CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Politeness is a social rule that helps individuals coexist with others in their community by dictating appropriate behavior according to prevailing standards. When people fail to use politeness strategies, misunderstandings and conflicts can occur. Therefore, it is important for people to use politeness strategies in order to communicate and interact effectively with others in their community. Politeness is often expected more than is necessary. Politeness shows on the face of the other person. Face-saving behaviors are linked to social behaviors that distinguish oneself from others. Politeness is increasingly seen as co-constructed and negotiable, with a shift in focus to listener judgments of rudeness or politeness. Moreover, relevance theory allows the term "politeness" to be applied beyond the provisions of etiquette manuals, with the aim of reducing facial threat. Communication has come to be understood not as the transmission of information from the object of encoding to the recipient of decoding but as a process of co-construction that necessitates ongoing realignment among participants. This method, which derives from sociology, investigates different varieties of discourse as socially situated actions without neglecting their cognitive components.

Communication is therefore inherently dangerous and has many opportunities for misunderstandings. A more sociologically oriented work focuses on misunderstandings arising from cultural differences and remedial strategies. One of the communities that is interesting to observe is the one with an educational setting. The author is concerned in this work with how students and professors on campus use politeness. With the current teaching and learning approach, lecturers generally place themselves as facilitators of

the learning process. Therefore, this may also affect how they interact andcommunicate, including the application of politeness strategies.

The writer observed that students communicate in their own ways when they areoutside the classrooms. Outside the classroom, some students may speak in a more relaxed way to the lecturer. It also shows that everyone can adapt their behavior to different situations. The writer is interested in knowing further what kind of politeness strategies students use to communicate with their lecturers inside and outside theclassroom, especially when they make requests. Words can dramatically affect your relationships, both positively and negatively. All languages have a double function. First, it conveys information and manages social relationships.

Politeness is the speaker's way of avoiding threats or saving one's face or that of the interlocutor. In most cases, politeness can be used to reduce facial threats, but there are instances when people seek to disfigure the recipient's face for their own gain. Politeness can be communicated well enough, and communicating the first of these is a prerequisite for communicating the second. Politeness is the goal of polite speaking.

There have been several studies exploring politeness strategies conducted by students of the Faculty of Language and Arts, such as politeness strategies in making requests. What makes this study different from the previous studies is that none of the previous studies focused on the interaction between students and lecturers inside and outside the classroom. Based on the explanation above, the writer proposes a study entitled, "A Study on How Students Apply Politeness Strategies in Making Requests to TheirLecturers Inside and Outside the Classroom."

This study uses a qualitative approach and involves students of Soegijapranata Catholic

University as the respondents. The writer hopes the results of this study will have a benefit for those who are interested in the pragmatics field, as it will provide information on how university students, who are millennials, apply politeness strategies when communicating with their lecturers.

1.2   Field of the Study

The field of study is linguistic, especially pragmatic.

1.3   Scope of the Study

The focus of this study is politeness strategies found in the interaction between students and their lecturers outside and inside the classrooms.

1.4   Research Questions

The problems of this research are formulated as follow:

1.   What kind of politeness strategies are applied by students when they make requests to their lecturers inside the classrooms?

2.   What kind of politeness strategies are applied by students when they make requests to their lecturers outside the classrooms?

1.5   Objectives of the Study

This research is conducted to achieve these following objectives:

1.   To find out the politeness strategies applied by students when they make requests to their lecturers inside the classrooms.

2.   To reveal the politeness strategies applied by students when they make requests to their lecturers outside the classroom.

1.6   Significance of the Study

The writer hopes the results of this study will be beneficial for those who are interested in the Pragmatics field as it will provide information on how university students who are millennials apply politeness strategies when communicating with their lecturers.

1.7   Definition of Term

1. Politeness

According to Yule (2002), as cited in Culpeper and Hardaker (2018), "In an engagement, politeness is the way by which one demonstrates awareness of another person's face." What is face, and why is it essential to communication? Face, according to Yule, is the emotional and social self-awareness that everyone possesses and expects others to acknowledge (Culpeper & Hardaker, 2018).

Politeness is shown in the face of the other person. Face saving behaviors are related to social behaviors that express differences from others. Politeness is increasingly seen as co-constructed and negotiable, with the focus shifting to listener judgments of rudeness or politeness. It shows the importance of inner desires and fears. Face-threatening behavior, on the other hand, can influence the behavior of others and can be seen as an insult to someone.

2. Politeness strategies

Fukada and Asato (2004), as cited in Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), disagreed with the ritualistic nature of etiquette strategies and argued that self- and face-saving motives strongly influence the use of Japanese honorifics. The politeness strategy may not be definitive, but it serves as a reminder that people must be courteous everywhere, if not always in the same way or for the same reasons (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

As a result of the increased interest in Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles, politeness has become one of the most extensively explored areas of language use. The acquisition and learning of politeness tactics and strategies is a component of learning L2 pragmatics, which has garnered considerable interest in second and foreign language acquisition. The research on politeness conducted by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Scollon and Scollon (1995) has garnered significant interest. (Grice's (1975), Brown and Levinson's (1987) and Scollon and Scollon's (1995) as cited in (Sadeghoghli & Niroomand, 2016)).

3. Request

Requests are typically used when the relationship between the requestor and the requester is close. Ervin-Tripp (1976), as cited in Daskalovka (2016), categorized the types of inquiries usually made in English according to the directness of the inquiry and the difference in rank between interlocutors. For example, the most indirect type of request is a hint. In this case, the request is understood based on context and not made explicitly. Requests are attempts by the speaker to convince the listener to take action. The direct, conventionally indirect, and unconventionally indirect strategies can be used to execute requests, which are significant for L2 learners(Daskalovska et al., 2016).

4. Face

The social context is highlighted by certain definitions of face, while the linguistic and interpersonal aspects are highlighted by others. Goffman (1967), as cited in Thompson (2014), noted that some definitions of face emphasize the social context, others the linguistic context, and still others the interpersonal context. He described face as "the positive social value that a person effectively claims for himself based on the line others assume he picked during a certain interaction." This term becomes more

understandable with closer inspection. Positive social value is based on the notion that people want to be viewed as having value to others. People "claim" that value by presenting themselves in specific ways; for example, a teacher may want to "claim" the image of an excellent educator, whereas a student may "claim" the image of an "A" student (Thompson, 2014).

5. Face threatening Act (FTA)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), as cited in Jasim Betti (2020), these acts serve as keywords in politeness theory. They define these as "acts that contravene the wishes of the addressee and/or the speaker by their very nature." The faces of both the listener and the speaker are at risk, depending on how the listener perceives the action. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain face threatening conduct based on two major elements: "whose face is being threatened (speaker's or receiver's face)," and what face is being threatened (positive or negative face)" Complaints, criticisms, accusations, references to taboo subjects, and interruptions are actions that threaten the listener's positive face. Included among the actions that threaten the recipient's negative face are offers and guarantees. "Confessions, apologies, accepting compliments, and self- humiliation are examples of threats to the speaker's positive face." (Betti, 2020).