

## Students' Politeness Strategies to Lecturers in Sending Messages through WhatsApp

Veronika Unun Pratiwi<sup>1</sup>, Atikah Anindyarini<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Postgraduate Program, Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia

[veronikaununpratiwi@student.uns.ac.id](mailto:veronikaununpratiwi@student.uns.ac.id), [atikahanindyarini@staff.uns.ac.id](mailto:atikahanindyarini@staff.uns.ac.id)

### Abstract

*One of the issues that students face today is a lack of politeness in their language. Students' politeness is reflected in their attitudes when sending messages to lecturers. The objective of this study was to determine how polite students are when communicating with their lecturers through WhatsApp. This study was conducted at a private university in Sukoharjo. The data was obtained from student texts in the lecturer's WhatsApp app. The data was analyzed using Brown and Levinson's (1987) FTA theory on politeness strategies. According to the findings of the study, some students were found sending messages without greeting the lecturers and instead conveying their intentions directly. FTAs are common, and students frequently threaten the lecturers' faces. The words used in a student's message can have an effect on the teacher's feelings and make the conversation appear informal. Students appear to be unaware of social distance, roles and status, and power dynamics when interacting with lecturers. Some students treat lecturers as equals, which comes across as rude and disrespectful. It is strongly suggested that this topic be expanded upon and discussed in a broader context and area for future research. More research could look at this issue from a different perspective.*

### Keywords

Face Threatening Act (FTA), politeness strategy; student-lecturer; WhatsApp



## I. Introduction

Smartphones have made it easier for people to communicate due to rapid technological advancements. There are various chat applications available today, including WhatsApp, in addition to the Short Message Service (SMS). It is unavoidable that this communication application be used in the sphere of education. This app is used to communicate amongst instructors as well as lecturers and students. Instead of meeting with the professor face to face to talk or ask questions, students might text the lecturer first. Students can also schedule appointments with lecturers, and lecturers can utilize the app to keep students up to date on all academic concerns.

In an academic setting, the use of WhatsApp raises problems regarding politeness, particularly between students and lecturers. According to the author's simple observation, many lecturers continue to complain about students sending messages to them. Message content, message style, and even message time are all examples of issues that can arise. Students may then refrain from mentioning their names in favor of expressing a willingness to send messages. The majority of lecturers say that students are unaware of their role in selecting words and phrases. Because the lecturer finds this situation to be quite bothersome, it is very uncommon for him or her to ignore the text and not respond to it. Some students claimed that teachers responded to their WhatsApp conversations and advised them on possibly unpleasant writing styles.

When interacting with others, most people desire to develop or maintain their 'facial' self-image. The desired face refers to a person's public self-image expectations (Yule, 1996). Face desirability is divided into two categories: face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA). "If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image, it is described as a face-threatening act," Yule (1996:61) notes. Threatening the face/self-image, in other words, is an action that can harm the interlocutor's image and honor during the communication process. Then, he claims, "in the event that any acts may be construed as a threat to another's face, the speaker can say something to lessen the likelihood of the threat," which is known as a face-saving act. Yule (1996), 61. This indicates that speakers can use polite language to save the interlocutor's face/self-image. Wardhaugh (2006:260) goes on to say "when we engage with other people, we should be aware of both types of faces and thus have a choice of two types of politeness".

Brown and Levinson (1987) also offer a politeness sub-strategy, stating that three elements influence speakers' choice of an FTA: social distance, relative power, and absolute rank. Furthermore, according to Holmes (2013: 9-11), politeness is influenced by four factors: social distance, status scale, formality scale, and two functional scales (referential and affective function scale). Because a place may have a diverse culture, Eshghinejad and Moini (2016: 3) believe that people must consider cultural standards in order to behave politely. In one place, a culture may be accepted, but not in another. Wardhaugh (2006: 260) believes that when individuals communicate, they should consider numerous factors, including what is said, how it is expressed, particular types of phrases, words, and sounds that blend what is said and how it is said.

The reality in the classroom is far from what society expects when sending their children to school. Students may have learned how to communicate effectively, but they do not always apply what they have learned in real life. According to Cohen (2004:3; cited in Elmianvari & Kheirabadi 2013: 376), students learn grammatical and lexical items but are unable to convey messages appropriately due to a lack of pragmatic and functional knowledge to inform their purpose in sending texts. This is evident from the students' WhatsApp messages to their lecturers. The language learning process itself aims to master communicative competencies and skills such as sociolinguistic competence. When students have this competency, they will be able to use and provide appropriate language responses, as well as understand the settings, topics, and relationships between people involved in communication (NCLRC Home, 2007 cited in Yulia, 2016).

Prayitno (2010) conducted a number of studies on the directive speech acts used by officials in the context of PKS, PSS, and PI in PRD. The findings of the study show that the PKS maxims developed by officials with a Javanese cultural background are expressed through the sub-submaxims of directive clarity, directive correctness, evidence adequacy, directive accuracy, directive inaccuracy, and directive strategy coherence. Directive politeness is based on indirect, hedged, and pessimistic methods of politeness rather than methods of minimizing coercion, respect, apologizing, and impersonal, question-statements, and subtle cues. Fitriani (2015) then describes imperative markers and imperative forms used by students at SMK Muhammadiyah 2 Bandung in imperative politeness. According to her findings, imperative politeness can be seen in imperative markers and imperative forms. Politeness markers, pronouns, interjections, and verbs are examples of imperative markers. The imperative form is made up of sentence form, strategy, and a mix code or code switch.

In terms of politeness in the same object of study, namely politeness in student speech to lecturers, several relevant studies include Yati and Suprpti (2016), who examined language politeness in students majoring in chemistry and discovered that students still use word abbreviations, non-standard words, and symbols feelings that appear less polite if sent to the lecturer. Abid (2019), Pratamanti et al (2017) found that politeness deviations include the use of slang, discussions outside the context of lectures, methods of expressing disrespectful intentions, and the use of inappropriate paralinguistic aspects when studying student language politeness towards lecturers on WhatsApp social media. Suntoro (2019) examined the politeness model of students' language to lecturers in WhatsApp communication, the study revealed that students can adhere to language politeness principles such as wisdom, generosity, appreciation, simplicity, compatibility, and sympathy. There were violations of the politeness principle of communication language based on the WhatsApp social network. According to the findings of the research, it is necessary to study forms of Indonesian language politeness between students and lecturers at the University of Veteran Bangun Nusantara in the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Study Program. When communicating with their lecturers, students must consider language politeness. Politeness in language interaction between students and lecturers is of particular importance in this study, because what is conveyed through utterances is an academic representation that students in related educational institutions should see.

## **II. Review of Literature**

### **2.1 Politeness Pragmatics and Speech Acts Theory**

The term pragmatics refers to speakers' communicative competence (Traugott & Prat 1980:226). Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics concerned with the rules governing the use of language in specific social contexts, specifically what to say, how to say it, when to say it, and how to make the language used acceptable to others (Bowen 2001). In other words, this field includes a language speaker's social competence. To be accepted in a language community, a speaker must first understand the rules that govern that society, including the proper and appropriate use of certain language functions or speech acts. Additionally, Austin (1962) identified at least three different levels of "action" that underpin an utterance when it comes to appropriate actions in communication. This expert differentiates it as (1) how the act of stating something is done (locutionary act), (2) what is done when stating it (illocutionary act), and (3) what is done by stating it (perlocutionary act). Furthermore, Searle (1976) uses the term speech act to refer to illocutionary actions, or the use of language in society. These speech acts are classified by Searle into five types: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

Pragmatics is a language study that studies the relationship between language and its context. There are two types of contexts, which are social and societal contexts. Social context is a context arises as a result of interaction between community members in a particular social and cultural society (Supriadi, 2020). Amilia et al (2020) stated that two features of pragmatic aspects of definition in the technical dictionary comprise the concepts which relay on the context theory and the forms of the definition given are based on the context itself.

## 2.2 Brown & Levinson's Theory of Politeness

To be polite in language means to say something that is relevant to society (Lakoff 1975:53). In a broader sense, Fraser and Nolen (1981: 96) argue that to be polite, one must follow the rules that apply to all social bonds. When a speaker violates the rules, he is considered impolite. The concept of politeness is closely related to the correct and incorrect aspects of a person's attitude as measured by a tool known as a rule. Similarly, if certain conditions are met, such as awareness of the form of courtesy, a social interaction will be well established. Forms of politeness can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as by using specific pronouns in conversation. In Indonesian we find the pronouns "Anda" and "Beliau" to honor the person being spoken to.

Pragmatics and the concept of politeness are inextricably linked. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness is the most influential, stating that the problem of politeness is a fundamental thing in pragmatics because politeness is a universal phenomenon in the use of language in social contexts. The concept of face is central to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. This politeness expert uses the term "face-saving view" to explain that politeness is done to save the speaker's and interlocutor's face, which can be positive or negative. People with a positive face have a positive image of themselves and a desire for approval. The negative face refers to fundamental human demands for territory, private parts, and the right not to be disturbed. To realize this face-threatening act, a politeness strategy is required (FTA).

## 2.3 Interaction and Politeness Scales

There are several factors other than language that influence the form of language politeness when people interact. This aspect of politeness is critical to remember in order for the goals to run (achieve) smoothly. Extralingual aspects that must be known include, among others, who is involved in the interaction, their relationship and social distance, or their relative social status, the context of the speech event, the goals to be achieved, the channel used, the method of expressing an intention, and so on (Hymes, 1985). The closer the participants' relationship and social distance, the more disrespectful their speech will be. On the other hand, the more distant the relationship and social distance between the participants in the speech, the more polite their speech will be. Apart from that, politeness markers include the presence of a "opening" or "prologue" before delivering the real meaning, such as conveying Selamat Pagi/Siang/Sore [Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening], apologies/regrets, and the like; express appreciation to the speech partner, such as Terima kasih sebelumnya [thank you in advance].

Brown and Levinson (1978), as cited by Wijana (1996), classified four (four) linguistic strategies for expressing politeness in greeting. Strategy 1: less polite (used with close friends), Strategy 2: somewhat polite (used with friends who are not/have not yet become acquainted), Strategy 3: more polite (used with people who have not yet become acquainted), and Strategy 4: most polite (used to people of higher social status). Three (three) pragmatic parameters must be associated with each of the four strategies. (1) the level of social distance, (2) the level of social status, and (3) the level of speech act ranking are the three pragmatic parameters. The level of social distance (distance rating) with regard to the parameters of age, gender, and sociocultural background, for example, using the form of your pronoun to greet parents (lecturers) is considered impolite; the level of social status (power rating) with regard to the asymmetrical position between the speaker and the speech partner in a speech, borrowing a neighbor's car in an emergency, for example, is considered more polite than in a normal situation.

## 2.4 Politeness Strategy

When having a conversation, it is necessary to consider and care for the feelings of others. A politeness strategy is required to keep feelings or utterances within the limits of politeness. Politeness strategy is a type of action or method chosen and used as a reference in making speech so that an utterance becomes polite and appropriate for the situation, he said (Gunarwan, 2007: 264). Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness strategies as "strategies or efforts to minimize threats to someone's face". Speakers are people who speak or those who perform specific pragmatic functions in communication events. Meanwhile, in a speech, the speech partner is both the target and the speaker's friend. In speech events, the roles of speakers and speech partners are varied; those who were speakers at the previous speech stage can now become speech partners, and vice versa. Age, social background, economy, gender, level of education, level of familiarity, and other factors related to the components of speakers and speech partners are examples (Wibowo, 2015: 8).

Brown and Levinson (1978), as cited by Wijana (1996), classified four (four) different linguistic strategies for expressing politeness in greeting. Strategy 1: less polite (used with close friends), Strategy 2: somewhat polite (used with friends who are not/yet familiar), Strategy 3: more polite (used with people who are not yet known), Strategy 4: most polite (used to people of higher social status). The four strategies must be linked to three (three) pragmatic parameters. The three pragmatic parameters are (1) the level of social distance, (2) the level of social status, and (3) the level of speech act ranking. The level of social distance (distance rating) with respect to the parameters of differences in age, gender, and sociocultural background, for example, the use of your pronoun form by a child or student to greet parents (more seniors) is considered impolite; the level of social status (power rating) with respect to the asymmetrical position between the speaker and the speech partner in a speech event, for example in a lecture hall, a lecturer has a higher position than a police officer; and the rank rating with respect to the relative position of one speech act with another, for example borrowing a neighbor's car in an emergency situation is considered more polite than in a normal situation.

## III. Research Methods

This qualitative descriptive study was carried out at a private university in Sukoharjo, Central Java. According to Wallace (2001), qualitative research is a typical research that explains data, and research can be subjective rather than objective because it is not associated with numbering and counting. The participants are lecturers who also serve as student supervisors when writing the final project. The participants were chosen on purpose. According to Maxwell (1996:70) and Alwasilah (2011:103), the participants chosen for the study are people who can provide researchers with information that cannot be obtained from others. Document analysis was used to collect the data. Document analysis is a data collection technique that involves locating and analyzing research-related information (Connole, Smith and Wiseman, 1993; Emilia, 2011). The data in this study is in the form of text messages sent by students to their lecturers. Students are referred to as speakers, while lecturers are referred to as listeners. Maxwell's theory was used to analyze the data (1996: 78-79). This study's data are utterances in WhatsApp messages sent by students to lecturers. The researcher obtained screenshots of the speech from the lecturer of the Indonesian Language Education Study Program. Writing memos during data analysis, categorizing and coding data, and contextualizing data are the three steps in data analysis. Students' WhatsApp messages are typed and categorized using Brown and Levinson's theory (1987). The data was then coded and contextualized by the researchers based on the category.

## IV. Results and Discussion

The word "ethics" comes from the Latin word "ethica" (a body of moral principle of value). As a result, ethics might be defined as a habit, a practice, or a custom. There are various reasons why we must study ethics, including: Ethics is highly important to utilize as a guide for social life in such a pluralistic society. Humans become aware of the laws or standards that apply in public ethics by studying ethics. So one can know what to do and what not to do. Communication is a major issue in everyday life. Communication is the direct or indirect transfer of messages or understanding from one person to another, with the goal of reaching a common understanding between communicator and communicant.

Everyone requires communication; families will not be harmonious unless they communicate, and problems will not be solved unless they communicate effectively. So, communication ethics are the rules or norms that have been established for communicators to deliver messages to communicants, either directly or through the media. An evaluation of communication ethics can be based on the communication actors themselves, both communicators and communicants. Consciousness in making ethical decisions on the basis of conscience. Conscience is the awareness of one's obligations and responsibilities as a human being in specific situations.

Communication begins with shouting, develops to nonverbal symbols, and finally to the communication we know and use every day (Bungin, 2009). It is referred to as communication ethics in the communication process. The word "ethics" means "habit," "routine," or "custom." Communication ethics refers to the rules or norms that govern the delivery of messages by communicators to communicants, whether directly or through the media. Communication ethics can be measured by looking at the people who communicate, both communicators and communicants. This means that the people involved in the communication process can evaluate every attitudes in the ongoing communication. Based on the voice of his heart and conscience, assessment in communication can be pleasing to the communicant or communicator.

Conventional communication, which is generally realized face-to-face, is communication that can clearly apply how communication ethics plays a role in communication. For example, someone who is generally younger will be considerate in conveying it to someone who is older, both in terms of how to convey and the selection of appropriate language and words, with the objective of helping the impression of politeness and respect. Similarly, communication between peers will occur at a minimum with the intention of displaying a friendly and good self. Something that needs to be communicated will take place with the impression that it may be a little stiff or full of small talk. The process of communication has evolved over time. Humans who initially lived in groups began to disperse, separate, and transmigrate, requiring the use of communication aids with a diverse range of communication media to facilitate human communication.

Communication media is a type of communication tool that can be divided into two categories. To begin, hot media is defined as high definition, or media with greater real-time visualization capabilities, which reduces consumer participation. Second, cool media is defined as low definition, i.e. media with limited real-time visualization capabilities, requiring consumers to be more engaged. Other communication media, namely new media, have emerged alongside the advancement of communication technology. New media are media that have high visualization capabilities but still require users to be active participants in the media. Social media, such as WhatsApp, is an example of new media.

After analyzing the findings, it was discovered that there were 36 data about students' texts to their lecturers. The majority of the texts are about student questions about their final project, where they ask for information or negotiate a time to discuss their project with the lecturer. The findings of this study show that students use almost all of the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) when contacting lecturers. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory was used to classify data (1987). According to the data, some students are unaware that they have negatively impacted their lecturers' faces by sending texts containing Face Threatening Acts (FTA). FTA occurs when the speaker is unaware of the position and status of the listener. Speakers are unaware that by directly stating their wants and needs, they have seriously damaged the listener's face. By employing the appropriate politeness strategies, the speaker or student can actually save the listener's face. The majority of FTAs occur when students send text messages to lecturers using a bald on-the-record strategy. There are 19 texts found, which can be divided into five positive politeness strategy data, six negative politeness strategy data, seven bald on-record data, and one off-record data. Bald on-record is the most common strategy employed by students, implying the presence of an FTA. Off-the-record is the least used strategy among students. The speaker unconsciously spoils the listener's face. The discussion can be seen in the following explanation.

#### **a. Positive Politeness Strategy**

When most students send a WhatsApp message to the lecturer, they say hello. Formal and informal greetings are used. There are those who still use the Islamic greeting, Assalamualaikum, which is considered polite in Indonesia, and those who simply say hello like "Malem Bu" [Night Mom] which is considered impolite and informal when directed at someone with a higher status than the speaker/sender of the message. The text of students' WhatsApp messages to their lecturers that demonstrate positive politeness strategies is shown in the data below.

##### **Data 1 (Student A)**

*"Malam Bu Vitri, Saya mau tanya, boleh gak Bu saya neliti youtuber Indonesia yang namanya Mr. xxxxx, tentang bahasanya ketika dia main games gitu Bu. Saya akan meneliti kata-kata makian dan jadi sudah nemu judul Bu "Analisis Kata-kata Umpatan di video YouTube Mr. xxxxx"...."*

[Evening, Mrs. Vitri. I I want to ask, can I do a research on an Indonesian YouTuber named Mr. xxxxx about the language he uses when playing games, ma'am. I was looking up swear words when I came across the title Ms. xxxxx]

The student's text above shows that he said informal greetings to his thesis supervisor. He said "Malem", which is usually said to someone with whom the speaker has close social relations and who has the same power as the speaker. In this case, the speaker has actually harmed the interlocutor's face. Based on the question posed by the speaker, *"boleh gak Bu saya neliti youtuber Indonesia Mr. xxxxx, video ketika dia main games gitu Bu"* [Mom, may I research Indonesian YouTuber Mr. xxxxx, videos when he plays games like that, Mom], It is possible to say that the speaker employs positive politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speakers use questions to elicit agreement. However, the speaker, on the one hand, threatens the listener's positive face by stating that the statement demonstrates that the speaker decides for himself what he will research. However, based on the text, it is possible to conclude that he is still in the process of determining his research topic and

needs lecturer approval whether the topic is appropriate or not, in which case FTA occurs (Yule, 1996: 61).

Looking at data 1 above, the following forms of politeness can be identified: I the absence of an apology because the speech participant may feel "good" or "doesn't hesitate," for example, sorry my mother is disturbing, (ii) the use of short pronouns, namely; "*Saya mau tanya, boleh gak Bu saya neliti youtuber Indonesia*" [Mom, I want to ask, can I do a research on Indonesian YouTubers?"] and (iv) the absence of honors, such as thank you, and so on. External factors (context), such as the social status of the speech participants who are not symmetrical (students and lecturers), do not appear, and there is little appreciation for the speech partners who have provided information. Furthermore, what strategy was chosen by the student in light of the asymmetrical social status and the politeness measurement scale used in utterances. Observing the dialogue fragment in data (1) above, the speech participants (students) choose to use positive politeness strategies: less polite, namely the use of strategies given to people (friends) with whom they are not yet acquainted. His partner in this case is the lecturer himself. Finally, when it comes to measuring politeness, the student utterances above use a scale of loss and gain. This scale portrays the severity of a speech act's loss and benefit (cost-benefit scale). The more detrimental the utterance is to the speaker, the more polite the utterance will be, and vice versa, the more beneficial the utterance is to the speaker, the more disrespectful the utterance will be.

### **b. Negative Politeness Strategy**

The following data contain negative politeness strategies used by speakers in their texts to listeners. The strategies employed include questioning, pessimism, apologizing, and saluting.

#### **Data 2 (Student F)**

*"Selamat sore bu, mohon maaf mengganggu waktunya. Bu saya Kezia dari kelas B, saya belum daftar sidang karena saya takut bertepatan waktunya dengan jadwal saya bu dari 3 September, pulang 15. Kalo boleh bertanya, apa jadwal batas sidang bu? Saya sebenarnya tinggal mengumpulkan saja berkas acc bu, tapi saya takut jadwalnya bentrok dengan tanggal saya pergi. kalau menurut ibu gimana ya? Apa saya mengumpulkan saja berkas ACC nya? Mohon maaf sekali lagi mengganggu waktunya ibu dan terima kasih"*

[Good afternoon, ma'am. I apologize for interrupting your time. Ma'am, my name is Kezia from class B, and I haven't registered for the trial because I'm afraid it will conflict with my schedule, Mom, because I'll be home from school on September 3rd. If I may inquire, what is the trial schedule, ma'am? I actually only need to pick up the account file, ma'am, but I'm worried that the schedule will clash with the date I leave. What are your thoughts on Mom? Is it sufficient to simply collect the ACC file? Please accept my apologies for interrupting your time once more, and please accept my gratitude]

According to the data presented above, speaker employ negative politeness strategies when communicating with lecturers on WhatsApp. This text employs several negative politeness sub-strategies, including asking questions, being pessimistic, saluting, and apologizing (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Questions are used when she wants to know the deadline for the exam schedule and what action she should take next. Furthermore, she expressed to the lecturers how concerned and afraid she would be if her exams and

schedules clashed. Her statement implies that a pessimistic strategy is employed. Respect is shown when the speaker apologizes for disturbing the lecturer in the opening and closing of her WA text. She also requests a solution from the lecturer, implying that she trusts and respects the lecturer. Speakers on this data save her lecturer's face by saying "thank you" at the end of the conversation. This speech text reflects Holmes' (2013: 285) theory, which states that "politeness entails contributing to social harmony and avoiding social conflict." Speakers maintain a polite demeanor while being aware of their position. She avoids conflict by involving the lecturer in determining the solution to the problem.

The typical politeness in data 2 is influenced by external factors (context), specifically the social status of the non-symmetrical speech participants (students and lecturers), feeling less "good" or "reluctant," the goals to be achieved (asking for information and thesis supervisor opinion), appreciation to the speech partner, and so on. Next, consider the female student's strategy in light of her asymmetrical social status and the politeness measurement scale used in the speech. Observing the dialogue fragment in data (1) above, the speech participants (students) chose the most polite strategy, namely the use of strategies reserved for people of higher social status. Using prologues and apologies, for example, "*Selamat sore bu, mohon maaf mengganggu waktunya...*" [Good afternoon ma'am, sorry to disturb your time]. Finally, if we look at the scale of politeness measurement, the students' utterances above use several scales, namely (i) the cost-benefit scale. This scale shows the size of the losses and gains caused by a speech act. The more the utterance is detrimental to the speaker, the more polite the utterance will be and vice versa, the more the utterance benefits the speaker, the more disrespectful the utterance will be. In communicating, the S and Sp politeness scale feels natural and does not feel compelled or arrogant. The utterances must be formal, at a reasonable distance, and as natural as possible. The presence of choices in speaking that must be given to both parties in order to create a sense of comfort and the speech should not appear stiff is stated by the profit-and-loss scale and the choice scale in the data above.

### c. Bald On-Record (Without Strategy)

Students primarily employ this strategy when communicating with lecturers. Loss to the listener's face is unavoidable once this strategy has been implemented. Such conduct can be considered impolite and irritable.

#### Data 3 (Student E)

*Assalamualaikum Bu, aku mau bimbingan. Bu Vitri ada di kampus D ya?*  
[Assalamualaikum ma'am, I want to be supervised. Mrs. Vitri is on campus D, right?]

In contrast to the previous politeness strategy, politeness in data no. 3 shows a lack of politeness in expressing its meaning. The student's WhatsApp text above shows that he uses a direct method of communicating with lecturers. It is clear that students do not attempt to soften language or texts that could be interpreted as commands. Readers of this text may find it annoying and impolite. The statement "*aku mau bimbingan*" [I want to be supervised] considered direct and "*Bu Vitri ada di kampus D ya?*" [Mrs. Vitri is on campus D, right?] is impolite. The request of "*aku mau bimbingan*" is direct, and students make no apologies for disrupting the lecturer's time. In Indonesian culture, this is considered impolite. The speaker does not inquire as to the lecturer's location and may annoy the lecturer in question because the students do not appear to be aware of their actions. The term "bald-on-record" is used because the speaker is not attempting to please the listener's

face. It can be stated that speakers are more likely to choose FTA than to satisfy the listener's face (Brown & Levinson, 1987:95). Faces are not minimized or ignored.

Looking at the data (3), the following types of impoliteness can be identified: (i) the lack of use of a prologue, *Selamat siang bu* [Good afternoon, mom], (ii) the absence of an apology because the participants may feel "good" or "do not hesitate", for example, *maaf Bu mengganggu* [I apologize for disturbing you Mom], (iii) the use of short pronouns, namely *Bu* (instead of *Ibu, Bapak*), (iv) direct expression of intentions, "*Bu, aku mau bimbingan-*" and (v) the absence of honors, such as thank you, and so on. External factors (context), namely the social status of the speech participants who are not symmetrical (students and lecturers), the feeling of "reluctance" does not appear, and appreciation for the speech partner who has provided information also does not appear, both in data (3).

#### **d. Off-Record (Indirectly Disguised)**

This strategy is found in one text. The strategy used is to give instructions.

#### **Data 4 (Student D)**

*"Selamat malam Bu, saya sudah mengirim PI saya yang sudah saya revisi. Terima kasih."*

[Good evening ma'am, I have sent my revised PI. Thank you]

According to the data presented above, students send off-the-record WhatsApp messages to lecturers. The student implies that he has revised the paper and hopes that the lecturer will review it again and give him feedback. Guiding is one of the off-the-record strategy's sub-strategies. The student also said hello, thanked her, and addressed the lecturer as "Bu." Only one student employed Brown and Levinson's (1987) off-record strategy.

## **V. Conclusion**

The purpose of this study is to investigate student politeness strategies when sending WhatsApp messages to lecturers. The study was carried out at a private university in Sukoharjo. The information is derived from student texts in the WhatsApp application. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategies was used to analyze the data (1987). According to the study's findings, some students did not greet lecturers and instead discussed their intentions directly. FTAs are common, and students frequently threaten lecturers' faces. The lecturer's feelings may be affected by the student's choice of words, which may sound informal. When interacting with lecturers, students are likely to be unaware of social distance, roles and status, and power relations. Some students treat lecturers as if they are equals, making them sound rude and disrespectful. It is strongly advised to expand on this topic and discuss it in a broader context and area for further research. Further research could look at this topic from a different angle. In terms of politeness scales, there are several conclusions and suggestions that support the findings of this study. First, the types of politeness in language are quite varied, influenced by both internal and external factors; second, that variation can occur in speech events with symmetrical and asymmetrical social status of the speech participants; third, there are interesting findings in terms of using politeness strategies, namely the asymmetrical social status of the speech participants; (students and lecturers).

## References

- Alwasilah, A. C. (2011). Pokoknya kualitatif. Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.
- Abid, Syaiful. (2019). "Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa terhadap Dosen di Media Sosial WhatsApp", Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Daerah dan Asing, <https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/semiba/article/view/10302>
- Amilia, F., et al. (2020). Pragmatic Aspects of Definition in Technical Terms Dictionary. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 278-289
- Arifin. (2012). Bahan Ajar Pragmatik. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. Tidak Diterbitkan
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics Requests and apologies. Norwood, NJ Ablex Publishing Corporation
- Connole, H., Smith, B., & Wiseman, R. (1993). Research Methodology 1: Issues and Methods in Research. Victoria: Deakin.
- Elmianvari, A., & Kheirabadi, R. (2013). The Study of EFL Students' Requests Based on Politeness Theory. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(2). doi:10.4304/jltr.4.2.375-385
- Emilia, E. (2011, July). Data collection techniques. Paper presented at SEAMEON Regional Centre for QITEP (The Training on Research Methodology for Foreign Language Teachers), Jakarta.
- Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging: Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher-Student. SAGE Open, 6 (1), 215824401663228. doi:10.1177/2158244016632288
- Fitriani, R.S. (2015). Kesantunan Tuturan Imperatif Siswa SMK Muhammadiyah 2 Bandung: Kajian Pragmatik, Ranah, 1, (4) Juli 2015
- Holmes, J. (2013). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group
- Kasper, G. (1994). Politeness: The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Pergamon Press: Oxford.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. Basic Books: Harper Row.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8 (3), 597. doi:10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15258
- Manipuspika, Y. S., & Sudarwati, E. (2017). Politeness strategies in text messaging (A case study of students' text messages to the lecturers in English study program Universitas Brawijaya ). MALTESAS MultiDisciplinary Research Journal (MIRJO), 2 (1), 1-13.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. California: Sage Publications.
- Pratamanti, E.D., Riana, R., & Setiadi, S. (2017). Kesantunan berbahasa dalam pesan WhatsApp mahasiswa yang ditunjukkan kepada dosen. Dinamika Sosial Budaya, 19, (2), Desember 2017, pp 230-239
- Prayitno, H.J. (2010). Perwujudan Prinsip Kerja Sama, Sopan Santun, dan Ironi Para Pejabat dalam Peristiwa Rapat Dinas di Lingkungan Pemkot Berbudaya Jawa. Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, 1 (22), Juni 2010: pp.30-46

- Rabiah, S. (2012). Language as a Tool for Communication and Cultural Reality Discloser. 1st International Conference on Media, Communication and Culture "Rethinking Multiculturalism: Media in Multicultural Society" organized by Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta and Universiti Sains Malaysia on November, 7th - 8th 2012 in Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia, p.4
- Searle, J. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. Reprinted in D. Carbaugh (ed), 1990. Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Supriyadi, S. (2020). Pragmatic Analysis on G.M. Sudarta's Caricatures in Kompas Newspaper. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal), p. 367-378.
- Traugott, E. C & Pratt, M. L. (1980). Linguistics. New York: London
- Wallace, M. J. (2001). Action research for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Victoria: Blackwell publishing.
- Yati & Suprpti (2016). Kesantunan Berbahasa pada Mahasiswa Jurusan Kimia Tahun 2012 kepada Dosen melalui media Short Message Service, Jurnal Risenologi KPM UNJ, 1 (2) Oktober 2016
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yulia, M. F. (2016). Politeness issues in communication over text messages. In Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4) (pp. 54-61). Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/select/article/viewFile/6961/5495>