?*
T: *Yes.*

In extract 9, the teacher wanted the students to count, but she was conventionally indirect by saying “*You may count*”. The use of “may” in the request performed the function of minimizing the imposition over the student. In extract 10 above, the teacher also wanted the representative of group 4 to explain briefly about the material. This strategy is similar to the teacher’s requests using the word “may” in extract 6. In this case, the teacher was conventionally indirect. It also performed the function of minimizing the imposition over the student.

The use of words “*can, may, maybe,*” in extracts 7, 8, 9, and 10 above were used by the teachers to be conventionally indirect to students in giving request. By using these words in request, the teachers were likely to offer option to students to do or not to do the request. The use of these words was to be conventionally indirect to do request to students. It offered option to students whether they willing to do it or not to do the request. Other ways of using requests can also be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 11 The use of “*ya*”

- T: *Penamatan tanggal 13 kah? Tanggal 14 libur lagi ya?*
“Is that the graduation day? Date 14 is holiday again, right?”
- Ss: *Yes, Mam.*
- T: *Hari Senin depannya tanggal..*
“Next monday is on the date”
- S: *18, Mam. 18.*
- T: *Okay. Tanggal 18, drama ya?*
“Okay. Date 18 will be the day of drama performance, right?”
- Ss: *Tanggal 18, Mam? Yes, Mam.*
“On date 18, Mam? Yes, Mam”

In extract 11, the teacher discussed the day of drama performance to the students. She sought for students’ agreement about the day. The word “*ya*” in this conversation was Indonesian style to ask agreement from the hearer, and it had similar meaning when it was replaced with the word “*okay?*”. By using this strategy, the teacher showed that he trusted the students to make decision together.

Extract 12: The use of “*ya*” as question

- T: *Jadi tadi tidak keluar?*
“So, you have not got a break time?”
- Ss: *Tidak, Mam. Tidak ada istirahat.*
“No, Mam. There is no break time yet”
- T: *Jadi belum, belum sempat istirahat, ya?*
“So you haven’t, you have not taken a rest, right?”
- Ss: *Belum, Mam.*
“Not yet, Mam”
- T: *Okay. Insya Allah sebentar ya. Pas istirahat kedua, Nak.*
“Okay. Insya Allah later on, right. In the second break time, Nak”

Besides the word “*ya*” can also be an emphasis of a question and a promise in another way. In extract 12 above, the word “*ya*” in sentence “*belum sempat istirahat, ya?*” means that the

teacher was emphasizing her question and it was not counted as request utterance, because the teacher did not want the students to do anything. The use of “*ya*” in sentence “*Insya Allah, sebentar ya.*” was counted as request utterance, because the teacher wanted the students to be patient and she promised them that they would have a break time later on. It was reinforced by using Arabic term “*Insya Allah*” which meant as a promise.

The words “*ya*” in the two extracts above (extract 11 and 12) were used to seek agreement from students. It showed that the teacher trusted the students to make decision together. Addressing the students with their name in request was to make the students feel good and showed intimacy between the parties. Other ways of requests were the use of address terms in following the requests that can be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 13: The use of “*Nak*”

- S: *Perkelompok? Atau masing-masing 1?*
“Each group? Or each student should make 1?”
- T: *Perkelompok, Nak. Dua saja, application letternya nanti ya. Ok. Silahkan, Nak. Kerja.*
“Each group, Children. Just make two, the application letter will be made later, ya. Okay.
Please, Children. Work on”

Extract 14: The use of “*Mam*”

- T: *Mam mau you make it by you, yourselves. Buat sendiri, ya!*
Mam want you make it by you, yourselves. Make it individually, right”
- S: *Kalau tidak kentara, Mam?*
What if the text is not clear, Mam?
- T: *Kalau misalnya ee, tidak kentara tulisannya, you may type.*
If the text, for example, is not clear. You may type.

The two extracts above (extract 13 and 14) are examples of using address terms as the way to soften the requests. The teachers may be direct without using address terms. In extract 13 above, the word “*Nak*” was counted as using in-group identity marker. It could be a strategy of the teacher to show intimacy with the students. The instructor didn't isolate herself from the pupils or project an air of superiority. The goal of the method was to lessen the threat to pupils' faces and dignity. It is customary in Indonesia to refer to a younger student as “*Nak*” (Children). But because he is considerably older than the addressee and is familiar with the teacher-student dynamic, an older guy could nevertheless refer to a 25-year-old man as “*Nak*.”

Similarly, with the word “*Nak*”, in extract 13, the teacher in extract 14 above used the word “*Mam*” as in-group identity marker strategy that showed her intimacy with her students. By

using this strategy, the students would feel close to the teacher and feel that they both have a good relationship. The word **“Nak”** was to show intimacy and good relationship between the parties in conversation. Furthermore, the words **“Mam”** instead of **“I”** are generally used in EFL classroom as identity markers. These identity markers have the same function of the word **“Nak”**, which is to make the students feel good and feel close with the teachers.

Besides using address terms, the teachers in fact used students’ name to address the students as can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 15: The use of student’s name

- T: **Ok. Fauziah, prepare the class.**
 S: *Pay attention. Stand up, please. Say a greeting to our teacher. (Every student said “Assalamu alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh”)*
 T: *Walaikum salam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*

In extract 15, the teacher chose to address the student with the student’s name rather than unspecific markers “student” or “guys” (to establish a close relationship). Even the teacher used imperative sentence by saying **“prepare the class”**, he softened his speech by adding the addressing marks of **“proper name”**. The following extract shows another expression of softening request:

Extract 16: The use of “a little bit”

- T: *Can you, maybe Nur Laela, **can you tell to me a little bit about your experience?** Nur Laela, (walking to the student) based on your experience when ee, Bother Karim did research.*
 S: *It’s very e, we, we all were very happy when Mr. Karim e, teach, teach a, teach our.*
 T: *Teach us (correcting the student).*

In extract 16, the teacher said **“a little bit”** in her request. This expression was to lessen the imposition by implying that the student was not forced to do the tasks. In this way, the student could feel more comfortable to express their feeling and will be willing to participate in the activities. The following extracts are examples of direct expressions which were also used by teachers in the class. used in the teachers’ requests:

Extract 17: The use of “don’t”

- T: **Don’t show. No cheating.**
 S: *Dua ji, Mam?*
“Just two”

T: Iya
"yes"

In extract 17, the students were cheating when they worked on their assignment. The teacher wanted them to do the assignment independently. The teacher just directly said, "**Don't show. No cheating**". These expressions were direct but at the time, the teacher wanted to save time in order to be effective. Therefore, she did request in clear and unambiguous way which also showed that the two parties have close relationship as a teacher and as a student.

Extract 18: The use of "**jangan**"

T: Mana jawabannya?
"Where is the answer?"
S: (Looking to his friends)
T: **Jangan balik-balik.** Two minutes.
Don't turn around. Two minutes

In extract 18, the teacher used the word "**jangan**". It was Indonesian language which was meant "**don't**" in English. Like extract 17, the teacher wanted to save time in order to be effective and also showed that the two parties have close relationship as a teacher and as a student. She also did the did request in clear and unambiguous way.

Extract 19: The use of "**have to**"

T: **You have to discuss with your friends**, diskusikan sama temanmu. Make an example, buat masing-masing 1 contoh. Yang pertama, tentang appeal. Yang kedua, oh, dua saja ya, job vacancy, karena application letter-nya nanti kalau ada e, ya kalau misalnya yang membutuhkan nanti itu tugasnya berikutnya.
"**You have to discuss with your friends**, discuss with your friend. Make an example, make an example for each. The first is about appeal. The second, oh, just two, job vacancy, because the application letter will be made later. E, if we need it, that will be the next assignment"

In extract 19, the teacher was explaining the assignment to the students. The teacher used the word "**have to**" in the request. She said it clearly and in unambiguous way in order to be effective and save time, because she was in the middle of explanation. It showed that the parties of the conversation had close relationships that no need to give hedge or hint in speaking.

Extract 20: The use of direct request

- T: ***Everybody says out. "Do you get it?"***
Ss: *You get it.*
T: *Do you get it?*
Ss: *We get it*
T: ***Ee, follow me. Follow my statement. "Do you get it?"***
Ss: *Do you get it?*

In extract 20, the teacher used direct request to students. It was similar with the utterance in extract 19, in which the teacher said it clearly and in unambiguous way in order to be effective and save time because he was in the middle of explanation. It also showed that the parties of the conversation have close relationships that no need to give hedge or hint in speaking.

The words "***don't, jangan, have to, direct request***" in extract 16-17 above were mostly used by the teachers to save time in order to be effective, because the teacher was in the middle of explaining the materials.

DISCUSSIONS

The FTA theory, introduced by Brown and Levinson in 1987, can be summed up as actions or words that induce fear in the face of another person. The five politeness tactics are arranged according to the level of danger associated with "losing face." The likelihood that the speaker engaged in face-losing behavior decreases with increasing danger. The approaches that could be used are: blatantly on record; positive politeness; negative politeness; off record; and don't engage in free trade agreements. Only three of them are found by the researchers in this study.

The term "baldly on record" refers to the first class of politeness techniques. This tactic is going to do exactly what it says. In order to make their points as plain, concise, and direct as possible, the presenters do so. In order to be efficient during class interactions, the teachers employed this time-saving tactic. The majority of this tactic worked in the midst of the explanation. This tactic was also used in situations when the teacher did not fear reprisals from the students, such as between a commander and one of his men, or in situations where there is little risk to the hearer's face. Extract 17, 18, 19, and 20 are the examples of "baldly on record". In these extracts, these types of politeness strategies were found in many utterances within English and Indonesian language. It can be seen in extract 17 "***Don't show. No cheating***" and extract 20 "***Follow me. Follow my statements***". These types of politeness strategies were uttered

in English. Whereas in extract 19, the expression "*Jangan balik-balik [Don't turn around]*" was uttered in Indonesian language.

"Positive politeness" refers to the second category of politeness techniques. In order to make the hearer feel good or that his ideals are shared, positive politeness is an appeal to solidarity with others. Positive politeness cues are utilized to convey intimacy, suggest common ground, and express desires. Positive politeness communicates the speaker's desire to engage in conversation with the listener. Brown and Levinson (1987) identified fifteen ways for practicing positive politeness (p. 102). Only the strategies 1 (notice), 4 (use in-group identification markers), 5 (seek agreement), and 10 (offer, promise) were discovered by the researchers.

The example of strategy 1 (notice) can be found in extract 15 "*Fauziah, prepare the class*". The teachers chose to mention the student's name rather than call her "chairman" to establish a close relationship. The example of strategy 4 (use in-group identity markers) can be found in extract 13 "*Ok. Silahkan, Nak. Kerja [Ok. Please, Children. Work on]*" and extract 14 "*Mam mau [want] you make it by you, yourselves*". These extracts use identity markers "*Nak*" rather than "*students*" and "*Mam*" instead of "I") to establish intimacy with the students as they have a good relationship. The example of strategy 5 (seek agreement) and 10 (offer, promise) both presented in extract 11 and 12 "*Ok. Insya Allah, sebentar [later on], ya*". The teacher promised the students to have break time after the teaching process by saying Arabic term "*Insya Allah*", then sought for the students' agreement by saying "*ya*" in the last sentence.

"Negative politeness" refers to the third category of politeness techniques. The term "negative politeness strategy" is an effort to show that one is aware of not wanting to be imposed upon, or, in other words, to refrain from restricting the other person's freedom of movement by employing hedging, apology, etc. Because it serves to reduce the imposition over the hearer, Brown and Levinson (1987) view this tactic as the foundation of respectful behavior. Only five of the ten strategies listed by Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 131)—that is, strategies 1 (be conventionally indirect), 2 (question, hedge), 4 (minimize imposition), 5 (give defense), and 6 (apologize)—were discovered by the researchers.

The examples of strategy 1 (be conventionally indirect) are shown in extract 8 "*one of you can take some books on library*" and extract 10 "*Maybe the fourth team about appeal?*". These utterances are conventionally indirect to do request to students. The examples of strategy 2 (question) can be shown in extract 7 "*can you repeat again?*" and also in extract 8. Both of these

utterances use question form to request to students. The examples of strategy 4 (minimize imposition) are shown in extract 1-6 and extract 16. The teachers used the words “*please, tolong, -ki, dulu, coba, a little bit*” to minimize imposition and avoid giving offense by showing deference. The example of strategy 5 (give defense) is also shown in extract 3 “*buat-ki kalimat [please make sentences of] hortatory exposition*”. The word “*-ki*” there has the same meaning with “*please*”. It is Bugis style of communication to show defense to people, even to younger people.

The results of this study suggest that classrooms should implement civility strategies. To be respectful during class interactions, teachers must use certain terms when making requests. This result corroborated the results of other research on classroom politeness (Yuka, 2009; Jiang, 2010; Senowarsito, 2013; Mahmud, 2014). The majority of the research in this area supported the significance of manners in classroom interactions. In order to foster effective communication in the classroom, teachers and students—who act as the actors in the classroom—must act politely toward one another. In the classroom, disruptive behavior can damage the interaction process, which can also have an impact on how well learning and teaching objectives are met.

The culture in which the research is being conducted influences the politeness strategies teachers use in their requests, which is another important conclusion from this study. The study conducted in the Bugis community revealed that individuals there frequently use their dialect when conversing in Bahasa Indonesia, or Indonesian, the country's official language. It is shown in extract 3, the teacher gave request to students in Indonesian language but add Bugis suffix “*-ki*” in his utterance. Some expressions derived from Indonesian language such as “*dulu*”, “*coba*”, “*tolong*”, “*ya*” and “*jangan*” were also used as ways to soften the requests of the teachers. This shows that culture within the community will influence the application of politeness strategies. This bolsters the body of research on politeness, which showed that politeness varies depending on the culture and circumstance. “Politeness strategies vary from language to language, from culture to culture,” according to Zhan (1992, p. 3). Furthermore, according to Lakoff and Ide (2005, p. 6), “all cultures recognize a set of behaviors and attitudes as polite.” No culture will have “a set of norms for what counts as polite or impolite behaviors,” claim Kadar and Mills (2011, p. 21). As a result, manners are practiced differently among people in different societies. The various ways that requests are used as politeness tactics that this study uncovered highlight the impact of culture on politeness customs.

The results of this study corroborate the notion of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Both educators and learners are obliged to exhibit courteous conduct. Both educators and students should refrain from actions that could be construed as "threatening acts" in accordance with Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory in order to protect "face," particularly for educators. In a research on secondary schools in the UK, Payne-Woolridge (2010) concentrated on facework in the classroom and used it as a means "to introduce a fresh way of considering the way teachers speak to pupils about behaviour." This suggests that teachers should utilize the "facework" method proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) to retain politeness when communicating with pupils in the classroom. In order to maintain "face" for both teachers and pupils, the usage of some of the softer language to accommodate the needs of the teachers examined in this study served as politeness techniques.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear from the discussion above that teachers employed a few techniques to respond to requests in an etiquette-aware manner during Indonesian EFL class interactions. According to Brown and Levinson Theory (1987), the politeness tactics employed by EFL teachers in this study can be divided into three categories: plain on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. The researchers expect that educators will become more conscious of the use of requests as courteous tactics. In order to foster productive classroom interactions, it is crucial to use requests as politeness tactics.

In order to make new, significant improvements to the practice of teaching English and to raise the standard of language instruction, particularly with regard to politeness strategies, the researchers also anticipate that the findings of this study will be helpful to English teachers, students aspiring to become English teachers, and future researchers who wish to carry out this basic research. Teachers and students that engage in classroom interactions might benefit from these findings by learning appropriate classroom behavior guidelines that lead to productive classroom interactions. The results of this study also add to the body of knowledge on politeness in Asian contexts, especially in Indonesia. To completely understand how factors like age, gender, and communication languages affect teachers' and students' politeness behaviors, more research is necessary.

REFERENCES

- Agha, A. (1994). Honorification. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 277-302.
- Ambady, N., Koo, J., Lee, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1996). More than words: Linguistic and non-linguistic politeness in two cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 996-1011.
- Basthomi, Y. (2014). No=Yes or Yes=No? Strategies in responding to an offer/invitation among Indonesians. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.*, 22(4), 1133-1146.
- Bharuthram, S. (2003). Politeness phenomena in the Hindu sector of the South African Indian English-speaking community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1523-1544.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, S. & K. Echlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in history, theory, and practice* (pp. 256-282). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chiravate, B. (2011). Perception of politeness in English requests by Thai EFL learners. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 17(2), 59-71.
- Fenclova, M. & Horova, M. (2017). The expression of politeness and modesty in the texts of the social sciences. *Xlinguae*, 10(1), 42-48.
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219-236.
- Fukushima, S. (2000). *Requests and culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1960). *The religion of Java*. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Graham, S. L. (2007). Disagreeing to agree: Conflict, (im)politeness and identity in a computer-mediated community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(4), 742-759.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 237-257.
- Haverkate, H. (1988). Toward a typology of politeness strategies in communicative interaction. *Multilingua*, 7(4), 385-409.
- Hobbs, P. (2003). The medium is the message: Politeness strategies in men's and women's voice mail messages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(2), 243-262.
- Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: A sex-preferential politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 445-465.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. London and New York: Longman.
- Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J.-N. 1992. Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 246-256.
- Izadi, A. (2013). Politeness in spoken review genre: Viva voce context. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.*, 21(4), 1411-1429.
- Jones, R. H. (2011). Data collection and transcription in discourse analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Bloomsbury companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 9-21). London: Bloomsbury.
- Kadar, D. Z. & Mills, S. (2011). *Politeness in East Asia*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, M.S. & Wilson, S. R. (1994). A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Implicit Theories of Requesting. *Communication Monographs*, 61, 210-235.

- Kummer, M. (1992). Politeness in Thai. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, S. & K. Echlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (pp. 326-336). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1976). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society*. Vol. 2 (1) (Apr., 1973), pp. 45-80. Cambridge University Press Stable URL [online]. Retrieved on January 21, 2015, from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>
- Lakoff, R.T. & Ide, S. (2005). *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mahmud, M. (2014). Teachers' Rituals to be Polite: Contesting Power and Solidarity. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2).
- Mahmud, M. (2015). Students' expectations toward their teachers: A study on teachers' competence, gender issues and politeness between teachers and students in Indonesian context. *ELT Worldwide*, 2(1), 96-112.
- Mahmud, M. (2017a). Communicative Styles of English Students at the State University of Makassar. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 17(1), 223-238.
- Mahmud, M. (2017b). Teaching students to develop paragraphs through poetry writing. *International Journal of Language Education (IJOLE)*, 1(1), 37-50.
- Marlyna Maros & Liyana Rosli. (2017). Politeness Strategies in Twitter Updates of Female English Language Studies Malaysian Undergraduates. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23(1), 132-149.
- Milal, A.D. (2011). Indicators of the practice of power in language classrooms. *The TEFLIN Journal*, 22 (1).
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mizutani, O. & Mizutani, N. (1987). *How to be polite in Japanese*. Tokyo, Japan: The Japan Times, Ltd.
- Najeeb, Z. M., Maros, M., & Nor, N. F. M. (2012). Politeness in e-mails of Arab students in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1), 125-145.
- Nor Fariza Mohd. Nor, & Jamaluddin Aziz. (2010). Discourse Analysis of Decision-Making Episodes in Meetings: Politeness theory and Critical Discourse Analysis. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 16(2), 66-92.
- Payne-Woolridge, R. (2010). Classroom behaviour and facework: Balancing threats and enhancements. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(2), 167-180.
- Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining politeness, face, and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1471-1506.
- Rachmawaty, N. & Hermagustiana, I. (2010). Does retelling technique improve speaking fluency? *Teflin Journal*, 21(1), 1-8.
- Rido, Akhyar, Noraini Ibrahim, & Nambiar R. M. K. (2015). Interaction strategies of master teachers in Indonesian vocational classroom: A case study. *3L: Language, Linguistics and Literature, The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 21(3), 85-98
- Scupin, R. (1988). Language, hierarchy, and hegemony: Thai Muslim discourse strategies, *Language Sciences*, 10(2), 331-351.
- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Srinarawat, D. (2005). Indirectness as a politeness strategy of Thai speakers. In R. T. Lakoff & S. Ide. (Eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (pp. 176-193). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sun, R. C. F. & Shek, D. T. L. (2012). Classroom misbehavior in the eyes of students: A qualitative study. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2012(2012). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1100/2012/398482>.

- Senowarsito. (2013). Politeness Strategies in Teacher-Student Interaction in an EFL Classroom Contents. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(1), 82-96 [online]. Retrieved on April 31th, 2014 from
- Setiawati, L. (2012). A descriptive study on the teacher talks at EYL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 33-48.
- Syahri, I. (2013). Resemblance of indirectness in politeness of EFL learners' requests realization. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 148-165.
- Tan, Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor & Nayef, Jaradat. (2012). Communication strategies among EFL students: An examination of frequency of use and types of strategies used. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(3), 831-848.
- Tan H. K., Teoh M. L., Tan S. K. (2016). Beyond 'Greeting' and 'Thanking': Politeness in Job Interviews, *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 22(3), 171-184.
- Watts, R. J. (1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R.J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Echlich. (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (pp. 43-69). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watts, R. J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhan, K. (1992). *The Strategies of politeness in the Chinese language*. California, USA: The Regents of the University of California.
- Zhang, Q. (2012). Teacher Request Politeness: Effects on Student Positive Emotions and Compliance Intention. *Human Communication*, 14(1), 347-356.