

Politeness and Power Relation in EFL Classroom Interactions: A Study on Indonesian Learners and Lecturers

Sheila Agustina

Universitas Negeri Malang

Graduate Program in English Language Teaching

Jalan Semarang 5, Malang 65145 Indonesia

Bambang Yudi Cahyono

Universitas Negeri Malang

Jalan Semarang 5, Malang 65145 Indonesia

Abstract

By the time, the role of a teacher is not merely to teach but also to educate, to guide, and to enlighten the students. It is then believed that teacher-student relationship becomes one of determinant factors in students' success in the classroom. Considering how teacher's interpersonal, communication skills relate to the teacher-student relationship and how they contribute to the success of both teachers and students, this paper purposes to raise the awareness of the English lecturers to use mannered language during the classroom interaction and to create effective communication through the dimension of politeness. The findings suggested how most lecturers generated face-saving utterances more frequent than face-threatening utterances, how legitimate power can be exercised excessively through the choice of lecturers' classroom discourse, and how students expect polite expressions from their lecturers.

Key Words: politeness, power, face-saving, face-threatening, utterances.

1. Introduction

Many studies have revealed that a teacher's role exceeds the notion of 'to teach'. Inside the classroom, students are encouraged to do and to think creatively. As students are engaged in activities, the role of a teacher is facilitating, controlling, and director managing, and resourcing the students to participate in the activities (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Brown, 2007). Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) then emphasize that crucial classroom achievement depends on the attainment of teacher-student interaction in classroom. It is inevitable that every action and expression produced by teachers inside the classroom involves linguistic substance (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto and Shuart-Faris, 2005). In teacher-student case, language plays important role in class management and the acquisition process of students. It describes that classroom language determines the success of teaching and learning activities as well as the medium to enhance students' knowledge acquisition in the classroom (Nunan, 1991, cited in Peng, Xie & Cai, 2014).

The language and the society in which the language is used are closely related. One can affect the other. The interaction of teachers and students in classrooms also create a particular discourse where both teachers and students are actively participating in constituting intact communication. A lot of topics about language use in wider society have been discussed by many linguists for years. One of the most exposed topics is the use of politeness. Grundy (2000) says that "politeness principles have been considered to have wide descriptive power in respect of language use, to be major determinants of linguistic behavior, and to have universal status." In respect to language, politeness corresponds to the use of indirect speech acts, addressing others using respectful tone, or utilizing polite utterances such as *please*, *sorry*, or *thank you* (Watts, 2003).

Some researchers refer politeness in language as 'preserving face' (Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Arndt & Janney, 1992). It is prescribed that individuals possess self-esteem which has to be credited and recognized by other people. Ridden from this concept, linguists categorize speech into two patterns: offending someone's 'face' or defending it.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) definition of face is "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself". 'Face' is differentiated from two types of esteem: positive and negative. The terms are viewed as two things which have two different understandings. The positive face refers to human's desire to be well thought, admired, respected, and considered as a good person. On the other side, the negative face refers to human's desire to be free from any burden. Regarding the concept of 'face', Yule (2010) considers politeness "as showing awareness and consideration of another person's face". Thus, every individual is described to have positive and negative face that interlocutors should recognize.

When an individual tries to do and says things which lead to other individual's face losing, Yule (2010) and Song (2012) call the action as face-threatening acts (FTAs). Whenever an individual performs positive or negative face-threatening, he or she will be considered impolite. It is almost impossible to avoid the acts of face-threatening. Accordingly, people can get the benefit from speech acts which are less threatening. The effort to minimize face loss hereinafter refers to face-saving acts (Yule, 2010). Face-saving acts also cover both positive and negative face. When an attempt is carried out to minimize the loss of positive face, it is called as positive face-saving act. Otherwise, negative face-saving act is an attempt to minimize the loss of negative face.

In relation to politeness, Brown and Levinson (1987) mention several factors which influence people to use politeness strategies or face-saving acts when talking to the interlocutors. They are the social distance (D), relative power (P), and absolute ranking (R). The weight of those factors will determine the language production of both speaker and hearer. Increasing in hearer's power, for example, leads the speaker to produce less-threatening speech acts. In such a way, it is important to take note that certain speech acts may be seen polite or impolite depending on who are the interlocutors and in what situation (Song, 2012). French and Raven (1968), two social psychologists, categorize power based on how it works in a relationship. They identify power into five bases: (1) legitimate power, (2) referent power, (3) expert power, (4) reward power, and (5) coercive power.

It is tangible that teacher's power is not to be questioned. The presence of power in the classroom strives students to always be obedient to the teacher as the most powerful person. In fact, teacher's power in the classroom will not exist without the interaction with the students. The absence of classroom interaction results in teacher losing power. Therefore, if the interaction is not carried out in the classroom, then the teacher cannot lead the students, and power in the classroom cannot be not exercised.

Mugford (2011) rephrases that students' different characteristics can be altered through classroom interaction. Therefore, a good classroom interaction is necessary for both teacher and student. A good interaction is able to make students develop their abilities in academic or non-academic sense. It is because, inside the classroom, a teacher does not only provide subject materials but also share moral values that will benefit students outside the classroom. For teachers, a good interaction enables them to build a positive relationship with their students so that the gap between them can be bridge by good communication skills. This is the reason why carrying out effective communication in the classroom is very important and cannot be underestimated.

Grounded on Penninton's (1990) notion about how teacher's interpersonal communication skills contributes to the success of a language teacher, and considering the phenomenon of language use, power, and teacher-student relationship in the classroom, the following research questions are formulated.

- a. How are face-threatening and face-saving utterances generated by the lecturers?
- b. How is power exercised in the lecturers' utterances?
- c. How do students perceive the lecturers' utterances?

2. Method

This study was conducted by analyzing the classroom interaction, particularly the speech acts generated by the lecturers which include face-threatening acts and face-saving acts, and correlating them to five bases of power proposed by French and Raven (1968). Since all of data were in the form of words and denying the quantitative measurement, qualitative approach was used in the current study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The aforementioned data in the form of words were the utterances produced by the lecturers during the classroom interaction and the questionnaire result which were explained descriptively.

2.1 Participants

This study was conducted in Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia. Six active male and female lecturers of English Department in Faculty of Letters were designated as the research subjects. The lecturers who were designed for the current study were teaching six different courses. Furthermore, since there have been many studies which pinpoint the different linguistic manifestations evinced by gender differences, both male and female lecturers were then selected in the current study as a matter of comparison. The other participants were 97 (ninety-seven) students taught by the selected six lecturers. The needs to observe the students were to see how those students responded to their lecturers' interactive utterances and viewed the relationship between the utterances with the power held by the lecturers in the classroom.

2.2 Procedures

In the current study, the researchers attended the intended classes and recorded the lecturer-student interaction during the teaching and learning process, without interfering the interaction in the classroom. The researchers utilized a video recorder to record the interaction. Without neglecting the whole class interaction, the record focused on the lecturers. The lecturers' speeches recorded during the classroom observation were then transcribed. Eluding non-verbal speech such as tone, intonation, or gestures, the transcripts were all in the form of words. In this step, the researchers did the data reduction to sort only the utterances containing interpersonal expression such as requesting, ordering, asking, or inviting done by the lecturers toward the students. Last, the researchers distributed the questionnaires for the participant students. The questionnaire consisted of 25 Likert-scale questions related to the lecturers' utterances production and power in the classroom (Appendix 1). This questionnaire was aiming at seeing how the students perceive their lecturers' speech act during the teaching and learning process.

2.4 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the researchers first sorted and classified the interactive utterances generated by lecturers into two types: the utterances include face-threatening acts and those include face-saving acts. Yule's theories on face-threatening and face-saving acts were used as grounds to identify the utterances. Second, the researchers used aforementioned lists of both face-threatening utterances and face-saving utterances to determine the power exercised within the utterances. Implementing French and Raven's five bases of power, the researchers determined which utterances exercised legitimate power, referent power, expert power, reward power, or coercive power based on the distinct definitions presented previously. Third, the researchers read the numerical scores from the students' questionnaire. The researchers, then, interpreted the numbers and frequency of the response. In informing the readers of the questionnaire results, the researchers formulated the number and frequency into neat and order explanation for better understanding.

3. Findings

To answer the research questions, the researchers represented the patterns of FTAs and FSAs in lecturers' utterances, the frequent exercise of power, and the general students' perception on the lecturers' speech in classroom interaction.

3.1 Face-threatening Utterances

The face-threatening utterances describe how lecturers were showing less awareness and consideration to the students in the classroom through direct expressions. This study reveals sorts of utterance examples generated by lecturers indicate the threats to students' positive face, which describes the students' desire to be well thought.

(1) *What is your name?*

Positive face refers to the appreciation of individual's self-image. Being unknown to some people may be embarrassing. When a lecturer cannot recognize his or her students and asks for name without any acts (excerpt 1), the students can feel humiliated. They may think that they are not that important so that their lecturers can easily forget their names.

(2) *Noit's wrong That's not right*

The interaction between the lecturers and the students in the classroom include the way the lecturers give feedback or correction to the students' mistakes.

There are a lot of possible methods for lecturers in correcting their students, but excerpt 2 were the most common and basic feedback the lecturers can give to the students when they are making mistakes. These kind of utterances potentially put the students in the wrong and make them feel unconfident to give response in next chances.

(3) *Ok, wait, wait, wait. I'm trying to understand your expression.*

Aside from giving feedbacks, some lecturers tend to interrupt students when the students' speech is unclear or when they want the students to repeat the speech, as shown in excerpt 3. However, when students are delivering a speech or giving answer, they do not expect that their sentences will be interrupted bluntly. It may damage their concentration. To avoid the unfortunate situation, the lecturers should wait until the students finish their sentences or interrupt them politely to decrease the effect of losing face.

(4) *Yes, sit down.*

Ok, stop talking. Now, your story

Ok, now answer the question, do you agree with any of these statements

Now open the page 320

The utterances in excerpt 4 above indicate the negative face-threatening, the term to define the threatening to the human's desire to be free from burden. The directness of the utterances shows the threats to students' rights to non-distraction. Those kinds of utterance are normal to generate from lecturers to students, but the absence of polite acts make those utterances too direct and face-threatening. The study shows that lecturers often generated negative face-threatening utterances in the classroom.

3.2 Face-saving Utterances

In the opposite of face-threatening utterances, the face-saving utterances describe how lecturers were showing awareness and consideration to the students in the classroom through the form of indirectness and polite markers. All of face-saving utterances are some alternative expressions of how to give instruction by using polite markers like *please*, lengthening the utterances using declarative and interrogative structures instead of direct imperative structure, or giving appreciation to the students through *good* and *thank you*.

(5) *When you talk about cheap accommodation, it will be much, you know, much impressive if you give the detail*

The long utterance as shown in excerpt 5 above referred to a response or feedback given by a lecturer to correct the answer delivered by the student. This utterance can also be called as a suggestion. This kind of utterance indicates the use of face-saving because the students will be less offended by their own mistakes. This expression makes the students become the active participants in the activity or conversation ignited by lecturers. The positive feedback depicted in the utterance is potentially way better than saying 'no' or 'it is wrong'.

(6) *good of course alright
okay yes*

The expressions in excerpt 6 are some common expressions to use in justifying the students' answers. The researchers found abundant numbers related to those expressions.

(7) *Camp? Ok good. Camping, you mean?*

Lecturers had many ways to correct students' errors and mistakes in the classroom. Instead of saying *no*, *wrong*, or *you are incorrect*, they can formulate more polite expression like one mentioned in a session of a skill course class (excerpt 7). From this kind of utterance, the lecturer was conveying a message that the student was making an error so that the lecturer tried to correct by generating *you mean?* For the sake of politeness. It may be an alternative and better way to say that students are making mistakes but without making an offensive expression. It can save the students' desire to be well thought in front of their friends.

(8) *so before you say 'it' to be the subject, it is a pronoun, right?
...but in term of concept, you have understood, right?
she's not that type, right, at first?*

The utterances in excerpt 8 were generated by the lecturers to give more explanation since the students had lack of understanding regarding the subject matter. It describes how the lecturers were giving assertion without imposing their will but seeking for the students' agreement to minimize the effect of feeling wronged.

(9) *Anybody can answer my question?
Would you please type your answer over here?*

Utterances in excerpt 9 are constructed in interrogative structures. In fact, those utterances are not functioned as questions at all. Those utterances were generated to direct the students to do something the lecturer wanted in the classroom. Indirectness is frequently remarked by the use of modals in the questions. The questions which are delivered may not be usual questions to ask for understanding but to give certain instruction. The common modals appeared during the observation were *can* and *would*.

- (10) *Nuril, please, would you type your sentences?*
Fajar, would you please retell us the story?

In giving deference to the hearer, the speaker can address the hearer by the title or by the first name. In teacher-student relationship, mentioning the name of the students can be a strategy for a teacher to act polite. Remembering and mentioning the students' name may sound trivial and insignificant, but the effect may be favorable for the students. It makes them feel respected and appreciated by their lecturers. Aside from its function as a polite marker when imposing students' negative face, mentioning a student's name can also be positive face-saving to fulfill the students' desire to be well-known.

3.3 Power Exercise

The analysis is grounded on French and Raven (1968) theory of five bases of power: legitimate power, referent power, expert power, reward power, and coercive power. The analysis of each power and how it relates to the face-threatening and face-saving utterances is arranged orderly based on five bases of power.

- (11) *Submit the outline*
Have a look at the illustration
Give the marker to whomever you want
Now please, check this one out
Probably I will give you some questions

Legitimate power refers to the authority attributed to a teacher for his or her position as a 'teacher' or instructor in the classroom. Legitimate power allows a teacher to give instruction to his or her students within classroom context. By this understanding, all of instructional utterances as shown in excerpt 11 can be categorized as the practice of legitimate power. In such a way, generating commanding utterances directly (face-threatening) and indirectly (face-saving) can also be considered as exercising legitimate power.

- (12) *Who can help me over this?*

Referent power refers to the interpersonal relationship between two parties, the teacher, and the students. In referent power, the closeness of teacher and students is principal. The practice of referent power in utterances is normally initiated by asking a question, can be a request, to random students. During the observation, the researchers found only one utterance which exercises the referent power (excerpt 12). This utterance appeared when a lecturer had some trouble with LCD projector, so he wanted his students to help him. Instead of giving command, the lecturer asked a favor to the students. Different from instructional utterances, this kind of expression may trigger the students to appeal to the lecturers.

- (13) *Camping, you mean?*
How are you sure that your answer is correct?

Expert power refers to the notion that a teacher is the most 'competent and knowledgeable' person in the classroom. With this power, a teacher is free to deliver the materials for his or her students without restraint. The expected result of using this power is cognitive development of the students. The utterances which practice the expert power usually contain assertion or confirmation, as shown in excerpt 13.

- (14) *If you give me the right answers maybe I give you something more for your score*

Reward power refers to the teacher's capability to give rewards for the students. The reinforcement is provided for students who meet the teacher's expectation. The practice of reward power usually initiates the use of clause "if you..., I will..." as shown in excerpt 14. Although it is not a peculiar action to give a good remark for successful student, for reward power to be exercised, the reward must be uttered explicitly.

In the opposite of reward power, coercive power refers to the teacher's capability to give punishment for the students. This power enables teacher to punish or threaten students who do not meet the teacher's expectations. During the observation, the researchers did not find any utterances indicated the exercise of coercive power.

It simply shows that punishment was not popular to be uttered explicitly. The coercive power may be common and useful to be exercised in lower degree of education such as in elementary and secondary school but not in university level.

3.4 The Students' Perception toward the Lecturers' Utterances

From the previous table on the influence of language in many aspects of classroom, most students believe that the utterances generated by their lecturers are influencing some aspects in the classroom such as class atmosphere, academic achievement, and students' self-esteem and self-confidence. As for the practice of face-threatening acts and face-saving acts in the classroom, most students agree that lecturers should be polite in delivering the instructions or feedbacks for students and may use some polite strategies to lessen the effect of 'threat' to students.

For the factors influencing the lecturers' utterances, more than a half of the participants are confident that the utterances generated by lecturers are affected by the teaching experience and educational background. On the contrary, most students do not believe that gender influence the lecturers' utterances. As a matter of the exercise of lecturers' power in the classroom, most students are in agreement that lecturers who generate direct utterances are more powerful. However, most students were also certain that generating polite utterances does not correlate with being powerless. They also agreed on the idea that lecturers who frequently use polite utterances build relationship that is more positive with the students.

Eventually, regarding to the reason of students in obeying their lecturers, most students said that they obey their lecturers because of their role as teachers inside the classroom. The second popular reason is because the lecturers are the most competent and knowledgeable persons in the classroom. Surprisingly, the positive and negative reinforcement abide were not the reason why many students should obey their lecturers.

4. Discussion

After analyzing the data, the researchers found that lecturers generated face-threatening utterances less frequent than face-saving utterances. It was shown by the occurrence of 168 face-threatening utterances compared to of 379 face-saving utterances in twelve-meeting observation. It indicates that the practices of face-threatening acts were not much and did not take the most part in teacher-student interaction. In fact, according to two previous studies (Hariyono, 2013; Senowarsito, 2013), face-threatening was frequent to use inside the classroom. Despite the unpopular use, face-threatening utterances emerged in the forms of interrogative, imperative, and declarative sentences. However, due to the directness nuance of face-threatening utterances, most utterances took the form of imperatives.

For the face-saving practices in classroom, the researchers found various uses of face-saving strategies. The researchers noted the use of both positive and negative politeness strategies to lessen the negative effect of face-threatening utterances for students. From the positive face-saving view, the lecturers made use of particular expressions (e.g. *you know, you mean, right?*), modality (e.g. *would you, could you*), appreciative expression (e.g. *thank you, good*), mentioning the students' name, and polite markers (e.g. *please, excuse me*). Among those expressions, most lecturers tended to generate indirect utterances by using modality to save the students' face.

In the discussion of politeness and power, some experts argue that "women are universally subordinate to men and therefore more polite" (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Thus, in taking this notion into consideration, the researchers designated both male and female lecturers to be the subject of the study. After the observation, the researchers found out those female lecturers generated face-saving utterances more frequently than male lecturers did. Although male lecturers also generated more face-saving utterances than face-threatening in one session of a classroom, but the proportion was not as distinct as those generated by female lecturers in one session of a classroom. The number of face-saving utterances generated by female lecturers which was greater than those generated by male lecturers shows that female lecturers tended to save students' face inside the classroom rather than male lecturers did, and thus more polite.

Another finding shows that legitimate power was the most frequent power base which was exercised by the lecturers through their utterances. This kind of power allows a teacher to give instruction to his or her students within classroom context. As mentioned before, the instructional utterances were very dominant to generate by the lecturers in this study. Thus, the exercise of legitimate power was very explicit.

In fact, McCroskey and Richmond (1983) had a notion that teachers and students perceive frequent use of reward, referent, and expert power in their study. It clearly confirms that both studies have different findings related to the exercise of power. This difference may be caused by the subjects from diverse educational levels which were designated in the previous study. The presence of subjects that start from seventh grader students may influence the teacher to generate many utterances which contain the exercise of reward, referent, or expert power.

According to the result of the questionnaire for students on their perception toward the lecturers' utterances, first of all, more than a half of the respondents believe that the utterances generated by their lecturers are influencing their class atmosphere, academic achievement, and students' self-esteem and self-confidence. Meanwhile, Hurt, Scott and McCroskey (1978, cited in McCroskey & Richmond, 1983) once define power as "a teacher's ability to affect in some way the students' well-being beyond the student's own control". Based on those grounds, it is implicitly stated that utterances generated by interlocutor is related to the practice of power. It explains how utterances generated by lecturers inside the classroom reflect the use of power, and the relationship of those matters eventually affects students in some ways.

Second, 46.39% students agreed on the statement "The utterances generated by my lecturers should not be offensive and humiliating" (Item 4). It means that the students expect polite words from their lecturers, and the result said that expressing *please*, *sorry*, and *thank you* are more favorable, and make the students feel comfortable and appreciated. It supports Watts's (2003) statement that in order to be polite, people can utilize utterances such as *please*, *sorry*, or *thank you*. Moreover, 63.92% students agreed on the statement "I feel more comfortable if my lecturers give me an instruction using indirect utterances such as "can you...?" or "would you...?" rather than direct utterances" (Item 7). It shows that students also expect their lecturers to generate more indirect utterances to deliver the instructions, because according to Searle (1975, cited in Song, 2012), "in order to be polite in ordinary conversations, people must avoid flat, imperative sentences or explicit performatives."

Last, the majority of the students were confident that the utterances generated by lecturers are affected by the teaching experience and educational background. The result was rather different from the previous study because the current researcher did not include aspects suggested by the previous researcher. The previous researcher, Senowarsito (2013) suggested social distance, age difference, institutional setting, and power to contribute to the politeness strategy. However, another researcher, Xiaogui (2006) included gender as one factor that may affect power. In fact, 36.08% of representative Indonesian EFL students were undecided to say that the influence of gender is significant, although the finding said that different gender was proven to be distinct in generating utterances.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, to the results of analysis, some expressions generated by lecturers in the classroom are possibly implying threatening acts which may impose the students' esteem. Thus, EFL teachers and lecturers should be aware of using such expressions and should find more polite expressions to deliver instructions, requests, or orders which were successfully demonstrated by lecturers in the study. Many students also agree that their lecturers should generate polite utterances and may utilize some strategies to make them feel more comfortable and appreciated inside the classroom. Students also believe that by generating polite utterances, lecturers can manage their power inside the classroom. Positively, politeness inside the classroom can lead to a better lecturer-student relationship.

For future researchers who are willing to conduct similar research, they need to include a larger amount and variety of data so that generalization can be made more reliable. Further studies are expected to consider the non-verbal expressions such as tone, mimics, and gestures to see how those expressions complementing the utterances are generated by lecturers. The future studies are also recommended to involve more research subjects, in this case lecturers with various backgrounds for comparison to figure out how far actually the different backgrounds of the interlocutors can affect their language.

References

- Arndt, H. & Janney, R. W. (2005). Intra cultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds), *Politeness in language* (pp. 21-42). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S. & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A micro ethnographic perspective*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z. & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1968). The bases for social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York City: McGraw-Hill.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Hariyano. (2013). *Strategies of Politeness in Classroom Interaction at English Department of STKIP PGRI Sumbar*. Unpublished thesis. Padang: STKIP PGRI Sumbar
- McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. 1983. Power in the Classroom 1: Teacher and Student Perceptions. *Communication Education*, (Online), 32 (1): 175-184, (www.jamescmccroskey.com/publications/112.pdf), accessed on January 9, 2015.
- Mugford, G. 2011. *That's Not Very Polite!* Discursive Struggle and Situated Politeness in the Mexican English-language Classroom. In B. L Davies, M. Haugh & A. J. Merrison (Eds), *Situated Politeness*(pp.53-72). London: Continuum International.
- Peng, L., Xie, F. & Cai, L. (2014). A case study of college teacher's politeness strategy in EFL classroom. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 4(1), pp. 110-115, retrieved January 9, 2015 from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls0401110115>
- Pennington, M. (1990). A professional development focus for the language teaching practicum. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds), *Second language teacher education* (p.135-152). New York: Cambridge University.
- Senowarsito. 2013. Politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(1),pp. 82-96, retrieved January 9, 2015 from teflin.org/index.php/teflin/article/view/Article/316
- Song, S. (2012). *Politeness and culture in second language acquisition*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness: Key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Xiaogui, Z. (2006). *The power relationships in mathematics classroom*, retrieved January 9, 2015 from math.unipa.it/~grim/quad16_Zhang1_06.pdf
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Students

This questionnaire is intended for English as Foreign Language (EFL) students. It aims at discovering the students' perception toward the lecturers' language in the classroom.

Please read each statement carefully and give a check (√) below the scale (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) that tells how true the statement is according to you. There are no rights or wrong answers to these statements.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = undecided

4 = agree

5 = strongly agree

Item	Statement	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Utterances generated by lecturers determine the class' atmosphere.					
2	Utterances generated by lecturers determine the smoothness of teaching and learning process.					
3	Utterances generated by lecturers determine the lecturers' academic competence.					
4	Utterances generated by lecturers influence the academic achievement of the students.					
5	Utterances generated by lecturers influence the students' esteem.					
6	Lecturers' utterances in the classroom should not disgrace the students.					
7	You feel uncomfortable when your lecturers ask you bluntly to do something in the classroom.					
8	You feel unhappy when your sentence is interrupted by your lecturers in the classroom.					
9	An imperative sentence like "Finish your task!" is less polite and would offend students.					
10	Explicit instructions are not necessarily practiced by the lecturers in the classroom.					
11	Lecturers should mind their language when speaking to students in the classroom.					
12	You feel appreciated when your lecturers ask you to do something in the classroom using the word "Please".					
13	You feel less intimidated when your lecturers interrupt you using the word "Sorry".					
14	An interrogative sentence like "Could you...?" is more polite to use.					
15	I prefer polite language to clear and explicit utterances.					
16	Your lecturers frequently use polite language such as using "Please" and "Sorry".					
17	Utterances generated by lecturers in the classroom are influenced by their power in the classroom.					
18	Using clear and explicit utterances show that lecturers have more power in the classroom.					
19	Using polite utterances shows that lecturers do not have power in the classroom.					
20	Lecturers who frequently use polite utterances would build relationship that is more positive with the students.					
21	You obey your lecturers' instructions because of their role as teacher in the classroom.					
22	You obey your lecturers' instructions because you want to please them.					
23	You obey your lecturers' instructions because they are the most competent and knowledgeable persons in the classroom.					
24	You obey your lecturers' instructions because they will reward you with good scores.					
25	You obey your lecturers' instructions because you are afraid of punishment if disobeying them.					