Language politeness in students' text messages sent to the lecturers through WhatsApp application: A sociopragmatic study

Miftahush Shalihah and M. Nurdin Zuhdi

Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta, Jl. Siliwangi (Ring Road Barat) No. 63, Sleman, 55292, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Corresponding authors: miftadialaula@unisayogya.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Students and lecturers often communicate, both in formal and semi-formal situations. Good communication between students and lecturers remains within the limits of politeness even though it is not in a formal situation. The existence of social media certainly facilitates communication between students and lecturers. This research aims to describe and analyze the politeness of language in short messages from students to lecturers through the WhatsApp application at Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA). This research employed a qualitative research. The data from this study were 105 conversations between lecturers and students through the WhatsApp messaging application. The analysis in this research was carried out to determine 1) obedience and violation to the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim, 2) forms of language politeness, that are positive face and negative face, and 3) function of language politeness that are representative, directives, expressive, commisive and declaratives. The results showed that most of students used polite language in their text messages and used formal language which contained complete politeness expressions such as greetings, self-introductions, apologies at the beginning and/or at the end of text messages, intention in sending messages, thank you –note and closing. Most of the text employs positive face. Students' text messages mostly function as representative and directives.

1. Introduction

One of the communication facilities on a smartphone is a text message. At the beginning of its existence, smartphones only had one text message facility that was a short message service (SMS). However, nowadays, there are many text message applications that can be downloaded for free. One of the text message applications that is widely used is WhatsApp (WA). WA is a message application that can be downloaded from the Playstore or the Appstore on the smartphone. WA is one of the favorite messaging applications because it is easy to use.

However, the ease of communicating through WA does not mean that the problems do not exist. One of the issues that need to be taken seriously is the form and style of language used in text messages through smartphones which tend to ignore the aspects of language politeness. Even the phenomenon of language politeness violation is now commonly found in text messages sent by students to their lecturers. Many students neglect the principle of politeness in sending text messages. In fact, politeness is very necessary to build good relationships and mutual respect. Politeness is one of the most important rules in communicating, both verbally and non-verbally. Moreover, written language can cause different meanings from the readers.

Technological development becomes one of the reasons for the loss of politeness in students' language nowadays. This is because technological developments in the current era can affect the lifestyle of each individual and even change the way a person communicates to each other. The development of technology makes it easier for people to access information. In the end, information that is too much and not filtered properly drives everyone, especially young-adult, immediately adapts it in their daily life. Some of them forget that Indonesia has different norms and manners from western culture.

Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) is one of the Islamic-based campuses in Yogyakarta. Currently, UNISA has thousands of students from all regions in Indonesia. The diversity of cultures brought by each student at UNISA, of course, also results in various forms and styles of student language in communicating through text messages. It cannot be denied that there are students who ignore politeness principle in sending text messages to their lecturers. This is, of course, very unfortunate considering that UNISA is an Islamic-based campus that provides moral and ethical lessons. Considering that UNISA is an Islamic campus that teaches morals and ethics, it is certainly very interesting to know the language the politeness of students at UNISA when they send text messages to their lecturers through the WhatsApp application.

In term of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in education, some studies mention the importance of ICT in education to prepare students for their future (Olivia & Asfina, 2017). Other contend that through ICT will increase students' attention Lailiyah (2016). Despite the fact that using ICT in teaching and learning brings benefit, however, there are also drawbacks of it.

Politeness is an aspect of pragmatics. Pragmatics is a relatively new branch of linguistics. In her book, Thomas (1995) defines pragmatics as meaning in use or meaning in context. In addition, the use of politeness in language is determined by some external context. The external context of politeness is the context of communication such as the social status of the participants. Grundy (1995) states that there are three determiners to use politeness strategies. They are distance, power, and imposition. Distance implies the evaluation of the other's place in the world, degree of familiarity, and solidarity towards the addressee. Power is evaluated in terms of numerous factors such as position in society and age. Imposition covers every action which threatens the addressee's autonomy and freedom of action.

Politeness in how language is used to define interpersonal relationships in terms of formality, intimacy, solidarity, and deference (Lakoff in Coulmas, 2003). In addition, being polite is a complicated business (Holmes, 2001). It is difficult to learn because it involves understanding not just the language, but also the social and cultural values of the community. She also states that a polite person

makes other comfortable. Being linguistically polite involves speaking to people appropriately in the light of their relationship. In addition to this, politeness concerns a relationship between two participants who called as self and other (Leech, 1983). Further, he then proposes six maxims in politeness principles. They are: 1) Tact maxim (in impositives and commissives) – a) Minimize cost to other [b) Maximize benefit to other]; 2) Generosity maxim – a) Minimize benefit to self [b) Maximize cost to self]; 3) Approbation maxim – a) Minimize dispraise to other [b) Maximize praise to other]; 4) Modesty maxim – a) Minimize praise to self [b) Maximize dispraise to self]; and 5) Agreement maxim – a) Minimize disagreement between self and other [b) Maximize agreement between self and other]; and 5) Sympathy maxim – a) Minimize antipathy between self and other [b) Maximize sympathy between self and other].

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that politeness involves people showing an awareness of other people's face. Face means the public self-image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expect everyone else to recognize. Brown and Levinson (1987) the subdivide face into positive face and negative face. Positive face represents the desire for approval and appreciation, the need to connect, to belong, to be accepted as a member of the group. Negative face represents the claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

Other than obedience and violation of politeness principles and the type of face, this research will also analyze the function of the language politeness using the Searle's illocutionary act theory. Searle (1969) divided language function in illocutionary acts into 5 criteria that are representative, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative.

Yule (1996) stated the definition and example of each criteria. Representative speech commits the speaker believe about something the truth or not. In directive speech, the speaker gets the hearer to do something. They express about what they want directly to the hearer. Expressive speech states what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow, surprise, apologize and thank. Commissive commits the speaker to some future of action. Declarative speech is an act that change the world via their utterances. The speaker has to have special institutional role in a specific context such as to pronounce, declare, baptize and sentence.

Based on the explanation of some theories above, the writer will employ Leech's politeness principle using six maxims, Brown and Levinson's face theory, and Searle's speech act theory to analyze students' text messages sent to the lecturers at Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta. Therefore, the research objectives of this study are: 1) to observe the types of politeness principle that are obeyed and violated by student in their text messages sent to their lecturer, 2) to observe the types of face used by students in their text messages sent to the their lecturer, 3) to observe the function of students' language in their text messages sent to their lecturers.

2. Method

This research employed descriptive-qualitative method. The data of this research were students' text messages that were sent to their lecturers. The respondents of this study were lecturers of UNISA from 17 departments which consisted of 5 diploma departments, 11 undergraduate departments,

and 1 postgraduate department. The researcher randomly chose 2 lecturers from each department. In collecting the data, the researcher requested the chosen lecturer to agree to forwarding the text messages sent by their students. In collecting the data, the researcher conducting document collecting by taking notes on all text messages sent by the students to the lecturers. Next, the researcher interviewed to the lecturers concerning their opinion on the students' text messages.

After gaining the data, the researcher identified the data in the datasheet. After that, the researcher classified the data into obedience and violation of politeness principles, type of face, and the function of politeness language. The last, the researcher analyzed and describe the data. to strengthen the description of the data in his research, this paper involves tables showing the frequencies of the occurrence of the data.

3.   Result and Discussion

3.1. Result

The obedience and violation of Leech's politeness principle in students' text messages sent to the lecturers are presented in the table 1.

Table 1. Table of findings on the obedience and violation of Leech's politeness principles

Politeness Principle Obedience						Politeness Principle Violation						Total
TM	GM	ApM	MM	AgM	SM	TM	GM	ApM	MM	AgM	SM	
51 (48.57%)	0	0	3 (2.86%)	8 (7.62%)	3 (2.86%)	26 (24.76%)	7 (6.67%)	3 (2.86%)	0	0	4 (3.80%)	105 (100%)

Note:

TM	: Tact Maxim	MM	: Modesty Maxim
GM	: Generosity Maxim	AgM	: Agreement Maxim
ApM	: Approbation Maxim	SM	: Sympathy Maxim

In this research, the total data of students' text messages which are gained from the lecturers are 105 data. After the data were analyzed, it is found that students' text messages contain obedience and violation of Leech's politeness principles.

From the table, it can be seen that 51 students' text messages (48.57%) obey the tact maxim while 26 students' text messages (24.76%) violate it. Tact maxim is also called as wisdom maxim. This maxim demands that each participant should depend on the principle of "reduce their own profit and maximize the benefit for others". The person who obeys the tact maxim can avoid envy and jealousy of his/her partner.

The second politeness principle's obedience and the violation is generosity maxim. There are no students' text messages which obey the generosity maxim. However, there are 7 students' text messages (6.67%) that violate the generosity maxim. The Generosity maxim requires participants to respect other people. This respect occurs if the participants can minimize self-profit and maximize others-profits.

The third is the approbation maxim. From the result of the analysis, there is no approbation maxim obedience, but there are 3 students' text messages (2.86%). In approbation maxim, participants are expected to maximize appreciation/praise of others and to minimize dispraise. This maxim requires to avoid saying unpleasant this about others.

The next is the modesty maxim. From the data, it can be seen that there are 3 students' text messages (2.86%) that obey the modesty maxim and there are no students' text messages which violate the modesty maxim. Modest maxim requires participants to be humble by reducing praise to himself.

The obedience of agreement maxim occurs eight times in students' text messages (7.62%) and there is no violation of agreement maxim in students' text messages. In agreement maxim, participants are expected to be able to foster mutual compatibility. Participants have to maximize agreement between themself and other people and minimize disagreement between self and others.

The last is the sympathy maxim. In this research, there are 3 students' text messages (2.86%) that obey the sympathy maxim and 4 students' text messages (3.80%) that violate the sympathy maxim. Sympathy maxim is politeness principle which requires the participant to maximize sympathy and minimize antipathy between self and other.

The next analysis is Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness related to face. The face is divided into a positive face and negative face. The frequency of positive face and negative face in students' text messages is shown in table 2.

Table 2. Table of findings on the form of language politeness of Brown and Levinson's face theory

Form of language politeness	
PF	**NF**
63 (60%)	42 (40%)

Note:
PF: Positive Face   NF: Negative Face

In table 2, it can be seen that there are 63 students' text messages (60%) that have a positive face. The positive face represents the desire for approval and appreciation, the need to connect, to belong, to be accepted as a member of the group. However, the rest of the data, that are 42 students' text messages which have a negative face. The negative face represents the claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

The last analysis is the function of language politeness based on Searle's speech act theory. The frequency of each speech shown in the Table 3.

Table 3. Table of findings on Searle' speech act theory

Speech act				
R	Dr	E	C	Dc
52 (49.53%)	51 (48.57%)	2 (1.90%)	-	-

Note:
R: Representative
Dr: Directive
E: Expressive
C: Commissive
Dc: Declarative

The data in Table 3 shows that 51 students' text messages (48.57%) are representative speech, such as state, tell, assert, correct, predict, report, remind, describe, inform, assure, agree, guess, claim, believe, conclude. Next, directive speech is used 52 times (49.53%) in students' text messages. Directive speech is usually in the form of requesting, demanding, questioning, asking, proposing, advising, suggesting, interrogating, urging, encouraging, inviting, begging, ordering. Last, the use of expressive speech occurs two times (1.90%) in students' text messages. Expressive speech can be noted with some performative verbs such as greet, surprise, like, fear, apology, thank, regret, and praise. While declarative speech occurs only once (0.95%) in students' text messages. It includes curse, announce declare, define, appoint, call, bless, nominate and authorized. However, there is no occurrence of commissive speech in students' text messages. Commissive includes ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat, invite, permit, advise, dare, defy, and challenge.

3.2. Discussion

(1) Obedience and Violation of Leech's Politeness Principle Theory

Tact Maxim

Tact maxim is the maxim that mostly occurs in students' text messages. Based on the analysis of the data, there are 51 students' text messages (48.57%) which obey tact maxim and 26 students' text messages which violate tact maxim. As it is stated before that in tact maxim, the speaker has to minimize cost to other and maximize the benefit to other. The example of tact maxim obedience can be seen in the following example:

Data WA004
Student   : *Assalamu'alaikum ibu, ibu maaf mengganggu, ibuk kami mau mengumpulkan tugas ke ibuk, ibu sibuk tidak nggih?*
Lecturer   : Di letakkan di loker aja mb
Student   : Enggih buk

The students sent the text message to the lecturer in order to confirm whether the lecturer was available or not if she wants to submit the assignment given. The message sent by the student obeyed the tact maxim. The student asked whether the lecturer was busy or not. It means that the student did not want to disturb or interrupt her lecturer's activity. In this utterance, the student already uses

polites expression such as greeting by saying *assalamu'alaikum*, using title *ibu* to address the lecturer, asking for apologize in the beginning by saying *maaf mengganggu* and using the word *nggih*. The word *nggih* is polite Javanese language which means *yes*. However, in this utterance, the word *nggih* has 2 functions. In the first utterance, *nggih* is used to ask whether the lecturer was busy or not, while in the second utterance, *nggih* is used to tell the lecturer that she will obey the lecturer's instruction to put the assignment in the locker.

The next following example is the violation of tact maxim.

Data WA017

Student : *Assalamu'alaikum ibu mohon maaf ibu saya mau minta ttd di lembar kuning, apakah ibu pagi ini di kampus?*

Lecturer : Saya ada acara ke UGM

Student :Kembali ke unisa jam berapa nggih bu.

The student sent the text message to the lecturer asking whether the lecture will be available or not on the campus this morning since she needed the lecturer's signature. However, the way she asked to violate the tact maxim. The utterance seems to be polite since it uses greeting *assalamu'alaikum*, address her lecturer by using the word *ibu*, asking for apologies in the beginning by saying *mohon maaf*. Yet, the way she asked is very impolite. It can be seen from the utterance *saya mau minta ttd di lembar kuning, apakah ibu pagi ini di kampus?* This utterance means as if the student is the most important person and the lecturer has to be available at the office in the morning so that she can get the lecturer's signature. The word *pagi ini* seems to force the lecturer to be met according to the wishes of the students. If the student wished to meet the lecturer, she should ask first when the right time to meet the lecturer is. It will be better if the student asks the lecturer's availability first by saying *Saya mau minta tanda tangan Ibu di lembar kuning. Kapan saya bisa menemui Ibu?*

Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim refers to minimize benefits to self and maximize cost to self. In this research, there is no obedience in generosity maxim. However, there are 7 students' text messages (6.67%) that violate generosity maxim. The following example shows the violation of generosity maxim.

Data WA004

Student : *Assalamu'alaikum bu, mohon maaf mengganggu saya ingin bertanya. Untuk logbook nifas itu kan ada anamnesis sendiri, ttv sendiri, pemeriksaan fisik sendiri, involusi sendiri, perawatan luka perineum sendiri. Kalau saya buat logbook komprehensif saja bagaimana bu? Biar tidak sulit bu. Terima kasih.*

Lecturer : (no reply)

Student's utterance in the text message violates the generosity maxim. In the utterance, the student stated *kalau saya buat logbook komprehensif saja bagaimana bu? Biar tidak sulit bu.* In generosity maxim, it is required to reduce self-beneficial utterance. However, from the student's utterance,

it appears that making her own logbook will certainly be beneficial for her. It is because by having a comprehensive logbook, she only needs one form, but if she does not have a comprehensive logbook, she has to make five logbooks. Usually, a comprehensive logbook already has a specific format. If only she makes her own logbook, there is no guarantee that the lecturer will understand her logbook. Even if she wishes to use a standard comprehensive logbook format, it is better to meet the lecturer to consult it directly. On the other hand, it seems that the lecturer did not pleased with this request since the lecturer did not give any reply to her text message.

Approbation Maxim

In the approbation maxim, the speaker is expected to avoid saying unpleasant things about others, especially to the hearer. In this research, there is no obedience in approbation maxim and there are only 3 students' text messages (2.86%) that violate the approbation maxim. An example of approbation maxim violation is as follows:

Data WA059
Student   : *Assalamu'alaikum pak, saya mau asistensi jurnal pak, bapak posisi di ruang berapa pak..??*
Lecturer   : Wa'alaikumussalam Wr. Wb. Maaf mbak saya baru di luar kampus. Diemail saja ya
Student   : Baik pak… segera saya kirim. Terima kasih pak..

The student's utterance *Assalamau'alaikum pak, saya mau asistensi jurnal pak, bapak posisi di ruang berapa pak..??* violate approbation maxim. Actually this utterance uses some polite expressions such as *assalamu'alaikum*, *baik*, *terimakasih* and addressing the lecturer by using the word *pak*. However, in the utterance, there is an unpleasant sentence that is *saya mau asistensi jurnal pak, bapak posisi di ruang berapa pak..??*. This utterance shows as if the student has a higher position than the lecturer so that she can do whatever she wants and ask the lecturer whatever she wants. The student wanted to consult her journal and the lecturer has to be available to be met at that time. The student also asked where the lecturer is by saying *bapak posisi di ruang berapa pak..??*. The student should understand that she sent the text message to her lecturer, not to his friend. She should not use the word *posisi* to her lecturer. The use of two full stops and two question marks also make the utterance more impolite. If the student wants to consult her journal to the lecturer, she should first tell her intention and ask her lecturer's availability time. It is better to ask *Saya mau asistensi jurnal Pak. Kapan dan dimana saya bisa menemui Bapak?*

Modesty Maxim

Modesty maxim refers to minimize praise to self and maximize dispraise of self. In this research, it is found that there are 3 students' text messages (2.86%) that obey the modesty maxim and there is no students' text messages that violate the modesty maxim. The example of modesty maxim obedience as follows:

Data WA001

Student : *Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Mohon maaf bu *****, ijin bertanya terkait look book persalinan itu bagaimana nggih, 1 look book 1 kala atau 1 look book kala 1-4 bu? Karena saya lihat punya teman-teman beda bu. Terimakasih.*

Lecturer : Sesuaikan dengan targetnya. Mohon di fotokan buku panduan yang ada targetnya.

The student's utterance in the conversation contains the obedience of modesty maxim principle. The utterance *ijin bertanya terkait look book persalinan itu bagaimana nggih, 1 look book 1 kala atau 1 look book kala 1-4 bu? Karena saya lihat punya teman-teman beda bu* shows that the student was hesitant about the information she has got. The student thought that the lecturer had the correct information she needs and could help her to solve the problem. In her utterance, the student already used politeness expressions such as greeting *assalamu'alaikum*, asking for apologies by saying *mohon maaf*, asking for permission by saying *ijin bertanya*, addressing her lecturer *Bu*, using the word *nggih* and thanking by saying *terimakasih.* The word *nggih* or *njih* is polite Javanese which means yes. This word is usually used to convey a speaker's consent or confirm the approval of another person.

Agreement Maxim

Agreement maxim refers to minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other and maximize the expression of the agreement between self and other. In this research, there are 8 students' text messages that obey the agreement maxim and there is no students' text message that violates the agreement maxim. Here is the example of agreement maxim obedience:

Data WA007

Student : *Assalamu'alaikum bu.. Mohon maaf sebelumnya saya mengganggu ibu. Saya ***** dari kelas ***** semester ***** Bu, ingin mengkonfirmasi bahwa pagi besok di ruang ***** kita reschedule ya Bu, lalu kapan ibu ada waktu untuk mengganti jam tersebut Bu?*

Lecturer : Wa'alaikumsalam. Khusus Metab Mikro diundur, dek. Bisa tanya *****.

Student : Baik Bu, terimakasih. Mohon maaf bu sebelumnya, ***** PJ metab kelas ***** belum aktif Bu, sampai sekarang, lalu untuk jadwal metab mikro kelas ***** bagaimana ya Bu?

Lecturer : Diundur 1 minggu ya dek. Topik darah akan ibu berikan minggu depan. Begitu juga praktikumnya akan diberkan hari Sabtu.

Student : Baik bu, terimakasih bu. Maaf Bu, *sebelumnya dikarenakan jadwal metab mikro hari ini diuntuk untuk 1 minggu ke depan jadi sudah saya rubah untuk digantikan pada hari selasa 10-03-2020 berada di C 5.07 pada pukul 15.30 nggeh Bu.*

The dialogue above shows the conversation between the student and the lecturer who discuss a reschedule of a class. In the beginning, the student confirmed with the lecturer about a class that is canceled by the lecturer and will be rescheduled. The student asks politely *lalu kapan ibu ada waktu untuk mengganti jam tersebut Bu?*. The lecturer then gives the solution to postpone the class for a week. In the end, the student reconfirms that the class is rescheduled the next week. In her text

message, the student already uses politeness expressions such as *assalamu'alaikum*, *mohon maaf bu*, *baik bu*, *terimakasih bu*, *nggeh* and addressing her lecturer by using the word *Bu.*

Sympathy Maxim

In sympathy maxim, the speaker is expected to minimize antipathy between self and other and maximize sympathy between self and other. After analyzing the data, the researcher found there are 3 students' text messages that obey the sympathy maxim and 4 students' text messages that violate the sympathy maxim. The explanation of obedience and violation of sympathy maxim can be seen below:

Data WA063

Student   : Assalamu'alaikum ibu, saya ***** bermaksud ingin bertanya mengenai teman-teman saya yang terkena musibah ditinggal ayahnya. *Apakah ada dispensasi untuk tidak mengikuti seminar gadar dihari selasa tgl 4 Februari? Dikarenakan belum 7 hari meninggalnya ayah mereka buk.* Maaf mengganggu. Terimakasih. Wassalam.

Lecturer   : Coba wa bu ***** mbak selaku pelaksanan.

Student   : Nggih buk. Terimakasih arahannya.

Lecturer   : Nggih mb

The student's utterance in the conversation shows the obedience of sympathy maxim. The utterance *Apakah ada dispensasi untuk tidak mengikuti seminar gadar dihari selasa tgl 4 Februari? Dikarenakan belum 7 hari meninggalnya ayah mereka buk*, shows her sympathy to her friend and she tried to communicate it to the lecturer. In her text message, the student already uses politeness expression such as *assalamu'alaikum, bermaksud ingin bertanya, maaf mengganggu, terimakasih, nggih buk* and *wassalam.*

Data WA007

Lecturer   : *****, nanti setelah kelas bimbingan ya. Jangan lupa bawa buku bimbingan.

Student   : Baik Bu. Bimbingan jam berapa bu?

Lecturer   : Habis kuliah nanti bagaimana?.

Student   : *Selesai kuliah bu? ***** selesai jam 5 bu*

Lecturer   : Ibu baru selesai kelas ini, *****

Student   : *Setengah 4 ada kelas sama bu ***** bu*

Lecturer   : Nanti jam 14.30 sudah selesai

Student   : *Sekarang ***** baru makan juga bu…*

The student's utterances in the conversation above show the violation of the sympathy maxim. The conversation was between the lecturer and the student. They were discussing the perfect time for consultation. The lecturer offered the students to have a consultation after class, that was at 2.30 PM. The lecturer at first stated *habis kuliah nanti bagaimana?*. The student then replied *selesai kuliah bu? ***** selesai jam 5 bu.* This reply implied that the student thought she had to meet the lecturer after all of her class has finished. She did not feel happy with the proposed time. She argued it again

by saying *setengah 4 ada kelas sama bu ***** bu*. In UNISA, the class which is started at 03.30 P.M. usually finished at 05.00 P.M. By saying this utterance, she wanted to reconfirm the lecturer that her class finished at 05.00 P.M. When the lecturer clarified that the consultation was about at 02.30 P.M., the student objected it by replying *sekarang ***** baru makan juga bu*. It shows that the student seemed less sympathetic to the lecturer who was willing to take her time to give consultation by giving various reasons. She even preferred to continue her lunch rather than to go to campus immediately to meet the lecturer.

(2)   Form of Language Politeness of Brown and Levinson's Face Theory
Positive Face

A positive face is the desire to be liked, appreciated, approved, etc (http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/theory/face.html). In this research, there are 63 students' text messages (60%) that show a positive face. An example of the student's text message that shows positive face is as follows:

Data WA039

Student   : *Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Saya ***** dari prodi ***** semester ***** kelas *****. Maaf mengganggu waktu ibu. Mohon izin untuk melakukan konfirmasi mengenai mata kuliah Metodologi Penelitian pad hari selasa, 03 Maret 2020 pukul 08.00 di ruang B.201. Apakah ibu bisa hadir? Terima kasih ibu atas waktunya. Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.*

Lecturer   : Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Insya Allah

Student   : Baik, terimakasih Ibu.

In the utterance, the student used some politeness expressions such as greeting by saying *assalamu'alaikum*, self-introduction by mentioning her name, her department, semester, and her class, addressing the lecturer by calling her *ibu*, apologizing by saying *maaf mengganggu waktu ibu*, asking permission by saying *mohon izin melakukan konfirmasi*, asking for confirmation by saying *apakah ibu bisa hadir*, thanking by saying *terimakasih*, accepting the lecturer's confirmation by saying *baik terimakasih Ibu*, and closing by saying *wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb*. Those politeness expressions show that the student had a desire to be appreciated and accepted by the lecturer.

Negative Face

A negative face is the desire not to be imposed upon, intruded upon, or otherwise put upon (http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/theory/face.html). In this research, there are 42 students' text messages (40%) that show a negative face. Here is an example of the student's text message that shows a negative face:

Data WA027

Student   : *Ibu sekedar mengingatkan pada hari selasa, 10 maret 2020 ada jadwal mengajar di kelas kami pada pukul 08.00 di ruang B 5.03 materi tutorial permasalah seks dan gender.* Terimakasih Bu. (This text message was sent at 06.38 a.m., after that, the student made 4 call which were missed)

Lecturer   : Di jadwal saya sabtu jam 10 ya mbak tutornya, apa ada perubahan ya?

Student   : *Iya ibu, sebenarnya kita ganti tadi jam 8 ditakutkan ibu sabtu tidak bisa masuk kembali. Maaf ibu, jadwal kosong ibu hari apa saja ya? Biar bisa di isi dengan tutor di kelas kami. Terimakasih.*

In the utterance, the student reminded the lecturer about a regular class. This utterance shows a negative face. First, the student did not greet the lecturer in her text message. The second, the student changed the regular schedule without confirming it with the lecturer. The lecturer realized that the schedule of the regular class had been changed. The class should be at 10 a.m., but the student moved it to 8 AM. From the dialogue, we can imply that in the previous class, the lecturer could not come to the class. The student was afraid if the lecturer could not come again, so she changed the schedule. The student should understand that the lecturer might have another agenda previously that made the lecturer skipped the class last week. If she wanted to change the schedule, she should ask the lecturer first. The other impolite thing is that she gave 4 missed calls to the lecturer early in the morning. The student, again, should understand that in the morning, the lecturer might be very busy at home preparing her family. The student should be patient in waiting for the lecturer's reply. She even did not apologize when she changed the schedule. The last, conversation which shows a negative face is the student's utterance saying *Maaf ibu, jadwal kosong ibu hadi apa saja ya? Biar bisa di isi dengan tutor di kelas kami.* This utterance implies as if the lecturer does not have any other classes or activities, so the lecturer has to teach in the student's class.

(3)   Language function of Searle's Speech Act Theory

Representative

Representative describes states or events in the world such as an assertion, a description, a claim, a statement of fact, a report, and a conclusion (Searle, 1969). To make it simple, the purpose of the representative is to inform. In this research, there are 51 students' text messages that show representative acts. The example is as follows:

Data WA010

Student   : *Assalamu'alaikum ibu, mau menanyakan untuk surat aktif mahasiswa sekarang dibuat via online. Saya sudah ke form formulirnya,tertapi saat saya masukan file nya server tidak mau. Ada keterangan boleh di screen di sim. Sudah saya screen tetapi tidak bisa terus bu. Lalu bagaimana nggih bu?*
Ada keterangan seperti itu, saya masukkan file tapi ditolak server. Yang betul seharusnya yang bagaimana ya bu?

Lecturer   : Lagi error mungkin *****. Coba lagi nanti aja.

Student   : Saya coba sebelum uas kemarin seperti itu bu. Saya di chat orang tua saya untuk segera ngurus, saya coba lagi tidak bisa bu…

Lecturer   : Coba saya tanyakan pdsi…

The student's utterance shows that she gives information to the lecturer about the obstacle when she was managing the student active letter. This utterance is polite since the student already uses polite expressions such as greeting by saying *assalamu'alaikum*, addressing the lecturer by using the word *ibu*, asking for the solution by saying *lalu bagaimana nggih bu?* and asking for correct information by saying *yang betul seharusnya yang bagaimana ya bu?*

Directive

Directive expresses what the speakers want (Yule, 1996: 54). It includes some actions such as commanding, requesting, inviting, forbidding, ordering, supplicating, imploring, pleading, permitting, advising, contradicting, challenging, doubting, and suggesting. Directive expresses what the speakers want. In this researcher, there are 51 students' text messages (48.57%) that show directive. Here is an example of a directive:

Data WA005

Student   : *Assalamu'alaikum ibu. Sebelumnya mohon maaf menggangu waktu ibu. Saya ***** dari *****. Mohon ijin mengingatkan bahwa*

Hari   : Senin, 24 Februari 2020

Waktu   : 13.00 WIB

Ruang   : Sk.Lab 1.01/Antenatal Care 1 (Lantai 3)
Ibu ada kuliah pratikum dengan kelas kami. Apakah ibu bisa dan berkenan untuk menyampaikan materi di kelas kami?
Sebelumnya saya ucapkan terimakasih. Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.

Lecturer   : Mohon maaf mbak… Besok saya masih ada penilaian ISO Universitas. Jadi kita reschedule yak.

Student   : Baik Ibu, terimakasih bu.

The student's utterance in the conversation above is to remind the lecturer about the regular class. The student confirmed whether the lecturer could come to the class or not. This utterance is polite because the student used some politeness expressions such as *assalamu'alaikum*, *mohon maaf menggangu*, *bisa dan berkenan*, *terimakasih*, *baik ibu* and *wassalamu'alaikum*.

Expressive

Expressive includes acts in which the words are to express psychological state. It can be a statement of pleasure, pain, like, dislike, joy, and sorrow. In this research, there are 2 students' text messages (1.90%) that show expressive. An example of expressive text message can be seen below:

Data WA103

Student   : *Assalamualaikum. Pak terimakasih banyak yaaa sudah menemani proses penelitianku, sudah melungkan waktu tenaga dan pikirannyaa, maasih buat semua kebaikan bapak, semoga Allah membalas semua kebaikanbapak, aamiinYRA*

Lecturer   : Walaikumsalam. Wah tumben

Student   : Hahaha lawak mulu pak

The student's utterance above shows an expressive act since she thanked the lecturer since the lecturer had accompanied her in doing her research.

Commissive

Commissive points to commit the speaker to some future action such as promising, offering, threatening, refusing, vowing, engaging, undertaking, assuring, reassuring, and volunteering. It expresses what the speaker intends. In this research, there is no students' text message that shows commissive.

Declarative

Declarative can be in the form of baptizing, declaring war, abdicating, resigning, dismissing, naming, and excommunicating. In this research, there is no students' text message that shows declarative.

4.   Conclusion and Suggestion

The students' text messages sent to the lecturer are not always perfectly polite. Some of the students' text messages obey the politeness principles proposed by Leech and some other violate the politeness principles. The politeness principles are divided into six maxims, they are tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. From 105 data, there are 51 students' text messages (48.57%) which obey the tact maxim and 26 students' text messages (24.76%) that violate it. There are no students' text message which obey the generosity maxim, but there are 7 students' text messages that violate the generosity maxim. Violation of approbation maxim occurs 3 times (2.86%) in students' text message and no obedience in approbation maxim. Students' text messages also obey the agreement maxim. There are 8 students' text messages (7.62%) that obey the agreement maxim but there is no students' text message that violate it. Obedience in the sympathy maxim occurs 3 times (2.86%) and the violation in the sympathy maxim occurs 4 times (3.80%).

In fulfilling politeness face, there are 63 students' text messages that show a positive face and 42 students' text messages that show a negative face. Every students' text message also has its own function. From 105 students' text messages, 52 (49.53%) have representative function, 51 (48.57%) have directive function, 2 (1.90%) have expressive functions. However, there is no students' text message that have commissive and declarative functions.

The future researchers are expected to conduct other deeper investigation into language politeness on students' text messages by grouping the university students, whether they are new or senior and grouping the lecturer, whether they are young or senior. It is also suggested to perform an ad-

vanced study on students' text messages associated with certain students' communities by using other politeness indicators. It is because in most universities, the students are coming from different provinces that have different culture. By conducting a deeper research on language politeness on students' text messages, it will give a better understanding on the reason why the student can produce polite or impolite messages

References

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. 2003. *Sociolinguistics. The Handbook of Linguistics. Edited by Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees-Miller,pp.563-581.* Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing pragmatics.* New York: Routledge.

Holmes, J. 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. 2nd ed.* London: Longman

Lailiyah, M. (2016). Content and Language Integrated Learning in Teaching English as Second Language: A Systematic Review of Empirically Based Articles. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka)/ : Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, *1*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v1i1.278

Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics.* New York: Longman Library.

Ovilia, R., & Asfina, R. (2017). 21st Century Learning: Is ICT Really Integrated In EFL Classroom or Merely Segregated Outside The Classroom? *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka)/ : Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, *2*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v2i1.527

Searle, J. 1969. Speech Act. An Essay in the Philosophy Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Thomas, J. A. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics.* New York: Routledge.

Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Face. http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/theory/face.html. Retrieved on 1 September 2020