

Positive Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interaction

by Rita Erlinda

Submission date: 02-Sep-2019 10:10AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1166084537

File name: Positive_Politeness_Strategies_in_EFL_Classroom_Interaction.docx (62.55K)

Word count: 7682

Character count: 43005

Positive Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interaction

RITA ERLINDA

Education and Teacher Training Faculty
Batusangkar State Institute of Islamic Studies, Indonesia
ritaerlinda@iainbatusangkar.ac.id

MEIVA MUTIA RAHMI

Education and Teacher Training Faculty
Batusangkar State Institute of Islamic Studies, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

¹ Learning a foreign language involves not only knowing how to speak and write well, but also how to behave linguistically. Therefore, the teacher-student interaction in class is influenced by their pragmatic knowledge, how to behave and respond in different situations and contexts. This study approaches teacher-student interaction in EFL classroom from pragmatic perspective. It focuses on linguistic politeness; that is, the ways the teacher expresses politeness verbally through teachers' use of language. The present study concerns on positive ¹ politeness strategies supplied by English teachers in the three 90-minutes English meeting in a senior high school. The data were video-recorded from three different English classroom where English was used in the classroom interaction. The data analysis used the theory of politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. The research result indicates that there are eight strategies that emerged in the teacher-student interaction namely, Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer; use in-group identity markers; seek agreement; joke; offers, promise; be optimistic; including both speaker and hearer in activity and giving or asking a reason. The age difference, institutional setting, power, and the limitation of the linguistic ability of the students has contributed to the different choices of positive politeness strategies.

Keywords: positive politeness strategies, teacher-student interaction, EFL classroom

INTRODUCTION

In English language teaching as a foreign language classroom, English is not only the target language for students to learn, but also a medium for teachers to teach English. English teachers are the models for the students to provide language exposure for the students. It is also the most important source for students to gain the knowledge of the language. The aim of communication in English classroom is not only delivering a message but also achieving the goal of learning. The goal of learning can be achieved through particular classroom activities. Therefore, the ability of teacher to communicate communicatively and use the language appropriately in different learning situation is crucial.

O'Sullivan (2007:48) claims that language learners need to understand culture, context and politeness to be able to function and communicate appropriately in the target language. Regarding to the term of politeness, Senowarsito (2013:88) explain that politeness is the use of an appropriate word or phrase in the appropriate context, which is determined by the rules that are prevalent in society. The concept of positive politeness is saving the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects, speaker wants is hearer's wants. As explained by Brown and Levinson (1987:101), positive politeness is designed to repair directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his wants should be thought of as desirable. Moreover, Brown and Levinson (1987:103) promote fifteen strategies of positive politeness which divided into three board mechanisms, namely; claim common ground, convey that speaker and hearer are cooperators and fulfill hearers' wants. Each mechanism

covers several strategies of positive politeness strategy that sometimes used by the speaker and hearer in transferring a message in communication.

The participants in the classroom which are teacher and students have different level of power, distance and relationship. Brown and Levinson in Pen, Xie and Cai (2014:11) argue that there are three factors that influence the power of a particular FTA (e.g. an invitation, a request, or a refusal). First factor is social space (D) between speaker and hearer. It refers to the degree of acquaintance and camaraderie they share. Second factor is relative authority (P) of hearer over speaker in respect to hearer. It means the extent to which the speaker can enact his/her desire on speaker. The last factor is absolute ranking (Rx) of displeasure in the culture. It includes the terms of the expenditure of goods or services by hearer, the right of speaker to perform the act, and the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition. These factors influence strategy choice. Consequently, the lesser the imposition, the less powerful and distant the interlocutor, the less polite one will need to be.

Teacher has more power than students that shows there is still distance in their relationship. During the interaction in classroom, participant's positive face may be threat by Face Threatening Act (FTA) which means there is one communication participant who is not appreciated that advance positive threatened. Yule (1996:61) explains that Face Threatening Act (FTA) happens when the speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image or face. If this is the case, communication certainly cannot run properly as expected. In classroom context it will cause a problem in learning as well. Therefore, the teacher should consider how to build good communication with the students without threatening their positive face. In reducing threats on someone's face, any rational speaker or hearer will select an appropriate strategy to counterbalance the expected face threat. Brown and Levinson (1987:91) propose four strategies namely; Bald-On-Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off - Record. In order to avoid the positive face from being threatened by some FTAs, the use of positive politeness strategies need to be concerned. Yule (1996:64) states that positive politeness strategy leads the requester to appeal to a common goal, even friendship. In other word positive politeness strategy used to show intimacy, closeness, and relationships.

This present study aims at describing positive politeness strategies used by the teacher in teacher-students interaction in EFL classroom context. Positive politeness is designed to redress the hearer's positive face. It is frequently employed in groups of friends, or where people in the given social situation know each other fairly well. They usually attempt to minimize the distance between interlocutors by expressing friendliness and solid interest in the hearer's need to be respected, in other words to minimize the Face Threatening Act. Therefore, positive politeness strategies function as a kind of social accelerator.

CLASSROOM INTERACTION

The classroom is a unique communication context with highly regulated patterns of communicative behavior. These patterns are actively negotiated between the participants in the classroom. The use of language in the classroom is not only for the sake of making small talks but also for achieving specific pedagogical goals. Classrooms are viewed as social settings where teaching and learning occur through social interaction between teachers and students. Classroom interaction is more than a simulation of everyday interaction. It is an interaction with learning as its central concern. Defining

classroom interaction in English foreign language context, Zhu (2013:119) claims that in English foreign language classroom, the teacher should learn how to negotiate meaning with the students and this kind of capability was a distinct knowledge that is specific to English for foreign language teaching.

Allwright and Breen in Nurmasitah (2010:31) state that interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that only through interaction the learner can decompose the teaching learning structures and derive meaning from classroom events. Interaction also gives learners the opportunities to incorporate teaching learning structures into their own speech and the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners.

Moreover, Yu (2008:49) explains that interaction facilitates language development of the learner because learners acquire linguistic knowledge and ability to use the language through the interaction. In the classroom interaction, the teachers and students can create the learning opportunities which motivate the students' interest and potential to communicate with others. Interaction between teacher and students in English teaching classroom has to deal with both knowledge about the language and how to behave linguistically with the language, because teacher-students interaction is influenced by pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence deals with the knowledge of how to behave and respond any situation and context that happen during the interaction. Thus, the successful of teachers in building communication between themselves with their students depend on how well they build a meaningful interaction in the classroom between teacher and students

In conclusion, classroom interaction plays a significant role in the process of foreign language learning, because it creates opportunities for the classroom community to develop knowledge and skills. It enables the students to explore their ideas, interpretations and reactions as they encounter the ideas, interpretations and reactions of others. These are the purpose of pedagogic where the interaction is aimed to develop learners' communicative ability and their pragmatic competence. Therefore, the role of teacher in classroom interaction is more than just transferring the knowledge but the development of student's communicative ability and pragmatic competence needs to be concerned.

A social view of interaction means considering the participants in interaction in different ways. It involves interactions between teachers and students. Jia (2013:209) explains that the teacher-students interaction has broad sense and narrow sense. In broad sense, teacher-learner interaction is the interaction between the teacher and learner. In narrow sense, it is the interaction between the teacher and learner or the teacher and learners in teaching situation. It happens between the teacher and one learner or many other learners. The teacher negotiates with his students about the content of the course, asks questions, uses student ideas, lectures, gives directions, criticizes or justifies student talk responses. On the other hand, the students will benefit by drawing on the experience of their teachers on how well to interact in the manner that is most effective.

According to Harmer (2007:37) teachers should focus on three things when they talk with their students. Firstly, they must pay attention to the kind of the language that the students are able to understand, i.e. teachers should provide an output that is comprehensible for the level of all the students. Secondly, the teachers must think about what they will say to their students, hence the teacher speech is as a resource for learners. Finally, teachers also have to identify the ways in which they will speak such as the voice, tone and intonation.

Furthermore Cohen (2011:272) explains that language grows through participation in social interactions and classroom interaction that builds upon socio-cultural frameworks embodies the view that learning is a socially constructed activity. It ascribes active roles to both teacher and student in a learning partnership where learning is facilitated, but not controlled, by the teacher. So, language learner's development which both the development of language and other pedagogic aspect will grow as well as the process that they gain over the classroom interaction. The interaction between teacher and student considered as the crucial aspect in learning successful, including language learning.

The students, as a part of classroom interaction, need to concern about some essential principles involved in interaction. It deals with the role of classroom interaction in preparing the students to use the language. McCarthy in Khadidja (2010:16) explains four principles in verbal interaction namely adjacency pairs, exchanges, turns taking and transaction and topics. Adjacency pairs refer to the pairs of utterance produced by the speaker. Exchange refers to the utterance performed by the speaker.

Turns taking dealing with both the construction and distribution of turns and transaction and topic concern with how speaker manage longer stretches of talk.

In conclusion, both teacher and students should concern with the principle of verbal communication in classroom interaction. It is related to the goal of communication that will be gained through interaction. The more meaningful communication that built by the participant in the classroom the success learning will be.

Successful communication in classroom depends on how the participants who are teacher and students understand the intension of one another. According to Jiang (2010:652) there are four categories of classroom interaction where the communication between the teacher and the students happen, namely, academic instruction, motivation, evaluation and classroom management.

First category is academic instruction. According to Jiang, (2010:652) academic instruction deals with several things such as the teacher's academic presentation, answering students' academic questions, and supportive and corrective feedback

Second category is motivation. Motivation is a crucial part of teaching and learning process, including in language learning. According to Dornyei in Xu and Huang (2010:193) motivation provides the primary impetus to initiate learning the foreign language and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process. Therefore, at class teachers should give their priority to motivation. Jiang (2010:625) highlights that motivation is aimed at activating students' initiative calls, initiative markers, academic quotations and initiative feedback. Moreover, Malik, Murtaza and Khan (2011:791) explain that motivation includes motivation to accomplish academic goals, interest and effort in academic work, perseverance in doing class work or homework, completion of difficult tasks, self-regulation, risk taking, independent learning, etc.

Third category is evaluation. According to Jiang (2010:652) evaluation consist of two, namely, positive and negative feedbacks. Hattie and Timperley (2007:81) define feedback as conceptualized as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding.

The last category is classroom management. According to Butt, Ahmad, and Ghazala in Malik, Murtaza and Khan (2011:784) classroom management is the process of working with and through students effectively and efficiently to achieve educational objectives. It covers discipline instructions, discipline directive such as orders, requests, questions and calls and discipline markers (Jiang, 2010:652).

Table 1.
Four Categories of Teacher Utterances in the Classroom Interaction

| Categories | Forms/Functions |
|----------------------|---|
| Academic Instruction | a. Teacher's academic Presentation b. Teacher answer students' academic question c. Supportive and corrective feedback |
| Motivation | a. Teacher's utterance to activate student's initiative calls b. Teacher's utterance to activate student's initiative markers c. Teacher's utterance in giving academic quotation d. Corrective feedback |
| Evaluation | a. Positive feedback b. Negative feedback |
| Classroom Management | a. Discipline instructions b. Discipline directive such as orders, requests, questions and calls c. Discipline markers. |

POSITIVE POLITENESS STRATEGY

The concept of positive politeness is saving the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects, speaker wants is hearer's wants. As explained by Brown and Levinson (1987:101), positive politeness is designed to repair directed to the addressee's positive face, his perennial desire that his

wants should be thought of as desirable. Normiani and Sabhan (2013:3) state that there are nine characteristics of positive politeness. First, it uses direct speech act. Second, there is an assumption that the superiors and subordinates such as teacher and students are friends. Third, speaker use first name to greet hearer. Fourth, it is wearing personal pronoun such as I, you, and she. Next is giving the praise. Sixth, it uses intimate language that shows closeness. Seventh, it is oriented on approaching rather than avoiding. Eighth, there is a similar view among speakers and the hearer and the last, positive politeness is often used as a supplement to negative politeness.

Moreover, Brown and Levinson (1987:103) promote fifteen strategies of positive politeness which divided into three broad mechanisms, namely; claim common ground, convey that speaker and hearer are cooperators and fulfill hearers' wants. Each mechanism covers several strategies of positive politeness strategy that sometimes used by the speaker and hearer in transferring a message in communication.

Strategy 1 of positive politeness strategy is noticing and attending to hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods). This strategy regards that speaker should take notice of aspect of hearer's condition. For instance "*You must be hungry, it's long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?*". This example shows that the speaker pay attention to the need of hearer about lunch. This strategy shows that the utterance is conveyed in direct speech act by using personal pronoun to show the intimacy of speaker and hearer. By using this strategy the hearer will feel appreciate and far away from face threat.

Strategy 2 of positive politeness is exaggerating (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer) which often done with exaggerating intonation, stressing and other aspects of prosodic, as well as with intensifying modifiers. This strategy softens the impending FTA by creating a friendly environment. Strategy 2 utilizes emphatic expressions such as really, absolutely, exactly. For example, "*Hi, John, I brought you coffee. We really appreciate your help last week. No one can split wood like you can. We could not have managed without you. Could you help us again this weekend?*". By using this strategy the hearer would be glad to do another favor for the speaker because the speaker convey the expression of asking for help beginning with giving a praise for hearer previous work. It will avoid the hearer from being annoyed.

Strategy 3 is called intensifying interest to hearer which is another way for speaker to hearer that he shares some of his wants. By making a good story the speaker intensify the interest of his own contribution to the conversation. This strategy draws the hearer into the narration, for example by using the 'vivid present' which is commonly utilized in positive-politeness conversations. It pulls hearer right into the middle of event being discussed, metaphorically at any rate, thereby increasing their intrinsic interest to him. For example, "*I come down the stairs and what do you think I see? - a huge mess all over the place, the phone's off the hook and the clothes are scattered all over.*" The example above shows the dramatizing of an event to share some of speaker's wants to the hearer. It will cause the hearer interesting to listen to the speaker's want.

Strategy 4 of positive politeness is using in-group identify markers by using any of the innumerable ways to convey in-group membership, speaker can implicitly claim the common ground with hearer that is carried by that definition of the group. This strategy includes in-group usages of address forms which used to convey such in-group membership include generic names and terms of address such as *mac, mate, buddy, pal, honey, dear, luv, babe, mom, blondie, brother, sister, cutie, sweetheart, guys fellas* and so on. For example, "*Come here buddy!, help me with this bag here will you son?*". This strategy also includes use of group language or dialect which related to the phenomenon of code-switching. In this situation, it is expected that a switch into the code associated with in-group and domestic values to be a potential way of encoding positive politeness when redress is required by an FTA. For instance first call: "*Come here Johnny!*", second call: "*John Henry Smith, you come here right away.*" Use in group identity markers strategy also used in jargon or slang. For example, "*Got any Winstons?*" the use of brand names in a request may stress that speaker and hearer share a reliance on the required object. Group identity markers also used in contraction and ellipsis, for instance "*mind if I smoke?, got any spare cash?, how about a drink?*". Because of the reliance on shared mutual knowledge to make ellipsis comprehensible, there is an inevitable association between the use of ellipsis and the existence of in-group shared knowledge.

Strategy 5 is seeking agreement which includes seeks the topic that possible to agree with and using repetition to stress emotional agreement with the utterance. For instance, A: "*John went to*

London this weekend”, B: *“To London!”*. This strategy shows repeating can be used to stress emotional agreement with the utterances.

Strategy 6 is called avoiding disagreement. There are three ways to do this strategy. Firstly, by using token agreement or pretending to agree. Secondly, by using pseudo-agreement which is drawing a conclusion to a line of reasoning carried out cooperatively with the addressee and the last is using hedging opinions. Seeking common ground upon which the speaker can agree with the hearer, for example by highlighting a positive aspect of a negative item, is a method that is used in using this strategy. For example, A: *“So you like my new dress?”*, B: *“It fits you perfectly”* (rather than *‘that is the ugliest orange I have seen in my life’*). Although it is kind of lie and pretend to agree for hearer’s want, this strategy is needed to save the hearer’s face from being humiliated because the dress that she wear is the ugliest that the speaker has ever seen in his life.

Strategy 7 deals with presuppose/raise/assert common ground which involves gossip or small talk, point-of view operations or using deixis. These are methods aimed at reducing the distance between the speaker’s and hearer’s points of view. This includes, for example, asserting common ground through assuming that the hearer knows something that he cannot possibly know; *I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn’t I?* It also used personal-center-switch with an equal knowledge between speaker and hearer. It also includes avoidance of adjustment of reports to hearer’s point of view, presupposition manipulation, presuppose knowledge of hearer’s wants and attitude, presuppose hearer’s values are the same speaker’s values, presuppose familiarity in speaker-hearer relationship and presuppose hearer’s knowledge. For instance, *I really had a hard time learning to drive, you know*. When *you know* is scattered through a story, it may not claim that hearer’s knowledge of the particular details to which it is attached is equivalent to speaker’s but rather claims hearer’s knowledge of that kind of situation in general.

Strategy 8 is Joke. It is based on mutual shared background knowledge and values. Joking is a technique that can be utilized in English, for example, in response to a faux pas or even to minimize an FTA of requesting: *“What has your wife been feeding you lately, beans and onions?”* (In response to the hearer’s excessively flautent evening) *“Let’s have a look at your wine cellar!”* (Rather than *“Please open a bottle of wine for me.”*). Joking is indirect way to convey speaker’s want to avoid hearer being annoyed. It is one of positive politeness strategy that useful to save the hearer from face threat.

Strategy 9 is asserting or presuppose speakers’ knowledge of and concern for hearers wants which is used to indicate that speaker and hearer are cooperators and thus potentially to put pressure on hearer to cooperate with speaker. The example is like *“I know you need to finish your thesis today, but couldn’t you spare just a few hours to write me a letter of recommendation?”*. This strategy, similar to strategy 1, shows awareness of and concern for hearer’s wants as a way of indicating cooperation.

Strategy 10 is called offer and promise. It is used in order to redress the potential threat of some Face Threatening Acts. In order to “distract” the hearer from potential face threats, the speaker may stress cooperation (or future cooperation) in various areas to demonstrate good will. This can take the form of offers, promises, or suggestions, often with little sincerity of intended fulfillment. For example, *“We do not have any positions open at this time, but we will keep your application on file for six months”*. This kind of utterance will save the job seeker from being over down because there is still hope that the company will open the recruitment for the next six month.

Strategy 11 is to be optimistic. This strategy is aimed at minimizing the FTA by presuming the hearer’s willingness to cooperate, and a positive outcome: *You’ll come to help me on Tuesday, won’t you?, I hope you can finish the project this week, You don’t mind if I smoke, do you?*. A variation of this is to imply that the imposition is minor: *That wouldn’t be too much to ask, would it?* (Formal), *what’s a few dollars between friends?* (Used in price negotiations). This strategy will be used in reducing the possibility of being rejected by the hearers.

Strategy 12 is including both speaker and hearer in the activity by using ‘we’ form instead of ‘I’ and ‘You’. For example, *we don’t like that color, do we?* (Wife to husband when shopping), *It’s time for our medicine!* (Mother to child or nurse to older patient). By using ‘we’ the children would take the medicine like her mom would do so. This strategy is used to smoothing the wants of the speaker.

Strategy 13 is giving (or asking for) reasons to convey why speaker wants what he wants. The speaker fosters cooperation by involving the hearer in his reasoning process so that the suggestion will

be seen as a mutual decision. *Our old rattletrap is not going to last the winter, so isn't it better we buy a new one now?, Let's play another set, we still have time.* This strategy often involves the use of the English construction 'why not doing something'. This conventionalized form implies that the speaker asks if there are any reasons against his suggestion, and assumes that there are none, and thus that the hearer will, of course, cooperate.

Strategy 14 deals with assuming or asserting reciprocity by giving evidence and reciprocal right or obligations obtaining between speaker and hearer. For example, *this is your round/this is my round.* (An American system for taking turns paying for beers). The speaker highlights or suggests an ongoing, mutually beneficial relationship.

Strategy 15 is giving gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, and cooperation). The speaker anticipates hearer's wants, tangible or intangible, shows support towards their fulfillment, and makes efforts to satisfy particularly the desire for goodwill. For instance, *we wish you good luck in finding a job suitable for your many talents.* This example shows intangible gift to demonstrate that speaker knows some of hearer's wants and wants them to be fulfilled but the wants that fulfilled by the speaker through this utterances is human-relation wants. It is including the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, and listened to and so on. This example shows clearly human-relation wants that fulfilled by the speaker is the wants of hearer to be cared about.

Table 2.
Positive Politeness Strategies

| Mechanism of Positive Politeness | Strategies of Positive Politeness |
|--|--|
| Claim Common Ground | Strategy 1: Notice, attended to hearer (his interest, wants, needs, goods) |
| | Strategy 2: Exaggerate (Interest, approval, sympathy with hearer) |
| | Strategy 3: Intensifying interest to hearer |
| | Strategy 4: Use in group identity marker |
| | Strategy 5: Seek agreement |
| | Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement |
| | Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert |
| | Strategy 8: Joke |
| Convey that Speaker and Hearer are Cooperators | Strategy 9: Stating understand the desire of the listener |
| | Strategy 10: Giving an offer and promise |
| | Strategy 11: Be optimistic |
| | Strategy 12: Involves the hearer in the activity of the speaker |
| | Strategy 13: Give or ask reason why speaker wants what hearer's wants |
| Fulfill Hearer's Wants | Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity |
| | Strategy 15: Give gift to hearer |

These fifteen strategies of positive politeness may show up and used by the teacher and students in English language teaching classroom to convey any message in interaction. The communication which concerns with politeness regard as a media to convey a norm through language and it is a crucial issue that every teacher should concern.

METHODS

This study describes positive politeness strategies used by teacher and student in four categories of classroom interaction namely, academic instruction, motivation, evaluation and classroom management. It explores positive politeness strategies used by teacher in three 90-minute English lessons in a senior high school. The data were video-recorded from three different classroom settings where English is the object and the medium of teaching learning process. The data analysis was based on Brown and Levinson's theory (1987). The data were analyzed based on the model analysis introduced by Miles and Huberman (1994) which involved reduction of the data, data display and

interpretation. This analysis focused on the teacher's and student's use of positive politeness strategies for dealing with Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) during the interaction in the classroom. The interaction is divided into four based on theory introduced by Jiang (2010) namely academic instruction, motivation, evaluation and classroom management.

FINDINGS

In this research, the object of the study was the verbal utterance that convey by teacher and students during the interaction in the classroom. The interaction is built in three languages, English, Indonesian and Minangkabau. The findings show that positive politeness strategies were generally performed by teacher and students during classroom interaction in form of ten strategies. These strategies were explained as follow:

EXAGGERATE INTEREST, APPROVAL AND SYMPATHY WITH HEARER

Following excerpt is an example of interaction between teacher and student in the classroom

Teacher : "Ok, **very good**". Horee...mereka kegirangan, Wisnu dan Elsi
pergi ke Ramayana yesterday. Pernah ke sana?
Student : Ya.

It can be identified that through this utterance the teacher performs strategy 2 of positive politeness strategy. The teacher gave positive feedback toward students work by saying "Ok, very good...". It shows that the teacher use an exaggerate intonation by stressing her positive feedback toward her students' work. She used modifier, "very good" to convey that the students have done their best during classroom activity. This strategy used by the teacher to softens the impended of Face Threatening Act, because the teacher tries to create a friendly environment during the classroom interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987:104) this strategy is often done with exaggerate intonation, stress and other aspect of prosodic as well as with intensifying modifiers. The use of this strategy found mostly in categories of evaluation where the teacher conveys her positive or negative feedback toward the student's work. It is useful in avoiding student from being humiliated even their work is not too good but the teacher can convey his positive or negative feedback without destroying students' positive face.

USING IN-GROUP IDENTITY MARKERS

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:107) use in-group identity markers include in group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang and of ellipsis. The sample of this strategy is shown by following fragment:

Teacher : "Ok **guys**, you can see in the white board, our topic today talking
about expression of relief, pain, pleasure and sadness. Ok!, what
will you get in this occasion (Write down on the white board some
expressions about the topic in that day).
Student : (Silent)

From the utterances above, the use of group identity markers in term in-group usages of address include the use of generic names and terms of address, *Guys*. Such forms may be used to soften the Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) because it indicates that speaker, in this case the teacher, considers relative power between himself with and the addressee which are the students, to be small. So, although power, distance and relationship of both participant in different level, the environment that created during the interaction, especially academic instruction, shown the closeness between participants and do not threat someone's positive face. This strategy mostly found in almost all categories of classroom interaction in both teacher-students interaction and students-teacher interaction.

- Teacher : **Have question, dear?**
Putri? Dila? Have question?
- Student : No.
- Teacher : No? Have question?
- Student : Waiting for the rain stop..
- Teacher : Yea... He is waiting for the rain stop. For the main point. The expression for the?...
Fuji, have question?Meliana, no question?
- Student : Yes.

The samples also show the same way, where the utterance “*Have a question dear?*” strictly try to call students initiative to deliver a question to the teacher. By using term of address such as “*dear*”, the message that the teacher wants to convey can be well respected.

SEEK AGREEMENT

This positive politeness strategy deals with an effort to seek the agreement without threatening someone’s positive face during the interaction. Brown and Levinson (1987:112) explain that there are two ways to get the addressee agree without threatening their face, namely, safe topic and repetition. In classroom interaction, especially in presenting the material of the lesson, the teacher performed some utterance to get the agreement of the students about the material that being taught. From the data the researcher found the way teacher seek the agreement by saving the topic, or in other word seek the topic that possible to agree with.

- Teacher : Now, let come to the second, write the body of the letter. Yang body nya itu nah tell your reason. Pertama take salutation, salutation nya the teacher khan?**Dear Mrs. Linda misalkan ya. Me is teacher, right?**
- Student : *Ya*

From the excerpt above, the positive politeness strategy that is used by the teacher is seeking agreement. The excerpt of utterance above show way of claiming common ground with hearer. Here, the teacher seek topic in which it is possible to agree with. The raising safe topic in classroom interaction allows teacher to stress his agreement with hearer. In the example, the teacher asking his students’ agreement about how to compose a good letter which begins with salutation by considering to give an example that the students easy to agree. Here, he promotes the example of himself as the teacher. This strategy allows the teacher to invite his students’ understanding without threatening their positive face. The use of this strategy mostly found in teacher-students interaction in four categories of classroom interaction.

JOKE

- Teacher : ***Ini Rahmat ini luar biasa sekali ni. Give applause. Bagalau. (students laugh)Ok finish?***
- Student : *Ya*

The extract above shows us that the teacher used joke in giving evaluation to what the student did by giving negative feedback. By using this strategy, the teacher can evaluate students without threatening his positive face. The teacher conveyed the weaknesses of students’ by using joke, so the positive face will be secured.

OFFERS AND PROMISES

In order to reduce the potential threat of some Face Threatening Act (FTAs), the speaker may choose to stress his cooperation with hearer in various areas of face. Brown and Levinson (1987:125) states that there are two natural outcome of choosing this strategy, namely; offers and promises, because both demonstrate speaker's good intentions in satisfying hearer's positive face.

Teacher : *Lah...? Belum ketemu? Nah, tambah satu lai!*
 Student : *Eee... iko ajo lun salasai, lah batambah lo.*
 Teacher : **Satu lagi lah, satu lagi. Kalau lah siap bolehlah rest time.**
 Student : Yes!

From the excerpt of utterance above, the teacher stress future cooperation in which to distract the students from potential face threat. The promise that conveyed by the teacher in utterance above shows that the teacher offers some cooperation to the students to make them have a willing to do what the teacher wants them to do. The requirement that the teacher convey makes the students do what the teacher asked. Offering and promising also found in almost four categories of classroom interaction. It was in both teacher-students interaction and students-teacher interaction.

BE OPTIMISTIC

Teacher : *Yes.Siapa yang bisa jawab. No satu?*
 Student : *Looking for any job.*
 Teacher : **Aaa kan bisa tu.**
 Student : *Duo apo pak?*
 Teacher : *Nomor dua?Lah pelan lagi sikit lagi!*
 Student :

The sample above shows that teacher is trying to activate students' initiative call by optimistically claim them has a good ability in doing the activity. This expectation is helpful in building students' self confident and willing to do the activity that the teacher asked. The teacher can motivate the students by firstly building their self confidence and taking them away from being threatened by some potential Face Threatening Acts (FTAS).

INCLUDING BOTH SPEAKER AND HEARER IN THE ACTIVITY

In reducing the dominant power of the teacher in the classroom, strategy 12 of positive politeness can be worked out. As stated by Brown and Levinson (1987:127) that using inclusive 'we' instead of 'I' and 'You' can call upon the cooperative assumption and repair Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). From the data, it is found that this strategy is mostly showing up during interaction that happened in academic instruction.. The example is shown as follow:

Teacher : *Evan sama fikri bisa masa resa sama adit nggak bisa.Mungkin tadi membuat pr-nya sama disekolah bukan dirumah kali.Now, it is time to show your writing. **We need to bacakan hasilnya.Oke, we invite, Dika! Ha,**please listen!*Yang lain tolong dengar ya!**
 Student : *(Dika read his writing)*

The example above shows that the utterance is conveyed by considered the strategy of positive politeness, namely including both the speaker and hearer in activity. It is aimed to reduce the domination role of teacher in giving command to do particular activity. By using an inclusive form, the teacher seems include in any activity that he created to be acted by the students. The sample shows that when conveying the utterance "*we need to bacakan hasilnya*", the teacher himself seems like included in the activity, but actually this utterance is aimed to ask the students to do the activity. The teacher use 'we' form to soften his request. Therefore, the students will do the activity sincerely. The use of this strategy appears mostly in teacher-students interaction. It is related to the role of the teacher

in classroom is not only to deliver the material to the students but also the way teacher treat the students which consider the protection toward their positive self image is important to be concerned.

GIVING OR ASKING FOR THE REASON

According to Brown and Levinson (1987:128) another aspect of including hearer in the activity is for speaker to give reasons as to why he wants what he wants. By including hearer in his practical reasoning and assuming reflexivity, hearer is thereby led to see the reasonableness of speaker's FTA. From the data, the researcher found utterances that used this strategy in teacher and students interaction. The strategy of politeness is shown as following fragment:

- Teacher : Pleasure? *Ha senang?* What expression can you use, **lets' show your pleasure, tegar you are the chairman of OSIS, what you said at the time?**
- Student : "Yeaahh..I am the winner".

From the excerpt above, the teacher includes the students in the activity and gives a reason why he wants what he wants. The utterance "*let's show your pleasure*", indicates that the teacher included in the activity as well as the students and giving the reason why he wants the students so the activity in the utterance "*Tegar, you are the chairman of OSIS, what you said at time?*". This utterance shows that teacher gives practical reason why he wants the students to answer the question. It also relate to the way teacher motivate the students by including himself and giving the reason why he need to let the students taking a part in classroom activity.

DISCUSSION

This research showed the strategies of positive politeness that are used by the teacher and the students in English classroom Interaction. There were eight (8) strategies of positive politeness appear in classroom interaction. These strategy were; Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer; use in-group identity markers; seek agreement; joke; offers, promise; be optimistic; including both speaker and hearer in activity and giving or asking a reason. These strategies appear in four classroom categories namely, academic instruction, motivation, evaluation and classroom management.

Overall, the strategies that mostly appear during classroom interaction are using in-group identity markers and including both speaker and hearer in activity. Regarding to the different power, distance and relation between the teacher that explain by Brown and Levinson in Senowarsito (2013:84), these strategies are useful to reduce the intents of possible face threatening act. By using in-group-usage of address form, the teacher can convey in-group membership in learning situation. In term of academic instruction, the use of class, guys, pals, and dear as greeting words show the intimacy and closeness between participants in classroom so the environment that created will be nice as well. In term of motivation, using 'dear' for example will ease the message or academic quotation or teacher's talk in calling the students' initiative calls. When this strategy is used, no matter in any classroom situation, the students as the participant in the classroom will feel comfort and feel respect.

Using inclusive 'we' during classroom interaction is also another way to reduce some threatening to someone face. This strategy also mostly found during interaction in classroom. Brown and Levinson (1987:127) explain that the use of this strategy is helpful to call upon the cooperative assumption without threatening face of participant in classroom. Classroom is place for any learning activities will be applied. It needs cooperation between students and teacher as well. By using this strategy, including the teacher in the activity as well as the students will reduce the threatening for the students' freedom. Because, the teacher as the one who has more power than the students need to ask the students to do particular classroom activities, but they may not also destroy their freedom. So, by using inclusive 'we' the teacher can do the duty as the teacher without threatening his students' face.

This result can be related to the characteristics of teacher and students communication in classroom. It drives five rank scales that promoted by Sinclair and Coulthard in Jiang (2010:2147) namely lesson, transaction, exchange, move and act. Lesson as the highest rank is the term that

primary aspect of classroom interaction that the teacher needs to deliver. In delivering the lesson, the teacher needs to compose the transaction to the students about the way they involve in classroom activities. It needs the strategy of politeness, positive politeness, to avoid some possible threat that can threaten positive face of the participant in the classroom. Using in-group identity markers and inclusive 'we' seem characterize the classroom talk. It also related to the third rank, exchange. It needs to be executed without any threatening to the classroom participants' face. The same explanation also goes to the fourth rank, move and the last one, act.

CONCLUSION

This research shows that there are eight strategies of positive politeness found in teacher-student in English classroom Interaction. These strategies are: Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer; use in-group identity markers; seek agreement; joke; offers, promise; be optimistic; including both speaker and hearer in activity and giving or asking a reason. These strategies appear in four classroom categories namely, academic instruction, motivation, evaluation and classroom management.

ACKNOWLEDMENT

We would like to thank the principals, English teachers and all members of students from MAN 2 Batusangkar, SMAN 2 Batusangkar and SMKN 2 Batusangkar for their gracious HELPS AND participation in admitting this research.

REFERENCES

- Aridah. 2010. *Politeness Phenomena as a Source of Pragmatics*. Retrieved on June 20th 2014. From journal.teflin.org/index.php/teflin/article/.../37/.
- Bagarić, Vesna and Djigunović, Jelena Mihaljević. 2007. Defining Communicative Competence. *Metodika*. Vol. 8, br. 1, pp. 94-103.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness; Some Universal in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cockayne, Matthew. 2010. Applying the Sinclair and Coulthard Model of Discourse Analysis to a Student-Centered EFL Classroom. *Centre for English Language Studies Postgraduate program. Open Distance Learning MA TEFL/TESL ODL*
- Cruse, Allan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- Dagarin, Mateja. 2004. *Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ljubljana: Birografika Bori.
- Dailey, Aja. 2010. *An Analysis of Classroom Discourse: The Usefulness of Sinclair and Coulthard's Rank Scale in a Language Classroom*. [Modul-Assessment Task]. England: University of Birmingham.
- Emzir, 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif; Analisis Data*. Jakarta : PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Farahian, Majid, Rezaee, Mehrdad and Gholami, Afshin. 2012. Does Direct Instruction Develop Pragmatic Competence? Teaching Refusals to EFL Learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 814-821.

- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research: Competency for Analysis and application (sixth edition)*. Practice Hall: Inc USA.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English*. England. Pearson Education Limited
- Hattie, John and Timperley, Hellen. 2007. *The Power of Feedback*. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 77, No. 1, pp. 81–112.
- Huang, Yongliang. 2008. Politeness Principle in Cross-Culture Communication. *English Language Teaching Journal*. Retrieved on November 30, 2013. From www.ccsenet.org/journal.html
- Huang, Yang. 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Jia, Xiaolin. 2013. *The Application of Classroom Interaction in English Lesson*. International Conference on Education Technology and Information System (ICETIS) 2013. China: Jilin Institute of Chemical Technology.
- Jiang, Xiaoqing. 2010. A Case Study of Teacher's Politeness in EFL Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 651-655.
- _____. 2012. A Study of Colle English Classroom Discourse. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 10, pp 2146-2152.
- Khadidja, Kouicem. 2010. The Effect of Classroom Interaction on developing the Learners' Speaking. [Master Degree Thesis]. Algeria: Constantine University.
- Luo, Xiaorong and Gao, Jian. 2011. On Pragmatic Failures in Second Language Learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 283-286.
- Malik, Muhammad Abdul. 2011. Role of Teachers in Managing Teaching Learning Situation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of contemporary research in business*. Vol 3, No 5, pp. 783-833.
- Meng, Xuemei and Wang, Xuesong. 2011. Action Study of Teacher's Language on EFL Classroom Interaction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 98-104.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics: an Introduction*. USA: Blackwell Publisher
- Miles Matthew B and Huberman A. Michael. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage Publication.
- Mirzaei, A, Roohani, A and Esmaili, M. 2010. Exploring Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Variability in Speech Act Production of L2 Learners and Native Speakers. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, Vol.4, No. 3, pp. 79-102
- Muir, Peter Yunlin and Xu, Zongfang. 2011. Exploring Pragmatic Failure into the Writing of Young EFL Learners: A Critical Analysis. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 254-261.
- Normiani, Arta and Sabhan. 2013. *Kesantunan Berbahasa Banjar dalam Transaksi Jual Beli di Pasar Kehua Kabupaten Tabalong*. Retrieved on Jun 25th 2014. From mlmu-efgp.unlam.ac.id/index.php/jbs/article/download/84/73.
- Nurmasitah, Sita. 2010. A study of classroom interaction characteristic in a geography class conducted in English: the case at year ten of an immersion class in SMAN 2 Semarang. [Master Degree Thesis]. Semarang: Dipenogoro University.
- O'Sullivan Wilma. 2007. A study on politeness teaching to English learners in China. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*. Issue 23, pp. 47-52.

- Peng, Liu, Xie, Fang and Cai, Lingling. 2014. A Case Study of College Teacher's Politeness Strategy in EFL Classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp 110-115
- Senorwarsito. 2013. Politeness Strategy in Teacher-Student Interaction in an EFL Classroom Context. *TEFLIN Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 82-96.
- Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Bandung : Alfabeta.
- Voerman, L. ,et al. 2012. *Types and frequencies of feedback interventions in classroom interaction in secondary education*. Retrieved on April 1st 2014. From <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.06.006>.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Xu, Runjiang and Huang, Lianguang. 2010. The Role of Teachers in College English Classroom — From the Perspective of Affect. *International Education Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 192-194.
- Yu, Runmei. 2008. Interaction in EFL Classes. *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 48-50.
- Zhu, Hongmei. 2013. Constructing EFL Classroom Interactional Knowledge in Teacher Education. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp 119-127

Positive Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interaction

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

6%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

3%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

journal.teflin.org

Internet Source

3%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches < 3%

Exclude bibliography On