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Abstract- This present study investigates the form of politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments performed by different gender in a classroom setting, single teacher and single student, in sociopragmatic perspective. Particularly, this study aims to 1) describe the form of politeness strategies of making requests used by male and female teachers 2) describe the form of politeness strategies of giving compliments performed by male and female teachers, 3) describe the difference form of their politeness strategies of those 2 speech acts and 4) evaluate the factors that may underlie the choice of their politeness strategies of those 2 speech acts in classroom setting. Therefore, the examples of the politeness strategies of 2 speech acts employed by distinct gender were provided in this study. To identify those politeness strategies, Brown and Levinson’s theory (1987) was used as a preliminary identification. In obtaining the data, video recording transcript and interview transcript are collected and then analyzed. The data were the utterances of 2 female and 2 male teachers in classroom setting. The findings show that female teachers tend to use negative politeness strategies more in making requests and both gender tend to use positive politeness strategies in giving compliments in the classroom setting. Their choices were underlied by their closeness to their participants which determined by the character of their participants, the time needed to get close to their participants, the interest of their participants and the topic discussed with their participants. This indicates that the teachers are aware of their pragmatic competence, yet, to create friendlier atmosphere both gender need to advance their ability in using other politeness strategies.
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1. INTRODUCTION

That language, society, and culture as terms which cannot be parted from one another or even kept aside is something undeniable. It has long been an interest and core issue among sociolinguist in the past and at present. Language itself is commonly put into account as ‘the device’ to communicate among ‘people’ who are determined as the members of society which come from very many different cultural backgrounds (Wardaugh, 2006: 1[42]; Duranti, 1997: 1[14]). Thus, when two or more people in a certain society attempt to communicate using their language, they obviously should follow the norms that exist as the part of culture and govern the choice of utterances which result to a particular attitude they may bring up. This particular attitude, a term which sometimes may refer to behavior, will lead to the concept of politeness; and politeness is viewed as social behavior which is common to all cultures. The concept of politeness can be studied linguistically or non-linguistically. Linguistic politeness, the way of being polite through the use of language, is the concern in this study. In the social interaction happens every day, politeness is a fixed concept which is needed to establish interpersonal relationship and maintain a good rapport among people in the society. According to Yule (1996: 60[47], politeness is seen as the way to show the awareness of another person’s face, while the other linguist like Mills (2003: 6)[31] stated that politeness is the attempt expressed by the speaker who intends to mitigate face threats carried out by certain face threatening acts toward another. In other words, the term politeness is used unequivocally by some theorists to refer to a certain expression or a particular way to show respect or build a close rapport employed by the interactants through the use of language. To show this respect and build this close rapport, then, one must have considered others’ feelings which deny an imposing act by paying concern on others’ face. The existence of the concept of ‘face’, the public self-image that is possessed and maintained during a social interaction by a speaker or hearer (Goffman (1967)[21]; Yule (1996)[47]), makes it possible to consider certain strategies of politeness which employed by people. People are engaged in a variety of speech acts to show some strategies of politeness. According to Austin (1962)[3], speech act is determined as an action performed in saying something. Making requests and giving compliments are included in speech act categories which have been discussed in many previous studies. Making
requests is considered as a highly imposing act by Brown and Levinson (1986)[8] cited in Yan (2010: 10)[46], they also stated that giving compliments is considered as the speech act which threaten the speaker’s and hearer’s face – hearer’s face is the most threatened given the reason that the hearer might have to take action to protect the object of the speaker’s desire and/or to accept and respond (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 66-68)[8]. The way expressing both speech acts of making requests and giving compliments is different from one person to another. This is due to the fact that people have different genders which considered as the social variables in some previous studies. Lakoff (1974)[26], feminist scholar, cited in May et al. (2015: 21)[29] stated that women’s speech is considered more polite than men. This means that women mitigate more often when they make requests in order to minimize the threat that may emerge than man who often uses the more direct forms. This makes an assumption also that female tries to communicate which shows solidarity when they make requests and giving compliments. Furthermore, Montgomery (1998), cited in Keikhaie and Mozaffari (2013: 53-54), claimed that there is a tendency to use polite language performed by both male and female speaker when they are speaking to women. It can be said that the gender of the hearer is taken into consideration too when the different gender of the speaker try to communicate their intention by using polite language and it seems that women and men tend to use the positive language when they talk to women to keep the camaraderie. Brown and Levinson’s politeness strategies theory may lead these different genders to be in attempt to save and even maintain another’s face. Both male and female can tend to use the negative politeness of positive politeness. More to the point, bald-on record or off-record which potentially elicited threats to another’s face are concerned too.

Moreover, the different strategies of politeness in making requests and giving compliments may not only be seen from the gender difference but also from the context, situation and place. When male and female communicate employing a certain politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments in a different context, then for sure they are in favor in getting the payoffs of the communication. Classroom setting has been the choice of numerous previous studies to conduct a research about the relationship of politeness strategies and distinct gender. Some of them conducted their studies to see the way politeness strategies are used by different gender of the students or learners (Bacha, 2012[4]; Furko and Dudas, 2012[20]; Marani and Szalat, 2010; Salvesen, 2015[36]; Keikhaie and Mozaffari, 2011; Oria, 2013[33]) while some others conducted their studies of politeness strategies based on the gender-based interaction between teacher and students (Monsifi and Hadidi, 2015[32]; Prativi, 2013). Meanwhile in this present study, the politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments performed by male and female teachers in a classroom setting of a private foundation with one teacher and one student is the main focus, given the assumption that, since linguistic politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987)[8] have different strategies by considering another person’s face aforementioned and since this classroom setting reflects the social interaction happens every day and it emphasizes the formal situation, the politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments performed by the distinct gender must be somewhat different too. Not only that, gender of the teacher and classroom setting may be the pivotal variable, yet the selection of these politeness strategies, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987)[8], is based on the sociological factors like relative power (P), social distance (D), and the degree of imposition (P) that underlie. In parallel, Yule (1996: 59)[47] also mentioned that there are internal factors like the degree of imposition and external factors like age and power which determine the choice of politeness strategies. Accordingly, speaker (S) from distinct gender should anticipate the form of FTAs that may happen while making requests and giving compliments to the hearer (H) by gaining awareness of the hearer’s power, social distance, and age.

Furthermore, to understand what the speakers are said and communicated by using this politeness concept when they share something to the hearer deals with pragmatic competence, which pay a heed on gaining beyond what is said and communicated which is absolutely assigned to social relationship. The successfulness of what is said and communicated by the speaker is weighed in the communicative competence of every person. Since male and female are considered as the person or the member of the society, they must have different pragmatic competence in using politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments in a classroom setting with one teacher and one student. This is why the sociopragmatic perspective is preferable to conduct this research, in that it examines the relationship between social context, like the different gender and discourse, like the classroom setting (Holmes and King, 2017: 121)[23]. From the explanation above, the present researcher tries to see the way how the male and female teachers in a certain private foundation’s intensive speaking program, one teacher one student, express politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments when they face adult learners of English in classroom setting and what other factors that may underlie the choice of their politeness strategies.

2. POLITENESS STRATEGIES OF MAKING REQUESTS AND GIVING COMPLIMENTS

The definition of politeness has widely been defined by several experts like Foley (1997: 207)[18] who stated that politeness as a social skills’ tool which has a purpose to make everyone inside the social interaction feels comfortable or affirmed. Meyerhoff (2011: 312), cited in Salvesen (2015: 53)[36], asserted politeness as the action to anticipate the emergence of commotion between the
people who are competent as a speaker in community when they engage in a social interaction. To determine whether is said is polite or not – since this study focus on the linguistic politeness – then one must first look at the linguistic form of used, the context of the utterance that works, and the relationship between speaker and hearer that exists (Yule, 1996: 157)[47]. From these statements, politeness can be seen as an appropriate behavior within a daily social interaction which considered as pragmatic competence involving appropriate language choice to reduce the disturbance. By considering the disturbance that may happen, speakers must be aware to the existence of the concept of face. Some prior experts in this study have established the idea of face, they were, Goffman (1967)[21], Brown and Levinson (1987)[8], and Yule (1996)[47]. Goffman (1967: 5)[21] stated that face is the positive value or image that a person takes based on the assumption from other participants during a particular interaction and claims for himself/herself as a self-delineated. Goffman (1972)[21] cited in Koutlaki (2002: 1736)[25] also added that the term of ‘face’ is only a loan derived from the society to a person as long as he/she is worth to it. It means that a person who possessed this self-image which represented by his/her face will be expected to maintain his/her position in the society considerably and avoid doing some actions which are costly to him/her. Not only that one must weigh up to his/her face, but also other’s feeling must be weighed up at the same time. In other words, if somebody acts out in a particular events with a certain line which described as the verbal and nonverbal acts pattern expressed by a person to evaluate the situation and the participants, especially himself (Goffman, 1967: 5)[21], he or she is required first to consider his or her face and others’ face since it may leave different impressions toward each other in order to sustain the flow of the interaction.

Also, other experts like Brown and Levinson (1987: 61)[8] took the inspiration from Goffman’s work of face and postulated face as something which is emotionally invested, and which can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be conventionally attended to in interaction, and Yule (1996: 60)[47] affirmed that face is the public self-image which relates to emotional and social sense of self that everyone posses and expects everyone else to recognize and Ho (1976: 867) cited in Salvessen (2015: 53)[36] emphasized that face is standards of behavior, personality, status, dignity, honor, and prestige. From those points of view, face is something which is tightly bound to a person socially and emotionally and should be considered by one and other participants involved in the interaction. At this point, the term ‘face-work’ has come to the surface. Lakoff (1977)[26] in Wijayanto et al. (2013: 189) stated that face-work is the transaction which underlies the flow of human communication cooperatively. She then formulated it into 3 rules, known as formality (don’t impose, remain aloof), hesitancy (respect other’s private territories), and equality (make others feel good). Leech (1983) in Senowarsito (2013: 84)[39] also asserted politeness maxims as fundamental theory of keeping the face in a social interaction which is stated as follow: maximizing the positive things to others and minimize the positive things in yourself. This fundamental theory is generally based on the 4 crucial notions: cost and benefit, dispraise and praise, disagreement and agreement, and sympathy and antipathy. Those aforementioned are known as the basic principles to deal with politeness and the explanation for the concept of politeness in English speaking societies. Furthermore, in order to make successful interaction without making any conflict, one must know first the way to talk properly in a certain context by following particular norms exist in the society, which is called as politeness. Lakoff (1975: 87) saw Grice’s Maxim as rules of clarity, and proposed 2 main rules for pragmatic competence, one of them is speech act, such as: be clear and be polite. Thus, the term politeness and speech act are closely tied to each other. Brown & Levinson (1987) cited in Oria (2014: 1)[33] have argued that request is a high imposing speech act due to the fact that the requester wants to deliver his/her intention by asking the requestee to do something directly or indirectly. If the requester is going to ask the requestee using a direct form, it is likely that the requester will step on the requestee’s negative face which makes them uncomfortable. To avoid any kind of disturbance toward the requestee’s negative face, it is necessary to make the request more indirect. It is corroborated by Brown and Levinson’s statement, cited in Dittrich, Johansen, and Kulinskaya (2011: 2) that the indirect form of request can be a way of redressive act to reduce the FTA.

Other speech act which is discussed in this study is giving compliments. If requests, based on Brown and Levinson (1987)[8], are considered as the most threatening speech act to the hearer’s negative face, then compliments are defined as the speech act which is included in positive politeness strategies to show solidarity (see Furko and Dudas, 2012: 138)[20]. Brown and Levinson (1987) [8] also added that this form of compliments is usually purposefully given to the hearer’s appearance, personality, possessions and needs as well as his wants which reflected in his or her positive face (cited in Furko and Dudas, 2012: 138)[20]. Thus, in order to lessen the threat in making requests and enhance the positive value in giving compliments, each individual has their own strategy to minimize the threat and enhance the positive value by looking at its weight of seriousness in a particular situation or context known as politeness strategies.
From the scheme above, it can be said that people in daily interaction must be aware of both types of face, negative face, the want or desire to independent and unimposed by others, and positive face, the want or desire to be approved of or appreciated by others. By enhancing awareness to other people’s face, those competent speakers have two options by doing the FTAs or not doing the FTAs, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) formulated 4 possible strategies ranging from the best case (strategy type 5 ‘Don’t do the FTA’) to the worst (strategy type 1 ‘Do the FTA’ and go on record as doing so boldly and without any redressive action, i.e. without atoning for the FTA in any way). The explanation about these five strategies by doing the FTAs is given below:

A. Bald-on record: This kind of strategy is used whenever the speaker wants to do the FTAs with maximum efficiency more than he/she wants to satisfy hearer’s face without any hesitation to use this in any degree. No effort in reducing the threat to the hearer’s face. It means that the speaker has a high confidence in having a close relationship with the hearer as close friends or member of the family. Direct imperative is the best example of the usage of bald-on record strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 95)

b. Positive politeness: Positive politeness is defined as strategy or redressive act which concerns on the hearer’s positive face in which his wants to be connected or desirable (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 101). Positive politeness with redressive behaviors involves satisfaction to the H’s desire to by communicating similar thing to his wants.

c. Negative politeness: Negative politeness strategy is the strategy which shows concern of the hearer’s negative face. Thus a speaker must do a kind of redressive act before he/she steps on or imposes his/her wants to the hearer (Brown and Levinson, 197: 101). The situation of this strategy may be used, so that the selves-esteem between the speaker and hearer can be kept when the speaker tries to establish the respect between them. The tendency to use negative politeness strategy is the tendency to show deference.

d. Off record: The very indirect strategies by using certain implicatures or hints which require the hearer to interpete what the speaker wants him to do (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

These all strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) should have been done by the interactants in order to promote harmonious life to each other and to come to a certain destination. To make this comes true, Brown and Levinson (1987) have claimed that degree of imposition, power, and social distance are the crucial factors which are said to be influential enough to the choice of politeness strategies. Degree of imposition is defined as a level or ranking of imposition which is culturally and situationally determined by considering the amount of interference to an agent’s positive or negative wants (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 77). Different degree of imposition may have attached to diverse speech act – one speech act like requests has a greater imposition than others which put the negative face of a person in danger. Other than that, power which is defined as the level to which the hearer can force his plans and his face over the speaker’s plans and face should be considered by the speaker (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 77). When the hearer (H) has a relatively high status, the speaker (S) makes a great effort to show politeness. Otherwise, the speaker (S) tends to show camaraderie to the hearer (H) who has lower status. The last factor to be taken into account is social distance which is defined as the similarity’s or difference’s symmetric social dimension maintain by the speaker and the hearer based on the amount of interaction’s frequency and the kinds of goods exchanged between the speaker and hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 77). The sense of being polite done by the speaker (S) to the hearer (H) who is distant or new is higher than its done by the speaker to the hearer (H) who is close.

By determining these factors, politeness strategies realization in different context in any social interaction may have been applied differently too in any speech acts. Making requests have been acknowledged as the highly imposing act according to Brown and Levinson (1987), they also assert that giving compliments is a kind of a threatening act in several cultures from different countries. Yet, since politeness strategies usage is a context-depending theory then, one must first study the context too, like in what situation they utter the words, to whom they talk, where they utter words, and etc, to be ascertain whether making requests and giving compliments are always imposing acts as stated by Brown and Levinson.

3. POLITESSNESS AND GENDER

According to Segal (2004: 3)[38] gender is taken to refer to a set of norms, values, and behaviors which is culturally attributed to one biological sex or another. These norms, values and behaviors specifically cannot be inherited since somebody has born as male or female. They are the notions that can be constructed through the living in the society which has diverse culture. Based on the statement of Ishikawa (2013) cited in Oria (2014: 12)[33] the study of gender has been challenged by many scholars from various perspectives, for instance the use of different linguistic aspects (e.g. Labov, 2001), styles (e.g. Trudgill,
This study focuses on the relation of language, politeness, and gender that has been the discussion of many prior researchers. Lakoff (1975)[26], well-known author of gender study, in her work stated there are specific features that make distinction to the women’s speech and men’s speech. She claimed that women’s speech seems more polite than men’s (p.74). She explained further as cited in Mills (2003: 165)[31] that women’s speech is more polite since they show indirectness, mitigation, and hesitation which characterized by hedge, tentativeness, and tag questions, on the contrary men’s speech is less polite since they show direct, forceful, and confident speech which characterized by direct, unmitigated statements and interpretation. Holmes (2013: 302-303)[23] also added about the women’s speech which is specialized by linguistic features such as lexical hedges or fillers (e.g. you know, sort of, well, you see) , tag questions (e.g. She is really nice, isn’t she?), rising intonation (e.g. It’s really good!), empty adjectives (e.g. divine, charming, cute), precise color terms (e.g. magenta, aquamarine), intensifiers such as just and go (e.g. I like him so much), hypercorrect grammar (e.g. consistent use of standard verb forms), super polite forms (e.g. indirect requests and euphemisms), avoidance of strong swear words (e.g. fudge, my goodness) and emphatic stress (e.g. It was a BRILLIANT performance!). What can be caught from these points of view is that women are more aware to the face-needs of the person they talk to given the reason that hedges, tag questions, mitigation devices are polite forms that can reduce the FTAs. The example of making requests (1) “May I borrow your book?” and (2) “May I borrow your car?” have different level of imposition – the second one must have considered as the most threatening since it endangers the negative face of the hearer (H). Thus, women may redress it by using hedges like well, you know, kind of, etc; tag questions like won’t you; and mitigation device like please. Even they may use the indirect form of making request like (3) “I have flat-tire and I need to pick up my children” when they want to address it to the hearer. The other example is giving compliments. In this case, as claimed by Coates (2004: 110)[9], women give more compliments to other speakers; on the contrary men talk more, swear more and use forced directives to get things done. Moreover, the gender of the hearer or addressee (H) is fundamental too to understand that women’s speech is politer than men’s. It coincides with the statement made by Montgomery (1998) cited in Keikhaie and Mozaffari (2013: 54) that both male and female speakers use polite language when speaking to women.

Regarding the gender of the speaker and the hearer and the speech acts they usually perform in daily life, the researcher wants to concern on the way female teachers and male teachers use politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments in classroom setting.

4. POLITENESS IN CLASSROOM SETTING IN SOCIOPRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

In most EFL situations learners have specific needs, like applying for a job at a foreign company or talking to a foreign professor at the university (Elmianvari & Kheirabadi, 2013: 375). These situations can happen in Indonesia too and only some private courses can provide the proper needs of the learners or participants. A few of particular private course companies provide private teaching of English with a private teacher and a single participant, while others provide a bigger class with several participants and a teacher. These proper needs of English of the participants in Indonesia can be bridged by particular teachers who have acquired English in a high-level and able to communicate in English effectively by using pragmatics competence like speech acts and politeness strategies, and the gender of the teachers will matter. As a matter of fact, as said by Bacha et al. (2012: 81)[4], albeit gender is acknowledged as the determining factor in influencing the use and interpretation of linguistic politeness of speaker and hearer, little researcher has specifically addresses gender and politeness in the second/foreign language setting. The example is from Senowarsito (2013)[39] who mainly discussed politeness strategies that took place in teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom context which has approximately 90-minute English lesson. The subjects were two non-native English teachers (42-year-old male and 36 year-old female) and 59 students in two different classes. The students in the English lesson were the 11th graders of a state senior high school in Semarang, SMA Negeri 2. The result shows that teacher and students basically employed positive, negative, and bald on-record strategies. Teacher and students’ perception on social distance, the age difference, institutional setting, power, and the limitation of the linguistic ability of the students has contributed to the different choices of politeness strategies. The students tend to use some interpersonal function markers. Linguistic expressions that are used in classroom interaction are addressing, encouraging, thanking, apologizing, and leave-taking. This researcher only pointed out to the level of pragmatics only in EFL classroom context and had no concentration to gender base.

With regard to this classroom context in private course, when applying politeness strategies, there is other factor – beside those which have been mentioned earlier by Brown and Levinson (1987)[8] – that the teacher should take into account. That is age (Monsefi and Hadidi, 2015:2)[32]. It is easier to understand that the younger a person is, the less awareness he/she has in term of politeness. However, if the participant is older (adult), it is likely that the teacher needs to be aware of their negative face since these kind of participants have the desire not to be imposed by the others, especially the teacher. Thus, a comprehensive study like sociopragmatic is needed to
examine the relationship of politeness of making requests and giving compliments performed by different gender of the teachers and classroom setting, given the reason that socio-pragmatics is a concept which links politeness with the social world since politeness has something to do with the language use which warrants its classification within pragmatics, as Eelen (2001: 1) pointed out. Šubertová (2013: 28) appointed that teacher’s academic instructions, motivation, evaluation of students, and classroom management are the notable source to obviously see politeness. To add, the findings of Xiaoqing (2010) of four main activities in classroom setting done by teacher – which has been cited by Šubertová (2013: 28) – are the guiding contexts to see the differences and similarities of politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments performed by male and female teachers in sociopragmatics perspective. According to Xiaoqing (2010: 652-654) academic instructions covers when and how the teachers initiate to direct the learning activity which include teacher’s presentation, responding to the student’s academic questions, and the teacher’s corrective feedback, for instance when the teacher comes to class and starts the lesson, he/she says ‘Let’s begin our class!’. On the other hand, motivation is described as when and how the teachers stimulate the students to ask questions, give their opinion about something in a discussion, and produce feedback to the peers for example when it is a presentation time, the students ask about something, and the teacher says ‘could you answer the questions?’. Evaluation is another activity too which concerns on when and how the teachers evaluate the students ability in English language which can make the students feel confident or inconfident to do the next activity for instance, when the teacher tries to ask the students to fix their mistakes with the correct grammar, he/she says ‘Well done!’. The classroom management activity is defined as when and how the teachers manage the classroom by giving discipline instructions, discipline directives (orders, requests, questions and calls), procedural instructions, and procedural directives for example, when the teacher explains about something and there are two students distract her, so he/she says ‘Stop talking please!’. Yet, the focus of Xiaoqing’s research was not the different gender of the teachers and the setting was not in a private course place with a single participant. Therefore, to complete the whole idea, the present researcher wants to do a research concerning the politeness strategies of making request and giving compliments by the female and male teachers in classroom setting by using the sociopragmatic perspective.

5. METHOD

The research design of this study is a case study which is included as descriptive qualitative research. It will be applied in this study because it is relevant to the objective of this study. Since the data of the study are in the form of transcription of female and male teachers’ utterances, this study uses qualitative method in order to identify, analyze, describe, and interpret the data. It is important to note that the object of this study was the politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliment performed by female and male teachers in classroom setting. They were selected because it meets the basis of the relevancy to the writer’s educational background or the writers’ consent. In order to collect the data, the researcher may use an instrument for collecting data but the researcher is the one who actually gather the information. This by means the existence of the researcher is the key instrument in conducting the research. Thus, dealing the technique in collecting the data, this study employs observation and documentation.

6. DISCUSSION

Politeness strategies of making requests performed by both female and male teachers could be traced almost in all of the activities of giving instructions, motivating students, and also managing class proposed by Xiaoqing (2010). These are the list of female and male teachers utterances of showing politeness strategies of making requests in the context of giving instruction.

| Requests Strategies | Teachers utterances in giving instruction context |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| | | M1 | M2 | F1 | F2 |
| RPPs 12 | Oh last meeting we talked about past tense. Ok, let’s practice it again now. (DG1) | Let’s see first. So, we are going to do the writing task together. (DG6) | Let’s discuss! (DG16) | Well, we are going to talk about excuses. (DG15) | So, Let’s talk about how you can explain it in the past tense. (DG20) |
| | So, you talked about travelling and all the things. Ok, Let’s review! (DG2) | OK. Let’s continue, Sir. (DG7) | Now we will be here…. We will learn about Present Simple and Present Continuous. (DG17) | | So, today we are going to talk about heroes first. (DG21) |
| | Alright, then. That’s about the travelling. Let’s move, then! (DG3) | Now, we are going to talk together, we are going to use continued-topic. (DG8) | Let’s Listen! (DG18) | | So, maybe at first, we are going to read an article and then we will do some exercises from the book page. (DG22) |
| | Let’s read about friends. (DG4) | Ok, let’s start. (DG9) | Let’s have a paper scissor first! (DG19) | | Now, Let’s do the exercises. Mam. Ok. |
Let’s see the task on the book. (DG5)

let’s move to the vocabulary first. (DG23)
Now, let’s see the video. (DG24)

Can you repeat that again? (DG25)
Could you open page 3? (DG26)
Would you mind to read...? the heading? (DG27)

Could you please read it for me? (DG28)

Excuse me, Can you help me, Mam? (DG29)

I want you to just go on to the next page, Sir. (DG30)

I’ll let you to prepare, first. (DG31)
So, first I want you to read, and then you’ll do the exercises. (DG32)

Please, listen to me carefully. (DG13)
Ok, just continue the story. (DG14)

Please, listen to me carefully. (DG13)
Ok, just continue the story. (DG14)

And next week, tell me about your wife’s schedule. (DG33)

Dominantly, in Datum 1 – 10 and Datum 15 – 24, the way all of the teachers make requests in giving academic instructions context are positive politeness strategies which involves the use of ‘we’ and ‘lets’ as Brown and Levinson has appointed which emphasize on involving theirselves with their adult participants to do an activity mostly when they open a discussion or direct their participants to discuss new topic in one session of learning (90 minutes). This indicates that the teachers do not want to impede her power or superiority over their participants and they are aware of their participants positive face to create a friendly atmosphere in the early discussion of the class. To add, there is a one time occassion, where a female teacher tried to use an honorific form like ‘Mam’ (Datum 23) to claim her common ground with her adult participant so that it lessen the social distance between them in the class. They also employ the hedge like ‘well’, or ‘maybe’ to show their degree of camaraderie as in Holmes (2013: 302-303) and in Yule (1996: 38).

Table 2. Requests strategies in motivating context

| Requests Strategies | Teachers utterances in motivating context |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|
| RPPs 12             | M1                                        |
|                     | Ok, let’s change the topic. Now, you may start the topic. (DM3) |
|                     | So, let’s match first, Sir. Before we have our discussion, let’s have some brainstorming. (DM15) |
|                     | Maybe let’s start with the simple one. (DM19) |
|                     | M2                                        |
|                     | Ok, let’s do it then. (DM2)                |
|                     | Lets have a practice, Sir yeah. (DM16)    |
|                     | let’s complete this one, first. (DM17)    |
|                     | I still have another game. (DM20)         |
|                     | F1                                        |
|                     | I give you time to search in google from your mobile phone about him. |
|                     | I want you to share to me about your important, like let’s say from year to year and |
|                     | I want you to play a game with me again, actually I still have another game. (DM20) |
|                     | F2                                        |
|                     | I give you time to search in google from your mobile phone about him. |
|                     | I want you to share to me about your important, like let’s say from year to year and |
|                     | I want you to play a game with me again, actually I still have another game. (DM20) |
|                     | May let’s start with the simple one. (DM19) |
| RNP 7 (Performative)|                                      |
|                     | I want you to just go on to the next page, Sir. (DG30) |
|                     | I’ll let you to prepare, first. (DG31)    |
|                     | And next week, tell me about your wife’s schedule. (DG33) |
|                     | I give you time to search in google from your mobile phone about him. |
|                     | I want you to share to me about your important, like let’s say from year to year and |
|                     | I want you to play a game with me again, actually I still have another game. (DM20) |
|                     | May let’s start with the simple one. (DM19) |
In motivating context, there are least number of both female and male teachers’ illocutionary acts which engage positive politeness strategies as seen in Datum 1 – 3 and Datum 15 – 19. Nevertheless, the female teachers’ outnumber the male teachers’. It means that the female teachers manage to minimize the gap between them and their participants and to decrease their authority toward their participants by expressing friendliness as shown by the use of the word ‘we’ and ‘lets’ where they include themselves in the activity in a situation when they want to motivate their students to have a more participations in the practice of speaking by doing several activities. In the other circumstances, both female and male teachers manage to motivate their students in participating more by using negative politeness strategies in the form of imperative and performative (Datum 4 – 5 and Datum 20 – 23). Yet, again, the number of utterances produced by the male teachers in using imperative form outnumber the number of utterances of the female teachers in using imperative form. These direct forms indicate that the male teachers aware of their participants negative face not to be impeded by impersonalizing their participants which mitigate with the words ‘please’. These utterances are produced in a situation when the male teachers motivate their participant to pratice more in the same topic or in the distinct topic.

| Requests Strategies | Teachers utterances in evaluating context |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|
| RBOR                | **M1** You want to be able to speak English. Say that. (DE1) | **M2** Ok. In the anesthesiology. Alright, you don’t use ‘because’. Make your sentence. (DE2) | **F1** Do you think which should be the correct one? Because “their mother very busy” is incorrect. (DE3) | **F2** I usually have bla bla bla for breakfast. (DE5) |
| ROR 2               | **M1** | **M2** Give up? It’s very close But it’s not like that, Mam. It’s not ‘how many time you | **F1** Rio De Janeiro call themselves like uuuurmm.... For example, Surabaya people.... | |
From the provided table, it can be seen that, unlike the female teachers who perform politeness strategies in evaluating through off record (Datum 3-6), the male teachers tend to evaluate their participants by using bald-on record (Datum 1-2). The female teachers tend to give hints or clues like ‘bla bla bla’ state something like ‘incorrect’, ‘missing’, or ‘first said’ in the sentence which means that they use the very indirect form which lessen the FTA and they try to remove themselves from any imposition whatsoever. Whereas, the male teachers perform bald-on record strategy since they do not want to lost the importance of their message in evaluating a participant’s mistake when they are in the situation of the middle of the game.

| Requests Strategies | Teachers utterances in managing classroom context |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| RNPs 1              | M1: Anyway, before we begin our lesson today, May I see your PDR first? *(DC1)*  
                      | M2: Could i see your PDR first? *(DC3)*  
                      | F1: OK, before we start, Could i see your PDR? *(DC5)*  
                      | F2: Can I have your PDR? *(DC7)*  
| RNPs 6 (beg for forgiveness) | M1: Sorry, I need your PDR *(DC2)*  
                      | M2: Excuse me, I see your PDR *(DC4)*  
                      | F1: Oh, may i see your PDR? *(DC6)*  
                      | F2: Can i have your PDR before we begin? *(DC8)*

The way the teachers manage their classroom are reflected in the way they ask the participant’s PDR (Participant’s Development Report) as the procedure to begin the class. Mostly, both male and female teachers, use negative politeness strategies in the form of being conventionally indirect (Datum 1 & 3; and Datum 5-8) since they want to protect their participant’s negative face from a feeling of forcing to give their PDR in the beginning of the class. Yet, both male teachers also express negative politeness strategies by begging for forgiveness (Datum 2 & 4) given the reason that asking the new adult participants to give their PDR is quite high imposition since the power of the teachers shown in the class can make the new adult participants uncomfortable. This means that they are aware of their participants negative face wants, thus they avoid to impose their act on their participants.

The overlook to the four main activity in the classroom provides different point of view of looking at the politeness strategies of making requests performed by the male and female teachers. It can be seen clearly that almost in all activities the female teachers, especially in giving instruction, motivating, and managing classroom, manage to use negative politeness strategy mainly. This is because, eventhough they are aware of their participants’ age and higher status, their closeness to their participants is determined by the character of their participants, the time needed to get close to their participants, the interest of their adult participants and also the topic they bring to be discussed with their participants. The friendlier the character of the participants for the teacher the closer their relationship is. The shorter the time needed to get close to their participants, the stronger the closeness they share. The more suitable topic of their participants’ interest the more they get closer. Therefore, the factor of closeness to their participants determined by these other factors which can underlie the choice of their politeness strategies of making requests.

In giving compliments to their participants, there are slight distinction between the male and female teachers. Mainly in giving feedback to their participant’s speaking activity or evaluating their participant’s mistakes (evaluation context), both male and female teachers give compliments importantly in the ability of their students to make sentence in the correct grammar or to answer a question., at one side, the female teachers occasionally give compliments to their participant’s appearance, at another side, the male teachers occasionally give compliments to their participant’s personality. The overlook can be seen below.

| Compliments Strategies | Teachers |
|------------------------|----------|
| CPPs 2                 | M1: Good! *(DA1)*  
                      | M2: Great! *(DA5)*  
                      | F1: That’s very nice! *(DA9)*  
                      | F2: Good! *(DA19)*  
|                       | That’s great! *(DA2)*  
                      | Very good! *(DA6)*  
                      | Such a productive time you use yeah, Sir! *(DA9)*  
                      | That’s good! *(DA20)*  
|                       | Very Nice! *(DA3)*  
                      | Very nice! *(DA7)*  
                      | *(DA10)*  
                      | That’s really nice! *(DA21)*  
|                       | Good! Very good! *(DA4)*  
                      | That’s very good! *(DA8)*  
                      | *(DA11)*  
                      | Very Cool! *(DA22)*  
|                       | Very good. *(DA12)*  
                      | Great! *(DA23)*  

Table 5. Compliments strategies on student’s ability in evaluation context

Table 4. Requests strategies in managing classroom context
In Datum 1-24, The use of adjectives such as, ‘good’, ‘nice’, ‘cool’ with a kind of exaggeration like ‘very’, ‘really’, ‘and ‘great’ are the overused utterances employed by the male and female teachers. Both of them try to satisfy their participant’s positive wants to be encouraged in doing more and more activities in speaking English. By giving such feedbacks in evaluating context to their participants, they use positive politeness strategies as described by Brown and Levinson (1987) in Furko and Dudas, 2012: 138 which means that both of this genders try to show solidarity to their adult participants, so that they do not impinge on their positive needs to be liked or approved of, also they do not want to hinder their adult participants activity in speaking English. Yet, the female teachers give compliments more often to their participants with some quiet formulaic form like ‘INT ADJ’, ‘PRO BE INT ADJ’, ‘PRO BE (INT) ADJ NP’, ‘You BE (INT) ADJ’, and ‘SUCH (a) ADJ NP’.

Table 6. Compliment strategies on student’s personality in academic instruction context

| Compliments Strategies | Teachers |
|------------------------|----------|
|                        | M1       | M2       | F1       | F2       |
| CPPs 2                 |          |          |          |          |
| Ok, you’re very brave. (DP 1) |          |          |          |          |
| You must be a good Mum. (DP 2) |          |          |          |          |
| You both are great fathers, honestly. (DP 3) |          |          |          |          |
| You’re such a kind woman, Mam. (DP 4) |          |          |          |          |

Male teachers sometimes give compliments to their adult participants’ personality, both male’s and female’s, by employing positive politeness strategies since they put their interest and sympathy to their adult participants needs to be liked, so that they could feel more comfortable in the class to speak English with a friendlier atmosphere. On the contrary, the female teachers tend to give compliments on their adult participants appearance, especially the female participants, by employing positive politeness strategies given the reason that female teachers considers compliments as a solidarity tools to show a degree of closeness as stated by Holmes (1988: 462-463).

Table 7. Compliment strategies on student’s appearance in academic instruction context

| Compliments Strategies | Teachers |
|------------------------|----------|
|                        | M1       | M2       | F1       | F2       |
| CPPs 2                 |          |          |          |          |
| You look beautiful too today, Mam. (DP 1) |          |          |          |          |
| You look great today! (DAp2) |          |          |          |          |

To continue, the table below gives an elaboration about the female and male teachers’ politeness strategies in giving compliments.

Table 8. Frequency of politeness strategies of giving compliments

|                  | M1 | M2 | F1 | F2 |
|------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Ability          | 4  | 4  | 10 | 7  |
| Appearance       | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  |
| Personality      | 2  | 2  | 0  | 0  |
participants, to both male and female participants given the reason that giving compliments to their appearance can make them more confident and more comfortable and their participants like to be complimented. These statements show that these female teachers try to reduce power inequality by showing camaraderie to their participants. The female teachers do not give compliments to their participants’ personality because for them it could be a face threatening act since they are really careful to pick their lines in complimenting personality because of their scare to hurt the feeling of their adult participants. If only they perform compliments on their participants’ personality, it will be when it is related with their progress in the class, not the other context. Unlike the female teachers, the male teachers tend to give other compliments on their participants’ personality in other context, both female or male participant. They stated their reason in the interview that for them this is not a kind of a threatening act because they try to do their duty as an English teacher by not focusing on their participants’ appearance and they think that not everyone likes to be complimented on their appearance, thus they will stay relevant to the topic they discuss; and their compliments on their adult participants merely comes naturally as their honest response. This means that, giving compliments at a certain context like appearance, the male teachers will damage their positive face because those who do not want to be complimented on their appearance will give response which infringe their positive face.

7. CONCLUSION

It is revealed that some of the illocutionary acts of the female and male teachers in performing politeness strategies of making requests and giving compliments have shown some significant similarities and differences through some contexts which they consider as non-imposing acts in the classroom setting and some of the social closeness degree in the classroom setting determined by some factors which underlie the choice of different politeness strategies employed by the male and female teachers are exist.

In making requests, the similarity can be seen from almost all of the activities done in the classroom which the female and male teachers tend to use negative politeness strategies given the reason that even though they know their participant’s power over them since they have higher status, their social distance with their participant’s since they are older than them, and their consideration on the 4 main activities as non-imposing acts, they still need to see their degree of closeness to their participants by looking at several other considerations like the character of their participants, the time needed to get close to their participants, the interest of their adult participants and also the topic they bring to be discussed with their participants. These both diverse gender, surprisingly, only perform positive politeness strategies limited to 2 main activities in the classroom like giving academic instruction, and motivating. Those are the context where they show their solidarity the most to make their participants getting close to them. Furthermore, the difference of the politeness strategies they employ for making requests can be seen when they try to evaluate their students mistakes. In this case, the male teachers often use bald on record strategy, while the female teachers often use off record strategy. The male teachers use that direct form on their adult participants because they try to engage their students to correct their mistakes in a little time that they have in the game without losing its meaning. This could be the indicators that female and male teachers have aware of their pragmatic competence in the classroom setting.

In giving compliments, positive politeness strategies are widely used by both divers gender teachers. Nevertheless, the context that they give compliment on is quite different. Both genders like to give compliment on their adult participants ability. In addition, giving compliments about their participants’ appearance is the concern of the female teachers, besides giving compliments about their personality is the concern of te male teachers. Both the female teachers prefer to give compliments on their participants’ ability and appearance as a solidarity tool in reducing power inequality and they consider that by giving these kinds of compliments their adult participants be more confident and more comfortable to speak in English. The male teachers consider giving compliments on their participants’ personality as their part of obligation in the class and as something comes naturally, but if they give compliments on their participant’s appearance, they are afraid that it will be imposing on them. This also could be indicator that both female and male teachers have aware of their pragmatic competence in giving compliments in the classroom setting.

Since the result of this study is based on case study with limited participants, it cannot be generalized to all female and male teachers around the world, instead it should be taken as prelimeray indicators of the female and male teachers’ behavior in making requests and giving compliments. Thus, to cover the limitation of this research, the future researchers who put their interest in sociopragmatics or sociolinguistics on gender differences in applying politeness strategies and to those who want to study about the relationship of the different genders’ politeness strategies with the factors underlined in this research are hoped to give more contribution and reference. Yet, this research sheds lights on the study of pragmatics in a private course foundation with a single teacher and a single participants which called as intensive program. By using their pragmatic competence they can use more varied strategies in making requests and giving compliments in the classroom setting to create more friendly atmosphere and to make their participants comfortable in the class.
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