Politeness Strategies in the EFL Classroom: A Pragmatic Analysis of Teacher-Student Interaction

Fransiska Orien Hieng[a,1]*, Lusiana Mariyeta Balik[b,2], Wendelinus Oscar Janggo[c,3]

[a,b,c]*Universitas Nusa Nipa, Jalan Kesehatan, Maumere, 86113, Indonesia*

[1]*kyienhieng@gmail.com* *, [2]*lusianabalik@gmail.com*, [3]*oscarjanggo@gmail.com*

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study examines the politeness strategies used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, with a focus on teacher-student interactions at St. Gabriel Senior High School, in Maumere. Adopting a descriptive qualitative approach, the study integrates Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory with Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) conversation analysis. Data were collected through observations, field notes, audio recordings, transcripts, and questionnaires. To identify politeness strategies, thematic analysis was used, combined with Conversation Analysis to examine interactional features of the data. The analysis revealed that teachers predominantly used positive politeness and bald on record strategies to balance authority, clarity, and rapport. Positive politeness was evident in greetings, praise, empathy, and encouragement, while bald on record strategies were employed for instructional clarity and classroom management. Students frequently demonstrated negative politeness through short, respectful responses that indicated acknowledgement of the classroom hierarchy. CA revealed key interactional features, such as turn taking control, adjacency pairs, repair sequences, and pedagogically functional interruptions. Questionnaire results further confirmed students' positive perception, which indicating that politeness strategies contributed to comfort, confidence, and active participation. These findings highlight the importance of politeness strategies in ensuring harmonious interactions, promoting engagement, and enhancing the pedagogical atmosphere in EFL settings.

I. Introduction

Language serves not only as a medium for transmitting information, but also as a fundamental tool for establishing and maintaining social relationships. Reference [1] stated that language is a powerful tool in society that human relies on. Furthermore, in every communicative act, speakers are expected to employ appropriate linguistic choices that demonstrate respect, empathy, and social awareness toward their interlocutors. This reveals that, based on the situation, people from different social classes tend to show politeness in various ways [2]. The use of politeness in communication thus plays a pivotal role in promoting mutual understanding, avoiding conflict, and preserving harmony. Therefore, it also reflects the crucial discipline in linguistics that relates to politeness, which is pragmatic, and examines how meaning is constructed and interpreted in context [3]. This refers to how speakers manage interpersonal relationships and social distance through language.

In this context, the concept of politeness is crucial. Politeness is not just about using polite words and forms, but also about choosing the right strategy to maintain social harmony and avoid conflict [4]. In addition, politeness plays a role as a norm for society life. This aligns with Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness strategies, consisting of five types: bald on record, which is direct and has no ambiguity, off record, which is indirect has ambiguity, positive politeness, which emphasizes closeness or friendliness, negative politeness, which shows respect through politeness expressions, and not using FTA, which avoiding the act to prevent face-threatening situations, therefore, these points provide a useful framework for understanding how speakers manage their words in communication [5]. These kinds of strategies can be seen in daily interaction, especially

when it relates to social distance, where people can show their politeness, such as at the workplaces, institutions, and particularly in a teaching and learning environment. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, for instance, these strategies can influence how teachers give instructions, provide feedback and correct mistakes, or discipline students, as well as how students respond, ask questions, or express disagreement.

Furthermore, communication in classroom is also shaped by cultural norms and values of politeness, as well as the social distance between teachers and students. Several studies had shown the same cases, such as from references [6] and [7], where Moroccan EFL students and even United State have their own cultural value that affect the politeness. Each country has its own cultural background that influences how politeness is expressed in classroom communication. This leads to different perceptions of what is considered respectful, appropriate, or else. In the scope of Asian education, including Indonesia, it is characterised by hierarchical relationships, and respect for elders is deeply ingrained in classroom interactions. Reference [8] revealed that in Indonesia itself, the power held by the adolescents or the teachers deserves high respect. Therefore, the communication used in this context determines how politeness strategies are applied. Apparently, teachers may use positive politeness to build familiarity and eliminate social distance. And students may use negative politeness to demonstrate respect and difference. Thus, analysing politeness in this context provides a meaningful understanding of how pragmatics is applied in speaker expressions.

Although politeness strategies has been extensively studied in pragmatic and sociolinguistics, research focusing specifically on classroom interactions remains limited. Most existing studies analyse politeness in the context of cross-cultural communication or everyday life, rather than teacher-student interaction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, such as the studies from references [9] and [10]. While these studies provide valuable insights into how politeness is enacted in EFL classrooms, they primarily focus on identifying types of strategies and often overlook the underlying social or institutional factors influencing politeness. Furthermore, although other studies, such as in reference [11] which observe that power relations affect the choice of politeness, comprehensive analyses of how teacher-student power dynamics shape politeness in EFL settings remain scarce. These factors are crucial and represent a research gap. This highlights the need for a pragmatic analysis of politeness strategies in the EFL classroom.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to address these gaps by providing a contextual, pragmatic analysis of the politeness strategies employed in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. This study is unique in integrating Brown and Levinson's theory [4] with a perspective that considers local norms [8] and teacher-student relationships. In terms of theory, this study contributes to the field of pragmatics by deepening the understanding of how politeness strategies operate in teaching and learning communication contexts. In practice, it raises English teachers' awareness of the impact of their language choices on students' perceptions, engagement, and the overall atmosphere. This study will focus on the verbal interactions between teachers and students in an EFL classroom. Data will be obtained through recordings, transcripts, questionnaires, field notes, and observation. Even though nonverbal aspects may be mentioned briefly if relevant, they are not the main focus of the study. The data will be analysed using pragmatic frameworks and method such as conversation analysis to identify and interpret the politeness strategies used in teacher-student communication.

II. Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method and used a pragmatic approach to analyse politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in EFL classrooms. Descriptive qualitative research is a method that focuses on providing a detailed account phenomenon and emphasises the description of events without influencing them [12]. This approach was chosen as it enables the researchers to thoroughly describe the phenomenon of language use in a natural learning context. This study's analysis is based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, which categorises politeness strategies into five types: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record, and not performing face-threatening acts (FTAs) [5]. The researchers used this theory to identify and classify the forms of politeness that arise in communication between teacher and students.

This research was conducted at Saint Gabriel Senior High School, a high school located in Maumere City, Sikka Regency of East Nusa Tenggara. The subject of the study included an English teacher and students. The selection of locations and participants was conducted using purposive

sampling. This is a population sampling process in which the researchers selects the participants based on their presence in a population of interest, characteristics, or experience [13]. Therefore, this action took into account that the selected classes had active verbal interactions and were representative of the context of English language learning at the high school level. The hierarchical school environment, which upholds the value of politeness, provides an important context for understanding the application of politeness strategies in the classroom.

The researchers obtained the data in this study through four main instruments, namely observation, to collect all the data in their natural context [14], field notes, to gather the information gained in the field [15], transcripts of conversations from recordings of classroom interactions. Data were analysed by transcribing the data verbatim, then identifying relevant utterances, and finally classifying them according to Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies. Questionnaires were used as a tool with questions to collect information from respondents [16]. The researchers collected questionnaire data that reflected students' perceptions of politeness strategies in their classroom interactions using the Likert scale. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, and means, were applied as a means of summarizing and quantifying the students' responses to the various politeness strategies assessed in the questionnaires. Observations were conducted to directly record communication between the teacher and students during teaching and learning. Field notes were used to record the contextual situation, non-verbal expressions, and social dynamics in the classroom. These recordings were transcribed and analysed using conversation analysis (CA) as a method for studying social interaction, whether in verbal and non verbal conduct, that focuses on the sequence of talk in natural settings [17]. Meanwhile, questionnaires were given to teacher and students to explore their perceptions of the use of politeness strategies in classroom communication.

The data analysis was conducted in several stages. First, politeness strategies were identified based on Brown and Levinson's theory [5]. Second, the strategies used by teachers and students were classified. Finally, the meaning and pragmatic function behind each strategy were interpreted. The results were also linked to social and cultural factors influencing classroom interactions, such as power distance, social relationships, and local politeness norms. To maintain the data validity, this study employed source and technique triangulation. This technique uses multiple data sources to reduce bias in data interpretation [18]. This entire research process was conducted in accordance with research ethics, including maintaining participants' identities in confidence and ensuring that the data were used solely for academic purposes.

III. Results and Discussion

3.1 Overview of Findings

This study analysed teacher-student in several EFL classroom sessions at St. Gabriel Senior High School using the framework of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson (1987), as stated in reference [19] and Conversation Analysis. Furthermore, the researchers entered three different classes in the school, then recorded the first hour of teaching and learning activity. Reference [20] mentioned that CA is a method to study talk interaction. It focuses on the systematic organisation of conversation through turn-taking, sequence organisation, and repair mechanisms. Moreover, it emphasised that CA explores how participants manage their turns and construct coherence within naturally occurring talk, especially in institutional contexts such as classrooms.

3.2 Observation Findings

The researchers recorded and transcribed all classroom interactions to ensure an accurate and detailed representation of naturally occurring speech. Transcription is a crucial methodological step in CA that can allow the researchers to examine the organisation of talk [21], turn-taking, and repair, especially at a small level, such as in a classroom situation. These data served as the primary basis for identifying politeness strategies within teacher-student interactions. This observation data further supports the politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson.

The following table provides a systematic record of the interpersonal exchanges occurring in classrooms through the language used by both teachers (*T*), as well as students (*S*), which demonstrates the application of politeness strategies. The table contains information on classroom interaction context and uses the data to demonstrate the communicative functions of various politeness strategies and ways in which they are used within a classroom.

Table 1. Observation Result

Information	Result		
	Class (XIF4)	*Class (XIF1)*	*Class (XE1)*
Activity	Studying formal and informal letter	Studying formal and informal letter	Studying descriptive text
Participants	Teacher and students	Teacher and students	Teacher and students
Utterance	1. T: "Coba lihat di situ, please look at that" 2. T: "Do you still remember the material we learnt last week?" 3. T: "Kalau salutation di formal letter ada –" S: "Dear" 4. T: "Pengirim itu sen-" S: "Sender" 5. S: "Alamat itu /isde/-" T: "Address" 6. S: "/dear/-" T: "/dier/"	1. T: "Why. Sleepy?" 2. T: "Please pay attention! Kembali fokus ke depan ya" 3. T: "Formal letter itu surat yang ditujukan untuk orang yang memiliki kedudukan, such as-" S: "Teacher, companies, institution" 4. T: "Speak in English" T: "Don't laugh!" 5. T: "Sit down, please" 6. T: "Informal letter is a letter addressed to-" S: "Friend, family" 7. T: "Yang lain diam, silent"	1. T: "Good morning!" S: "Good morning, Pak" 2. T: "How are you today?" S: "Fine /good/ baik" 3. T: "Jesen, where is your book?" S: (silent) 4. T: "Visit touri-" S: "Tourism object" 5. T: "Jesen, are you ok?" S: "Yes, pak"
Strategy/ method	1. Bald on record 2. Positive politeness 3. Positive politeness 4. Positive politeness 5. Off record 6. CA - repair	1. Positive politeness 2. Bald on record 3. Positive politeness (CA – interuption) 4. Bald on record 5. Bald on record 6. Positive politeness (CA – interuption) 7. Bald on record	1. Positive politeness (CA – adjajency pair) 2. Positive politeness (CA – adjajency pair) 3. Off record 4. Positive politeness (CA – interuption) 5. Positive politeness (CA – adjajency pair)
Note	The first session emphasised directive yet supportive interaction. The teacher balanced direct commands with encouraging tone, helping students stay focused and engaged. Interactional structure was clear, systematic, and maintained through turn-taking and repair with politeness strategiess.	The second session revealed directive instruction. While teacher controlled talk distribution, politeness strategies encouraged participation.	The third session reflects a balance between control and care. Conversation structure showed cooperative alignment, while politeness sustained harmony. The teacher used humor, empathy as a tool for maintaining learning motivation and social respect.

3.3 Politeness Strategies Used by the Teacher

This section examines how teacher use politeness strategies to facilitate classroom interaction with students.

3.3.1 Bald on Record

According to Brown, bald on record strategies are used when efficiency and clarity outweight the need for politeness mitigation [19]. In a classroom context itself, these are not impolite acts but serve institutional and instructional purposes, consistent with the teacher's power role. Through the CA lens, such directives demonstrate turn-taking dominance, where teacher controls conversational flow to ensure lesson continuity.

The teacher frequently utilized bald on record strategies, particularly when delivering instructions, managing discipline, or redirecting student attention. Utterances such as:

"Please pay attention!", "Kembali fokus ke depan ya!", Bagaimana, ulang!"

These expressions appeared in the middle of the teaching and learning process and in classroom situation when the teacher needs to regain the attention of students immediately, it is common for teachers to say things like, "*Please, pay attention!*", "*Kembali fokus ke depan ya!*", and "*Bagaimana, ulang!*". Teachers use this form of instruction when the student has lost the concentration to listen to what the teacher is teaching and when student is talking to their friend's side of the classroom. At this moment, the teacher's priority is that the students have a clear understanding of what the teacher is saying and the teacher's need for control over the classroom, which means the teacher does not use softer or indirect language, instead, used direct and urgent language.

According to Brown and Levinson, the bald on record politeness strategy is used when the speaker delivers their message directly, in a very clear manner, and without any mitigative language, for example, to show the urgency. As a result, the expressions noted earlier emerge during periods of extreme time when the class has become noisy, and the teacher requires an immediate answer from student.

3.3.2 Positive Politeness

In contrast to authoritative speech, the teacher also employed positive politeness strategies to establish rapport and emotional closeness with students. Utterances such as:

"Good morning"
"Do you still remember the material we learnt last week?"
"Jesen, are you ok?"

These utterances appeared at different moments during the classroom interaction and reflected the teacher's communicative intentions at that time. The utterance "*Good morning*" appeared at the beginning of the lesson, when the teacher entered the classroom and initiated interaction with students. This moment when the teacher created a positive environment of the classroom. Then, after the teacher greeted the students, the utterance "*Do you still remember what we learnt last week?*" This question was asked at the beginning and allowed students to remember past material and prepare them to proceed with the lesson. While the lesson was on going, the teacher noticed that one of students appeared to be paying less attention and was sick. Then the utterance "*Jesen, are you ok?*" This question demonstrated that the teacher cared about the student and was trying to reconnect the student into the lesson.

These three utterances in classroom interaction provides insights into how teacher used their language to help monitor classroom interaction, give assistance to students and create a positive environment for learning. This reflects what Brown describe as attempts to satisfy the listeners' positive face or the desire to be liked or approved of [19]. In CA, this also refers to the sequence of speaking that can strengthen mutual understanding as mentioned in reference [20]. As well as in local values, where it reflects Indonesian values such as harmony and togetherness.

3.4 Politeness Strategies Used by Students

Students' responses where short but cooperative:

"Good morning, Miss"
"Receiver, penerima"
"Social"
"Kata sifat"
"Yes, Sir"

These utterances appeared when students heard their teacher was leading them on their learning process. The expression "*Good morning, Miss*" was the first response students gave. And during the vocabulary building portion of the lesson, the teacher asked the students to tell the teacher the meaning of a certain English word. Several students responded with "*Receiver, penerima*". In this case, the

student used a bald on record strategy and effectively gave the teacher the answer in an unadorned and straightforward utterance. The word "*Sosial*" was also the response of a student during a discussion about definition of a vocabulary, but at that moment, the student said it in Indonesian. In this case, student used a bald on record strategy to answer, once again, but only plain answer without addition of information.

In other moment, the teacher prompted the students to determine the grammatical category of one of the previous words and students answered back with "*Kata sifat*". This answer again illustrates the students' use of the bald on record strategy, as the student provide a brief and direct answer that answered only the prompt with no kind of polite embellishment. And then, at the end, the student responded to the teacher's question about student's condition with "*Yes, Sir*". When a student uses the term "*Sir*" or "*Miss*" after responding to teacher's question, the student demonstrates their respect for being a teacher and increasing the relationship between the teacher and students as much as possible. These utterances exemplify negative politeness, in which the speaker respects the addressee's freedom and maintains distance. The gap in this context, also in their respectful address forms, shows proper behavior and humility. Moreover, the frequent use of honorific forms, such as "*Miss*" and *"Sir"* reflects recognition of authority and institutional hierarchy. And from the CA perspective, such responses indicate the student's interruption of the teacher, as well as minimal turns [20], in which students produce concise replies that confirm understanding while upholding the teacher's turn control. Students thus maintain both interactional order, and active response.

3.5 Conversation Analysis
The utterances analysed occurred at different classroom times rather than single continuous dialogue. However, each session illustrates how conversational structure and politeness occur to manage interaction. Conversation Analysis reveals that interaction in the classroom is not random but structured through such patterns like turn taking, repair mechanisms, adjacency pairs, and sequential organization. These patters shape not only how meaning is constructed, but the power relations in interaction.
Excerpt Sample:

> T: Good morning (entering the classroom)
> S: Good morning, Miss.
>
> T: Please, pay attention!
>
> T: What is tourism object?
> S: Tourism object is a place with attraction.
>
> T: Bagaimana, ulang! Kalau masuk, berikan salam.
> S: Good morning all
> S: Good morning
>
> T: Jesen, are you ok?
> S: Yes, Sir.

The teacher initiated an interaction in the classroom by greeting the students with "*Good morning*", which served as an entry point for the rest conversation. In Conversation Analysis, this response completes as greeting sequence, and it was confirmed by students' response. Then, the teacher issued the directive utterance "*Please pay attention*" to the students following a lack of focus showed by students. Conversation Analysis would classify this direction as a regulatory element in terms of managing students' participation. Although the students did not verbally respond to the directive, their adherence to it showed alignment to the teacher and stated by Conversation Analysis as an acceptable form of interaction within the classroom.

Following the directive, the teacher posed the question *"What is tourism object?"*, which was part of a question and answer sequence. That utterance appeared from the teacher when the teacher wanted to jump into the material would be given. Then the utterance in Indonesian, such as *"Bagaimana, ulang! Kalau masuk, berikan salam"*, this emerged when one of the student in class was late, but

instead of giving a greeting, he entered the class without saying anything, therefore, the teacher raised that utterance, in which the teacher prompted students to correct their prior action. After that, the student immediately said *"Good morning all"* to all his classmates, then the other students respond it with "*Good morning"*.

Later in the interaction, the teacher addressed a particular student by asking, *"Jesen, are you ok?"* which existed in the middle of the learning process. Then the student replied with *"Yes, Sir"*. These utterances appeared illustrated how classroom discourse was organized through many kinds of expressions. Hence, these utterances can be analysed using Conversational Analysis according to Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson [20] and its integration with politeness strategies.

The analysis of each utterances which related to the CA can be seen as follows:

1. Turn-taking

    In the observed classroom interactions, the teacher occupied the role of controller, specifically, as the center of class. Students were rare to intentionally speak, instead it was because of the elicitations, directives, or direct call for teacher, for example *"Jesen"*. According to them, turn-taking is a basic mechanism for maintaining conversational order. It this situation, the teacher's bald on record imperatives control the students.

2. Repair Sequences

    When the student mispronounces or gives an incomplete answer, the teacher uses repair initiation "*Bagaimana? Ulang!*". This aligns with reference [20] which describe repair as a cooperative mechanism for maintaining intersubjectivity. The teacher performs a repair initiation that makes the correction, where the teacher gave a signal to the student, not directly, but allows the student to provide the correction.

3. Adjacency Pairs

    This component reveals the pair function of conversation between the utterance and the response, such as greeting and greeting, question and answer, instruction and compliance. From the observation, the teacher and the students used those adjacency pairs, such as greetings ("*Good morning!*" / "*Good morning"*) and question - answer ("*What is tourism object?*" / *tourism object is an attractive place*"). The classroom discourse is structured around adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs often used in teaching and learning process when give some apperception and even ask for students' prior knowledge regarding to the lesson. This demonstrate CA structures that sustain interactional flow [20]. This conversational design reflects a dominant structure in classroom interaction, where through the feedback from the speaker, which is the teacher, the respondents or students confirm learning and reinforce correct and align responses.

4. Empathy and Rapport

    The question raised by teacher, which is "*Jesen, are you ok?*" shows a shift from control to care. This is an example of positive politeness, because it reinforces the bond between teacher and students.

5. Overlap or Interruption

    The utterances demonstrate that all the interruptions functioned as teaching tool, not disruption. In contrast to casual conversation, overlaps in classrooms often serve instructional goals. This occurs in several situations, such as when students hesitated, answer out of topic, or even pronunciation errors. Through controlled overlaps, the teacher reinforced learning objectives while keeping the politeness and respect. In addition, there were some moment when the students interrupted the teaching, which showed that the students were truly engaged and responded it well.

3.5 Questionnaire Findings

To ensure the validity and reliability of the research results, this study employed data triangulation, which involved multiple sources of evidence, including a questionnaire. The questionnaire data were distributed to capture students' perceptions of the politeness strategies. The following table presents the students' responses from the questionnaire, showing the mean score of each item related to politeness strategies used in the EFL classrooms, with a score out of 5.

Table 2. Questionnaire Result

Statement	Result	
	Mean Score	Percentage (%)
My teacher often gave praise to encourage students to talk	4.06	81.2%
My teacher gave a positive response to the student's answer to keep the interaction fun	4.41	88.2%
My teacher used humor or friendly tone to dampening tension in the classroom	4.16	83.2%
My teacher often responded to student remarks without cutting off their conversation	3.91	78.2%
I felt positive comments from the teacher made me more daring to speak in class	4.34	86.8%
My teacher used polite expressions such as "Can you…" or "Are you willing…" rather than direct orders	4.19	83.8%
My teacher rarely interrupted students' talk while they were talking	4.03	80.6%
When correcting mistakes, my teacher uses polite expressions	3.94	78.8%
My teacher waited for the students finish their turn to speak before giving a response	4.13	82.6%
My teacher respoects the opinions of the students despite differing from his own opnion	4.00	80.0%
My teacher gave instruction directly when explaining class activities	4.16	83.2%
My teacher immediately corrected the error to keep the conversation going well	3.81	76.2%
I find it helpful when the teacher clearly mentions who should answer the question	4.06	81.2%
My teacher only used direct language when it is necessary to organise the class	3.59	71.8%
In my opinion, direct communication from teachers helps avoid misunderstandings	4.03	80.6%
My teacher sometimes gives indirect instructions when students make mistakes	2.97	59.4%
My teacher used example or story for students to realize mistakes without being told directly	3.41	68.2%
My teacher used facial expressions or gestures to deliver message without words	3.34	66.8%
My teacher gave a subtle suggestion to invite students to participate (e.g., "It would be nice if anyone would answer")	4.16	83.2%
I feel more comfortable when the teacher corrects my mistake indirectly	3.34	66.8%

The analysis of students' responses to the questionnaire revealed that teacher frequently employ various politeness strategies in EFL classroom interactions. Based on the mean scores of each item, the overall perception of students toward politeness strategies used was high, which refers to the consistency of politeness and positive perception in classroom communication.

The highest rated statement was *"The teacher gives positive responses to students' answers to keep the interaction enjoyable",* with a mean score of 4.44 out of 5. followed by *"Positive comments from the teacher make students more confident to speak in class"*, which is 4.37. These findings suggest that positive politeness strategies, such as giving praise, showing appreciation, and encouraging students, are dominantly used. Such strategies align with Brown and Levinson framework of positive politeness, which aims to build rapport and reduce social distance between speakers [19]. In the

context of EFL classrooms, these help to create a supportive and encouraging learning environment that fosters students' participation and confidence, which is also related with the previous study, such as from reference [22].

In contrast, the lowest involving indirect strategies, such as using gestures or stories to correct mistakes, which has the mean of 3.34-3.41, and giving indirect instruction, 2.97. This suggests that off record politeness was less commonly applied compared to more direct or supportive strategies. Thus, these findings indicate that the teacher mainly employed positive politeness and direct communication strategies to ensure clarity, and also activate participation by students. This result also align with reference [20]'s view of classroom discourse as institutional talk, where directness and pedagogical control are contextually appropriate forms of politeness.

IV. Conclusion

The research illustrates the systematic, pragmatic use of politeness strategies during classroom interaction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, particularly at a senior high school in Maumere, East Nusa Tenggara. Through an examination of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies framework, as well as the principles of Conversation Analysis, the data collected in this research illustrated that teachers were more likely than not use a combination of both politeness and bald on record strategies. In using positive politeness, teachers were able to build rapport with their students, whereas the use of bald on record strategies provided them with the clarity necessary to maintain effective classroom management. The students relied on the use of negative politeness within the classroom environment through using brief, respectful and deferential responses to their teachers. In addition to the systematic, structured interaction patterns described in result and discussion section, the participants also indicated their beliefs that they were more comfortable and confident in class discussions due to the use of politeness strategies. While this research has limited its focus to three EFL classrooms, specifically in Maumere, it highlights the importance of developing pragmatic competence in EFL pedagogy and recommends that future research explore the use of politeness strategies across diverse context and among different participant groups.

References

[1]   Apriyanto, "The role of language becomes very dominant in various human daily activities, there is no action without language(1)," *J. Ilmu Huk.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 45–54, 2022, [Online]. Available: http://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Justi/index

[2]   E. Sembiring and S. Sianturi, "Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Context: Avoiding Future Conflict and Maintain the Harmony of Diversity," *Utamax J. Ultim. Res. Trends Educ.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 105–111, 2019, doi: 10.31849/utamax.v1i3.6257.

[3]   G. N. Leech, "Priciple of pragmatic Leech," *Longman Group Limited*. pp. 1–250, 1983.

[4]   N. F. Abbas, "Positive politeness & social harmony in literary discourse," *Int. J. Appl. Linguist. English Lit.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 186–195, 2013, doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.186.

[5]   R. N. Xafizovna, "CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE On Linguistic Politeness Theory: Robin Lakoff's Theory of Politeness, Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness, Geoffrey Leech's Theory of Politeness," no. c, pp. 66–74, 2022.

[6]   Z. Hmouri, "Politeness in a Moroccan EFL Classroom: How Students of High School Using Apologizing Strategies in English?," *Int. J. Linguist. Transl. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 97–112, 2022, doi: 10.36892/ijlts.v3i3.240.

[7]   C. Armia, "PENGARUH BUDAYA TERHADAP EFEKTIVITAS ORGANISASI :," vol. 6, no. 1, pp.

103–117, 2002.

[8] M. J. Pratama and H. Mukhlis, "Communication Strategies of Indonesian Secondary School Teachers to Establish Interpersonal Relationships with Students; A Literature Review," *J. Psychol. Perspect.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 107–116, 2024, doi: 10.47679/jopp.629262024.

[9] N. E. Jayanti, M. Mahmud, and K. Salija, "Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom Interaction: Teacher-Student Strategies," *Int. J. Business, English, Commun.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 83–88, 2024.

[10] S. R. (2024) Sorohiti, M., Hidayah, A. R., & Murtiningsih, "Journal of English Language Studies," *J. English Lang. Stud.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 60–77, 2024, [Online]. Available: https://jurnal.untirta.ac.id/index.php/JELS/article/view/3381

[11] E. M. Sembiring, F. M. P. Simanjuntak, K. J. Tarigan, and V. Silalahi, "Politeness in the EFL Classroom Interaction: Strategies in Avoiding Face Threatening Act (FTA)," *J. Classr. Action Res.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 18–26, 2023, doi: 10.52622/jcar.v1i2.73.

[12] B. W. Furidha, "Comprehension of the Descriptive Qualitative Research Method: a Critical Assessment of the Literature," *J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–8, 2024, doi: 10.56943/jmr.v2i4.443.

[13] S. J. Stratton, "Purposeful Sampling : Advantages and Pitfalls," no. April, pp. 2024–2025, 2024, doi: 10.1017/S1049023X24000281.

[14] H. Martinez, J. David, S. Mosquera, and A. Romero, "OBSERVATION AS A RESEARCH TECHNIQUE . (REFLECTIONS , TYPES , OBSERVATION AS A RESEARCH TECHNIQUE . (REFLECTIONS , TYPES , RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXAMPLES)," no. December, 2022, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.28743.51367.

[15] J. Phillippi and J. Lauderdale, "A Guide to Field Notes for Qualitative Research : Context and Conversation," no. February 2018, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1049732317697102.

[16] P. Ranganathan and C. Caduff, "Designing and validating a research questionnaire - Part 1," pp. 1–4, 2023, doi: 10.4103/picr.picr.

[17] C. Goodwin, "Conversation Analysis Author (s): Charles Goodwin and John Heritage Source : Annual Review of Anthropology , 1990 , Vol . 19 (1990), pp . 283-307 Published by : Annual Reviews Stable URL : https://www.jstor.org/stable/2155967 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS," vol. 19, pp. 283–307, 1990.

[18] L. L. Lemon and J. Hayes, "Enhancing Trustworthiness of Qualitative Findings : Using Leximancer for Qualitative Data Analysis Triangulation Enhancing Trustworthiness of Qualitative Findings : Using Leximancer for Qualitative Data Analysis Triangulation," vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 604–614, 2020.

[19] P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, "Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use".

[20] H. Sacks, E. A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson, "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation Author (s): Harvey Sacks , Emanuel A . Schegloff and Gail Jefferson Published by : Linguistic Society of America Stable URL : https://www.jstor.org/stable/412243," vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 696–735, 1974.

[21] M. N. Al-amri, "Listening to foreign language student teachers : The use of transcripts to study classroom interactions," vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2024.

[22] D. Rahayuningsih, M. Saleh, and S. W. Fitriati, "The Realization of Politeness Strategies in EFL Teacher-Students Classroom Interaction," vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 85–93, 2020.