

# POLITENESS VIOLATION IN EFL CLASSROOM: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNICATION APPROACH TO CLASSROOM INTERACTION

**Fitriyah**

Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Jakarta  
E-mail: fitriyah.fit@bsi.ac.id

Received: 2023-04-10

Accepted: 2023-05-10

Published: 2023-05-29

## Abstract

In every English learning class, there must be a process of communication between lecturers and students, upholding intellectual values in communicating. Both have different social distancing that will make some politeness violations in classroom. Politeness is an important factor in human interaction, a behavior polished by relying on social conventions, institutionalized and socially evaluated. This research aims to analyze the politeness violation in EFL classroom and the most dominant of politeness violation by means of descriptive qualitative method, revealing social phenomena, using an ethnographic of communication approach. The participants of this study are three lecturers and the students of three English classes. The study uses a qualitative descriptive method and ethnography of communication approach. The results of this study show politeness violation of tact maxim, 42,30 %, approbation maxim, 9,61 %, generosity maxim, 3,85%, modesty maxim, 13,46%, agreement maxim, 25%, and sympathy maxim, 5,76%. The most dominant politeness violation is politeness violation of tact maxim.

**Keywords:** *EFL classroom interaction; ethnography of communication; politeness; politeness violation*

## 1. Introduction

In every English learning class, there must be a process of communication between lecturers and students. Lecturers and students are an academic community that upholds intellectual values in communicating. Therefore, one main requirement needed by person to do communication is to make sure that the listener or people involved in the conversation will cooperate each other; so, the communication will be a success (Bintoro, Manugeran, & Pratiwy, 2022). Students must have communicative competence which does not only consist of linguistic competence, but also socio-cultural competence, interactions, formulas and strategies (Celce-murcia, 2007). Kasper in Senowarsito (2013) says that sociocultural, interactional, and strategic competencies refer to the speaker's pragmatic knowledge. A pragmatic perspective can be defined specifically as knowledge of communicative action and how to apply it, and the ability to use language appropriately in context. The classroom can be seen as a sociolinguistic environment and community of discourse where we speak using various functions of

language to build communication systems, and the interaction of lecturers and students is believed to contribute to the development of student language (Consolo, 2006).

Jiang (2010) states that the classroom is one of the places where interactions between lecturers and students occur. The interaction process must be effective and polite. If the class interaction goes well, the knowledge that will be conveyed by the lecturer will be well received by the students. The professional role of lecturers gives them the right to evaluate student behavior, limit their freedom of action, control resources and provide critical feedback, which will inevitably pose a threat to the positive and negative faces of students. In addition, lecturers are models in class and students will imitating the way the teacher teaches them. Therefore, in creating good interactions in class, lecturers and students must make good interactions.

As stated by Khosh that in order to understand an interlocutor from another culture, it is essential to be aware of politeness or impoliteness in his/her culture and teach politeness to second language learners as well (Kameh Khosh, Rossinskaya, & Rossinsky, 2022). In learning English there is interaction between lecturers and students. Both have different social distancing. Both of them could have violated the politeness maxim, and the two of them in dialogue could have used different politeness strategies. In line with Khosh, Putrawan (2022) states that in Indonesia, it is common in EFL classrooms to use both Indonesian and English to clarify grammatical rules and motivate pupils.

Chejnová (2014) studies the realization of politeness violations in e-mail communication by analyzing the spoken way of expressing politeness, the degree of regularity, and the number of lexical and external modifications. By exploring socially appropriate greetings and communicative variables in their own cultural context, teachers can then help students understand appropriate communication in the target language. For example, "Hey where are you going?". This may be linguistically correct, but not proper politeness in English (politeness violation). Understanding politeness discourse and how thoroughly politeness influences all aspects of daily social interaction among students themselves can lead to a deeper understanding and awareness of politeness in the target language.

Although a large number of studies on language politeness have been conducted, this research attempts to analyze language politeness violation in the classroom, using the ethnographic of communication method, applying a qualitative research. In addition, the researcher uses Leech's maxims (2014). It is because these maxims are very relevant to the conditions of the cultural background and politeness in Indonesia, which incidentally is an eastern nation that tends to respect others, not more on self-expression.

## 2. Literature Review

Politeness is generally related to the relationship between two participants who can be referred to as self and others. In conversation, one is usually known as a speaker, and other people as speech partners. Politeness is achieved based on distance or social closeness between the speaker and the interlocutor. Politeness that is oriented to maintaining politeness/face because of closeness is called familiar, friendship and solidarity (Leech, 2014). The politeness theory reveals the degree of politeness based on politeness notions. Politeness is defined as the emotional state or self-image of each person that should not be embarrassed.

Politeness is an important factor in human interaction. Polite behavior is behavior that is polished by relying on social conventions, which are institutionalized and socially evaluated (Watts, 2003). The main motivation is to maintain cooperative social interactions and avoid unnecessary conflict. In other words, politeness serves to maintain the social status quo and avoid devaluation by others. Behaviors or speech acts that are considered 'polite' can differ from one speaker to another and from one community to another, depending on the social context involved in the situation. Politeness is attached to communicative actions but is connected to interactional relations which are transmitted by social standards dictated by cultural norms. As stated by Fitriyah, et al (2019) that the students and lecturers must have communicative competence that does not only consist of linguistic competencies, but also concerning of socio-cultural ones. Therefore, it is important for community members to recognize social consensus among community members and be deemed appropriate by community members.

Politeness has several characteristics. First, according to Goffman (1967), a person is obliged to protect his 'face' and the 'face' of others in social interactions. Goffman defines the concept of face as the positive social value that a person claims for himself by the lines that others perceive him to have taken during certain contacts. According to him, 'The face is an image of the self depicted in terms of approved social attributes. A person's face is evidently something that is not lodged in or on his body but something scattered situated in the flow of events in encounter and becomes apparent only when these events are read and interpreted for the judgments expressed in them.

Reiter (2000) argues that social judgments of politeness are not wholly based on speech or actions, and therefore speech or actions alone cannot be considered intrinsically polite or impolite. On the other hand, politeness is primarily based on the relationship between communicators based on shared values and standards in the cultural values of society. In line with Reiter, Eelen (2001) also argues that politeness is significantly dependent on appropriateness. In other words, although politeness starts from the speaker's personal goals, the communicative success of expressions of politeness in the act of speaking depends heavily on the use of the correct level and type of politeness, determined at the right time, in the right way, and determined by what kind of social norms. appropriate in the given situation.

Li (2012) also analyzes the discourse used on Wiki mediated communication of EFL in China. The results show also studies the use of impoliteness strategies in academic blog discussions which show the emergence of strategies used to interpret conflict. Chejnová (2014) studies the realization of impoliteness in e-mail communication by analyzing the spoken way of expressing politeness, the degree of regularity, and the number of lexical and external modifications. The researchers observe that the participants used both positive and negative strategies in conveying their meaning.

Other studies that investigate politeness in an academic context include Sabee and Wilson. They research students' main goals, attributions, and facework in conversations with their teachers about disappointing grades, as well as various FTA (face threatening acts) and politeness strategies they use (Sabee & Wilson, 2005). In line with this statement, Littlejohn and Foss (2008) state that conversation is a sequence of interactions, namely the beginning of the conversation and the end of the conversation, taking turns and the purpose of the conversation. Based on these

statements it can be said that the research data used in English politeness are the utterances spoken by the people involved in the conversation.

In dialogue, people do not always deal directly with textual issues, but also deal with interpersonal rhetoric. If as textual rhetoric requires the principle of cooperation, then as interpersonal rhetoric requires the principle of politeness. The principle of politeness is translated into maxims, namely *tact maxim* (give a low value to speaker's wants), *generosity maxim* (give a high value to others wants), *Approbation maxim* (minimize dispraise of others, maximize praise of other), *modesty maxim* (minimize praise of self, maximize dispraise of self), *agreement maxim* (minimize disagreement between self and other, maximize agreement between self and other), and *sympathy maxim* (minimize antipathy between self and other) (Leech, 2014).

### 3. Research Method

This research is qualitative research and using an ethnographic of communication approach. As stated by Emzir (2009) that ethnography as a method refers to social research characterized by (1) human behavior in everyday contexts, (2) data collected from a range of sources by prioritizing observation and conversations that relatively informal, (3) unstructured data collection initially as a raw format. (4) a single background or group of relatively small scale, and (5) data analysis involves the interpretation of the meaning and function of human action.

As explained by Brewer (2000), the ethnographic method is a type of method involving procedural rules for collecting data. Ethnography tends to rely on a number of specific data collection techniques, such as naturalistic observation, documentary analysis, and in-depth interviews. This research method is based on Dell Hymes's ethnographic theory of communication, regarding the analysis of communication components, namely: "The Ethnography of Communication" which is then shortened to "The SPEAKING Grid"(Johnstone & Marcellino, 2010).

The participants of the study are three lecturers and 70 English class students of 2021 at Islamic College Jakarta. Data Collection Techniques in this study include: (1) *Observation*. The researcher recorded things that happened during the process of learning English in class. For example, what is the process of communication, when the lecturer starts lessons in class, how is the process of communication between lecturers and students, how is the class atmosphere during learning, and so on. (2) *Recording*. The researcher recorded by using video and a tape recorder. After recording the object under study, the next step is to listen to the recording and identify the utterances used in classroom (3) *Interview*. To find out the reasons why they used the utterances more deeply, the researcher make interview to the lecturers and the students.

Triangulation was also carried out in the form of checking data from data sources, data collection techniques, theories and methods. This is followed by interviews and the use of recordings/recordings, photos and videos.

Furthermore, this method is also more specific into the Troike's analysis model into an Analysis of Communication, which includes: (1) analysis of communication situations, (2) analysis of communication events, and ( 3) analysis of acts of communication (Saville-troike, 2003).

The detailed explanation is as follows:

Table 1. Troike's Analysis of Communication

No	Analysis Stage	Politeness Analysis
1	Situation Analysis (Communicative situation and context of communication)	Assessing communication patterns, such as, what is the context, how to communicate, communication situations, communication rules, communication components, and communication functions in the community
2	Event Analysis (Communicative event or whole set of components intact)	Including the general purpose of communication, the same general topics, participants who generally use the same varieties of language, with the same rules of interaction and in the same settings.
3	Action Analysis (Communicative act)	Single interaction functioning such as statements, requests, commands, or nonverbal behavior

#### 4. Discussion

Someone should communicate politely to anyone regardless of time and place. Included in the English language learning dialogue, lecturers and students should carry out dialogues in a polite manner, so that forms of violations in language politeness should not need to occur. Violation of the politeness principle is found in the English language learning dialogues used by lecturers and students. The distribution of occurrences of the politeness violations in English language learning dialogues at the Islamic College Jakarta is shown in table 2 below.

Table 2. Occurrence of Politeness Violations in Learning English.

No	Politeness Violation	Amount	Percentage
1	Violation of Tact Maxim	22	42,30 %
2	Violation of Approbation Maxim	5	9,61 %
3	Violation of Generosity Maxim	2	3,85 %
4	Violation of Modesty Maxim	7	13,46 %
5	Violation of Agreement Maxim	13	25 %
6	Violation of Sympathy Maxim	3	5,76 %
	Amount	52	100 %

Based on the table above, it is found that the violation of tact maxim reaches 22 utterances (42.30%); then followed by the violation of agreement maxim, 13 utterances (25%). Next, the violations of modesty maxim expose 7 utterances (13.46%). Violations of approbation maxim are of 5 utterances (9.61%). The violations of sympathy maxim are of 3 utterances (5,76%). The last is the violations of generosity maxim, 2 utterances (3.85%).

Based on the research data, it is known that the violation of tact maxim is dominant, namely there are 22 utterances. The 22 utterances are used by the lecturers and students. The data show that the speech participants in communicating do not maintain the principles of politeness to their speech partners.

Politeness of the use of language can be seen from at least two aspects, namely the choice of words, and the power of language. The ability to choose a speaker's words can be one of the determinants of the politeness of the language used. The choice of words in question is the accuracy of the use of words to express meaning and intent in a certain context, so as to have a certain effect on the speech partner. Every word besides having a meaning also has a certain language power. If the choice of words used creates a certain language power, and the language power that arises makes the speech partner objectionable, the speaker will be perceived as being impolite. The politeness violations that occur in the data above is because the teaching lecturer does not minimize benefits for himself, but rather maximizes benefits for himself.

## The examples of dialogue

### a. Violation of Tact Maxim

This Maxim requires each speaker to minimize the harm to others, or maximize the benefits to others. This is done solely to create a polite impression on the interlocutor. However, in learning English, this maxim is often violated. The speech participants try to maximize losses for others and seek benefits for themselves. Violation of this tact maxim was found in 22 utterances.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in classroom 305 Islamic College Jakarta, the researcher conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students (S) and taught by Lecturer 1 (L1).

**Event.** Lecturer (L1) discussed the Topic of Transportation then asked students (S) about the meaning of gridlock.

- (01) L1: Great. All right, let's start our lesson today. We will discuss our last topic about transportation problem. What vocabulary that we used previously??
- (02) S1: Gridlocks.
- (03) L1: Yes, Gridlock... (she's pointing at a student) Ok. *What is gridlock?*
- (04) S2: We cannot move anymore.
- (05) L1: Ya, we cannot move anymore. *What is the difference between gridlock and congestion?* (Lecturer is looking at the class with a smile) Very good. Okay, *what is the difference? Gridlock and congestion.*
- (06) S2: Congestion, you still can move, but gridlock you cannot move anymore, stuck.
- (07) L1: Stuck, we are stuck, okay! *Another word for congestion? Traffic congestion is...??*
- (08) S3: Traffic jam.

The conversation above shows that lecturer (L1) repeatedly asked direct questions to the interlocutors Students (S1), (S2), and (S3). These direct questions will make students confused in answering it, which question should be answered first. The direct question posed by this speaker clearly does not provide an advantage for the interlocutor, but on the contrary, the speaker has maximized the loss for the interlocutor.

**Action.** Asking questions directly can be categorized as a form of violation of politeness, but in the context of learning English in class it can still be done because class learning is bound by scientific norms which are marked by narratives based on facts, logic, and conveyed in a straightforward manner.

### b. Violation of the Acceptance Maxim

The maxim of acceptance requires each participant to always maximize losses to oneself and minimize gains to oneself. In learning English, this maxim of acceptance is ignored so that speakers tend to maximize benefits for themselves. There are five speech turns found which are indicated to violate this maxim. Of the five speech turns that violate this maxim, they are found in the following conversation examples.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in class 313 at Islamic College Jakarta, the researchers conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students and taught by Lecturer1 (L1).

**Event.** Lecturer (L) discussed the topic of *Transportation* and then asked students (S) about traffic jams in Indonesia.

- (01) S1: Such as in Lombok.  
(02) L1: *Lombok is a small province, so I don't think gridlock happens.*  
(03) *Traffic jam, yes. No gridlock in Lombok, according to them. Ok.*  
(04) L1: Now...I wanna show you the video ...ya...we will watch movie ....  
(05) S1: Yeay, watching movie...Wow, refreshing...

The violation of the acceptance maxim in the dialogue above occurred when L1 said that *Lombok is a small province, so I don't think gridlock happens. Hourly traffic, yes. No gridlock in Lombok, according to them. Ok.* The utterances conveyed by L1 include utterances aimed at saving face for himself.

**Action.** Speech that contains saving face for oneself is included in the violation of the maxim of acceptance.

### c. Violation of the Maxim of Generosity

Good and polite communication will be built if each speech participant applies the maxim of generosity, in which the speech participant must minimize disrespect for others. The generosity maxim can also occur if the speech participant maximizes respect for others. However, in learning English, which happens the other way around, the participants are often said to be disrespectful to their interlocutors. Violation of this maxim was found in two speech turns. Of the two speech turns that violate this maxim, they are included in the following examples.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in class 305 at Islamic College Jakarta, the researchers conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students and taught by Lecturer1 (L1).

**Event.** Lecturer (L) discussed the topic of *Transportation* and then asked students (S) about traffic jams in Indonesia

- (06) S1: *Except Sunday.*  
(07) L1: *Ooh, except Sunday, okay. Yeah. I mean working days, every working days, almost everyday? You, making me confused (laughing). Ok. And then, what did you take?? What kind of public transportation did you take? (still asking to Junia)*  
(08) S1: Angkot  
(09) S8: *Say it...! Say... (speak to Junia) say that, don't be shy. Say, just angkot.*  
(10) S1: *Yes, just angkot.*

The students' utterances indicated that they had violated the maxim of generosity. As a speaker, Student (S) has maximized his disrespect to his interlocutor by saying *Say it...! Say... (speak to Junia) say that, don't be shy. Say, just angkot*. This speech conveys the impression of being forced and belittling Junia's ability to be able to answer questions from lecturers.

**Action.** The use of utterance *say it...say it* several times is clearly a form of impoliteness which is a violation of this maxim.

#### **d. The Violation of Modesty Maxim**

Cooperative speakers will always maintain good communication principles. In communicating with the interlocutor, a good speech participant will be polite in front of the interlocutor so that by doing so he will never highlight his abilities or tell all the advantages he has such as intelligence, wealth, achievements and so on. If these principles are violated, the result is that he is considered arrogant.

In learning English, there are several utterances that show the attitude of speakers who are not polite to their interlocutors. The attitude of the speaker who is not polite is manifested in utterances that sound irritated, annoyed, and angry at the other person he is talking to. Data on the violation of the humility maxim were found in seven speech turns. Of the seven speech turns, some of them are found in the following conversations.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in class 305 at Islamic College Jakarta, the researchers conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students and taught by Lecturer1 (L1).

**Event.** Lecturer (L) discussed the topic of *Transportation* and then asked students (S) about traffic jams in Indonesia

- (11) L1: *Oh you always get a headache every time you use public transportation?*
- (12) S3: *Yes. But if I go to school I don't use public transportation, I go on foot. Yes, I always get what I want.*
- (13) L1: *So, you always get what you want? **Hmmm... That's too philosophical.** So, this is talking about public transportation seeing from the philosophy point of view. Ok, so, the conclusion is you get a headache every time you use public transportation. Ok, how about you, Nila? So, do you also have headache?*

In the dialog, the student (S3) said *Yes. But if I go to school I don't use public transportation, I go by foot. Yes, I always get what I want*. When listening to the answer of the interlocutor, the speaker in this case L1 immediately rebutted *So, you always get what you want? Hmmm... That's too philosophical*. From this statement it can be seen that L1 (20) seemed to belittle the answer from S3 and did not give an opportunity to see what S3's answer meant, on the contrary L1 said that S3's answer was very philosophical.

**Action.** Speech that belittles or underestimate and does not respect the opinions of others is clearly a violation of the maxim of modesty.

#### **e. The Violation of Agreement Maxim**

In order to maintain relationships with people, good communication strategies are often needed. One of these strategies is to avoid conflicts that might occur when



communicating, because conflicts usually come from disagreement of opinions between speakers and interlocutors. An effort to avoid this disagreement is to maximize agreement or compatibility between one speech participant and another. Even if there are opinions that must be different, it is better to use partial forms of disagreement.

In the English class, there were thirteen utterances of disagreements. From these utterances, some of them could be found in the following conversations.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in class 305 at Islamic College Jakarta, the researchers conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students and taught by Lecturer1 (L1).

**Event.** Lecturer (L) discussed the topic of *Transportation* and then asked students (S) about traffic jams in Indonesia

(14) S1: *Okay guys, I want to tell you about my home remedies in my family. Okay, I don't know what's the name but I said it poisons antidote. From a bite of animal, like centipede. Do you know centipede? Lipan in bahasa. Ok. In family we have many traditionalist medicines to cure poisons. Do you know samsu?*

(15) S2: *ji samsu??*

(16) S1: *no, some kind of water, but the smell is different, we call it samsu*

The disagreement can be found in the conversation by S1 (23) who said *no, some kind of water, but the smell is different, we call it samsu*. In this speech it shows that the speaker feels unsuited to the interlocutor, even though the answer given by the interlocutor resembles what the speaker intended.

**Action.** If we look closely, the utterances above have proven that the speaker has deliberately maximized disagreement between himself and other people, so that this utterance is included in the category that violates the maxim of conformity.

#### f. The Violation of Sympathy Maxim

To maintain good relations with other people, a sympathy maxim is required. Sympathy maxim requires speakers and speech partners to maximize sympathy and minimize antipathy between them. In a natural speech, this maxim needs to be obeyed because basically everyone needs to sympathize with the achievements that have been achieved, or feelings of sorrow, or calamities that have befallen other people. People who get achievements need to be congratulated, and people who get calamities need to be given words that show our sympathy or concern.

**Situation.** On Monday, at 08.00 – 09.30 in class 307 at Islamic College Jakarta, the researchers conducted research in an English class which was attended by 22 students and taught by Lecturer 3 (L3).

**Event.** The lecturer discussed the topic of *clauses* and then asked students (S) about clause models in English.

(17) L3: *Adjective clause. Kalau digunakan sebagai benda?*

(18) S6: *Noun*

(19) L3: *Kalau digunakan sebagai adverb?*

(20) S6: *Verb.*

(21) L3: *Easy kan, gampang (dengan intonasi yang agak tinggi). Jadi begini ya, when we put the connector in front of the sentence, at the beginning of the sentence there must be comma, harus ada koma ada connectornya di awal. Sejak saya kecil, saya sudah berbicara bahasa inggris, how do you say?*

In dialogue above, L3 (28) said *Easy kan, gampang. Jadi begini ya, when we put the connector in front of the sentence, at the beginning of the sentence there must be comma, harus ada koma ada connectornya di awal. Sejak saya kecil, saya sudah berbicara bahasa inggris, how do you say?*. This utterance was delivered by the speaker as a response to the interlocutor's answer S6 (27). In this speech, it seems to belittle the ability of the interlocutor with the expression "*Easy, kan*", and indicates his lack of sympathy for the interlocutor".

**Action.** The utterances conveyed above clearly violate the sympathy maxim because the speaker does not maximize sympathy for the interlocutor.

The main principle to be able to speak politely is to have good prejudice towards everyone. That is, everyone wants to be respected and appreciated, so respect them. A speaker who maintains the humility maxim in communicating will be polite in front of his interlocutor so that by doing so he will never highlight his abilities or tell all the advantages he has as intelligence, wealth, achievements and so on. If these principles are violated, the result is that he is considered arrogant.

This utterance which indicates antipathy towards other people in learning English is found when the lecturer expresses his disapproval directly to the students. A sense of antipathy (not sympathy) is shown by the lecturer when responding in a cynical and disparaging tone to student answers. Disapproval shown by a speaker will lead to a feeling of antipathy towards his interlocutor, such as when L3 asks a student *Itu apa tuh baca?* (what are you reading?), and is answered by S *Nggak tahu.* (I don't know). The answer given by the student annoyed L3 and asked the student again *Lho kok nggak tahu?* (How come you don't know?). Interrogative sentences delivered by speakers are like in general someone makes interrogative sentences, but the use of the sentence *Lho kok nggak tahu?*. (how come you don't know) make sounds cynical. This cynicism utterance shows that the speaker has antipathy towards his interlocutor.

There is no sympathy in utterance of L3 either, when the lecturer says *Easy kan, gampang. Jadi begini ya, when we put the connector in front of the sentence, at the beginning of the sentence there must be comma, harus ada koma ada connectornya di awal. Sejak saya kecil, saya sudah berbicara bahasa inggris, how do you say?*. (it's Easy, isn't it? So, it's like this, when we put the connector in front of the sentence, at the beginning of the sentence there must be a comma, there must be a comma and a connector at the beginning. Since I was little, I have spoken English, how do you say?) This utterance was conveyed by speakers as a response to student answers. In this speech, it seems to belittle the ability of the interlocutor with the expression *Easy kan, gampang!* indicates his lack of sympathy for the interlocutor. The utterances conveyed above clearly violate the sympathy maxim because the speaker does not maximize sympathy for the interlocutor.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the findings above, there are violations of the principle of politeness between lecturers and students. The distribution of the frequency of violations of politeness principles in learning English at the Islamic College Jakarta shows the violation of tact maxim of 22 utterances (42.30%). Then followed by the violation of agreement maxim, 13 utterances (25%). Next, the violations of modesty maxim 7 utterances (13.46%). Violations of approbation maxim are of 5 utterances (9.61%). Next is the violations of sympathy maxim 3 utterances (5,76%). The last is the violations of generosity maxim, 2 utterances (3.85%). Based on the research data, it is

known that the violation of tact maxim is dominant, namely there are 22 utterances. The 22 utterances are used by the lecturers and students. The data show that the speech participants in communicating do not maintain the principles of politeness to their speech partners.

In the process of learning English, it is necessary to pay attention to the actual function of language, namely as a means of communication. Thus, we should not be focused only on grammatical rules of language, but also attention to the practical use of language in everyday life, especially the concept of politeness in English that might be different from our cultural background.

This research is politeness violation in speaking English in classroom. The interaction between lecturers and students creates a somewhat tense or rigid atmosphere, so that they are less able to express themselves more freely so that variations in language use are less visible. Therefore, it is suggested for other researchers to research English politeness in different situations, for example in situations of short conversations (small talk) between students in the dormitory, in English courses between teachers and students, or in a student research seminar using the Indonesian language.

## References

- Bintoro, M. R., Manugeran, M., & Pratiwy, D. (2022). Cooperative principle in Parmoedya Ananta Toers' novel bumi manusia. *Journal of Language*, 4(2), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.30743/jol.v4i2.5968>
- Brewer, J. D. (2000). *Ethnography*. London: Open University Press.
- Celce-murcia, M. (2007). International culture and theory. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 41–57.
- Chejnová, P. (2014). Expressing politeness in the institutional e-mail communications of university students in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 60, 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.10.003>
- Consolo, D. A. (2006). Classroom oral interaction in foreign language lessons and implications for teacher development. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 9(2), 33–55.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Emzir. (2009). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif, Analisis Data*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Fitriyah, F., Emzir, E., & Ridwan, S. (2019). Cultural values of politeness in efl classroom: a study of ethnography of communication. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 3(2), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v3i2.1965>
- Goffman, E. (1967). *On Face-Work an Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jiang, X. (2010). A case study of teacher's politeness in efl class, 1(5), 651–655. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.5.651-655>
- Johnstone, B., & Marcellino, W. M. (2010). Dell hymes and the ethnography of communication. *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, (May), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n4>
- Kameh Khosh, N., Rossinskaya, E., & Rossinsky, A. G. (2022). Politeness in second language teaching, (June 2022). <https://doi.org/10.46529/socioint.202216>
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of politeness. the pragmatics of politeness*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001>
- Li, M. (2012). Politeness strategies in wiki-mediated communication of efl collaborative writing tasks. *IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 42(2), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.17161/iallt.v42i2.8510>
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2008). *Theories of Human Communication*. Harlow: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Putrawan, G. E., & Sinaga, T. (2022). Bilinguals' linguistic repertoire and foreign language instruction: what do teachers say about teaching efl through translanguaging? *Journal of Language*, 4(1), 166–172.
- Reiter, R. M. (2000). *Politeness in Britain and Study of Requests*. London: Library.
- Sabee, C. M., & Wilson, S. R. (2005). Students' primary goals, attributions, and facework during conversations about disappointing grades. *Communication Education*, 54(3), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520500356154>
- Saville-troike, M. (2003). *The Ethnography of Communication, third edition*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Senowarsito. (2013). Politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in an efl classroom context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24, 82–96. <https://doi.org/10.15639/TEFLINJOURNAL.V24I1/82-96>
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.