LEARNING POLITENESS IN CLASSROOM'S INTERACTION IN
KAMPUNG INGGRIS PARE

Joesasono Oediarti[1], Endah Yulia Rahayu[2], Nunung Nurjati[3]

[123]University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya

nunung.nurjati@unipa.ac.id

Abstract

To facilitate communication runs smoothly, it is necessary that the existence of appropriate language as guidance to be applied in language society. Language that is appropriate, for the language society is interpreted as politeness. This study aims to describe whether politeness exists in interactions of the members of the community of practice and can be learned in classroom. The method used in this study is descriptive qualitative with the research subjects being community members practicing English as a foreign language (EFL) consisting of course participants and classroom teachers who are in the area of *Kampung Inggris* Pare.

Keywords: politeness, classroom's interaction, learning, *Kampung Inggris* Pare

Abstrak

Untuk menunjang supaya komunikasi berjalan lancar, di dalam masyarakat bahasa diperlukan penerapan kaidah menggunakan bahasa yang layak. Bahasa yang layak, bagi masyarakat bahasa diartikan sebagai kesantunan berbahasa. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengetahui apakah kesantunan berbahasa hadir dalam interaksi anggota komunitas praktek Bahasa Inggris dan apakah kesantunan berbahasa dapat diajarkan di kelas. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif dengan subyek penelitian adalah anggota komunitas praktek bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing yang terdiri dari para peserta kursus dan guru kelasnya yang berada di lingkungan Kampung Inggris Pare.

Kata kunci: kesantunan, interaksi kelas, pembelajaran, Kampung Inggris Pare

INTRODUCTION

Along the road that connects from village to village, a very common sight is seen many people communicated in English either individually or in groups. Such conversations occur almost in public places, such as food stalls, cafes, and other public place. More specific situation is where the language courses are spread evenly over almost three villages. Such situations depict life as in abroad. The atmosphere of English native countries as if replicated here. What appears to be insoluble in English-speaking communication is that only indigenous people reside in the village. This is the phenomenon of *Kampung Inggris*, Pare. This is not a merely attraction that this research is conducted in the first place, this is that of the phenomena. The phenomenon of Pare, a district in Kediri Region geographically located on the center of East Java Province, is well known throughout Indonesia and some regional countries such as Malaysia, Thailand, Brunei, and even Libya. Not because of its natural beauty, but as the center of the international language course, English.

Actually, Pare is a small district town located 24 kilometers northeast of Kediri. The term is not because of many Caucasians or native speakers, but because of the publication of language schools and courses in the region. Pare has become famous all over the world because it is here that world-class anthropologist Clifford Geertz - who was a doctoral at the time - conducted field research that later wrote *The Religion of Java*. In his book, Geertz disguises Pare as "Modjokuto". In Pare, Geertz the anthropologist often discussed and consulted with *Kyai* Yazid ibn Thohir who was assisted by Mr. Kalend Osen. Later, Mr. Kalend Osen is the pioneer of English courses in Pare in later time known as *Kampung Inggris* attached to Pare. There are currently more than 147 language courses registered in the Official Education Offices in Kediri District (Permanasari, 2017: 18).

The characteristics of the foreign language used in a region are influenced by many things. However, the English used in Pare is strongly influenced by the circumstances and differences that make up why foreign languages are spoken in that area. This will form the character which then become known as Pare English.

The course participants in Pare are very much vary in origin. They originate from the northern, central, east to south of Sumatra. The west, central, and east of Java, and also comes from the southern islands and northern island of Indonesia to the

easternmost island, namely Papua are the origin of the course participants in Pare. As the destination of international or foreign language courses in Indonesia, Pare occupies the first place as educational destinations which beat cities like Yogyakarta, Bandung or even Jakarta. The origin of course participants are coming from all over Indonesia and neighbouring countries in Southeast Asia such as Malaysia, Brunei, Thailand, Vietnam and even from Libya.

The educational background of course participants is also varying, starting from the lowest of elementary to graduate students. Elementary school students often come on vacation. They join the programs to fill their school vacations. During the school holidays, the population of elementary school children in *Kampung Inggris* increases. On average, the participants of the courses are those who have graduated from high school. While awaiting university period of new admission, they add English skills by becoming a course participant in Pare. Moreover, university graduates also register as participants of the course. Their purpose is twofold; which is to improve English language skills to add skills according to the demands of the job they desire, and to get a scholarship for those who want to continue their studies to the next level. From the different origin and educational backgrounds, learners of English as foreign language in Pare create unique characteristics. From those unique characteristics, English learners in Pare still shows clearly as a common characteristic of English as Foreign Language (EFL) speakers in non-native countries (not native speakers) other than English.

Referring to the above-mentioned facts about *Kampung Inggris* Pare, therefore it is necessary to find out whether the participants of English course in Pare applying appropriate language in conducting conversation among them, or in other word that this research is aimed at finding the occurrence of whether politeness is implemented during the conversation among members in the community.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

1. Understanding Politeness

Understanding the meaning of 'politeness' should be retroactive by explaining the history of the word 'polite' which is derived from Latin '*politus*' which means 'smoothed', 'polished' or 'accomplished' (Watts, 2003, p. 13-16). While, the term

'polite' in thesaurus has the same meaning with 'refined', 'good manner', or 'courteous'. Thesaurus defines 'politeness' as 'courtesy manner'. Oxford Dictionary of Etimology mentioned that in medieval century polite person was written as 'one of refined courteous manners'. Shahrokhi and Bidabadi (2013) believes that in French, Spanish, German, and Dutch courtesy values such as 'loyalty' and 'reciprocal trust' were used by upper class people in the Middle Ages to distinguish themselves from the rest of people. When taking more closely, the word '*politus*' relates to the word '*poly*' which means 'city', 'polity' ('city', 'government') and '*politizmos*' which means 'civilization'. *Politizmos* is not only defined as a long evolution of people learning to control physical, speech and attitude but is an effective method of self-control and social control. This is reflected in the opinion of France (in Watts, 2003: p.33) that in the 18th century politeness was not only interpreted as polite ways of dealing with manner but also related to the formation of civilization as a link between a set of values that are interpreted collectively as a society and ideal modern European culture. France's views show that politeness is not only related to the personal aspect, but also related to socio-cultural values agreed by a society to form a civilized society.

In broader scope definition, the term 'politeness' is also interpreted by scholars as a concept related to behavior and language use. It is described by Fraser and Nolan (1981: 96) and Spencer-Oatey (2000: 2) that politeness 'is not only referring to the use of relatively formal and deferential language, but it is also referring to a social judgment, speakers are judged polite or impolite depending on what they say in context'. The use of formal term such as 'Sir' or 'Madam' and request pattern such as 'would you be so kind to…' and formal expression of gratitude or apology in a common situation can be indicated being polite. The use such terms and phrases can be more meaningful for politeness if they are suited to the context or appropriateness. Being polite is not only regarded from what people utter, but it should be incorporated with the situation behind it.

2. Classroom Interaction in Community of Practice

As a result of the teaching of English in Pare raises the so-called community of practice. Quoting Wenger (1998) that "community of practice is a group of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do, and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly" In this case, the community is formed as a result of the

learning activities and all aspects that are caused by it. Furthermore, if observed, the community formed has aspects as presented by Wenger (*ibid*) is as follows.

> "The domain: *members are brought together by a learning need they share (whether this shared learning need is explicit or not and whether learning is the motivation for their coming together or a by-product of it).*
> The community: *their collective learning becomes a bond among them over time (experienced in various ways and thus not a source of homogeneity)*
> The practice: *their interactions produce resources that affect their practice (whether they engage in actual practice together or separately)*

Wenger (1998)

Those three characteristics of community of practice mentioned by Wenger can be identified in Pare.

The domain

It is obvious that the participants who learn English come to Pare are from various places and spread from the far north of Sumatra, Kalimantan and the far south of Java, Lombok, Nusa Tenggara, and even the furthest island of Papua. They are brought together and willing to stay for the similar purpose to master English which they have known as an international language.

The community

Based on similar purpose, the participants from many different parts of Indonesia and its regional neighbourhood are bound together pursuing goal of English mastery.

The practice

The purpose of utilizing community of practice (CofP) in this research is to facilitate the researcher to illustrate the language practice in context.

This is important to analyse behaviour or politeness conduct (Mills, 2011: 31). Since the focus on community of practice makes it possible behaviour or politeness conduct to see that different groups compose different norms for what is appropriate or inappropriate what regards as polite or impolite. Therefore, in relation with the approach of Relational Work, the community of practice is used to be the location of the span of relational continuum which the interactants interact in social interactions.

Thus the English practiced by the practice community in Pare has a diversity with most other EFLs in the expanding circle area that develops due to the influence

of the mother tongue and the local culture in which the EFL develops. This affects the usage of English as a communication tool containing aspects of politeness (and / or irreverence) in the interaction between English users in Pare.

3. Relational Work Approach

Relational work termed by Locher (2004) and Locher and Watts (2005) is defined as "*the process of defining relationships in interaction*." It refers to "*the work of individuals invests in negotiating relationship with othe*r*s*" The term has a meaning that people, as part of society, needs others to realize life and pursue the goal of life. They must be aware of their interdependency on others.

This term *relational wor*k is intended to focus that interlocutors supply "work" into their ways of communicating by adjusting their language to different speech events and to the different goals that they might be engaging. The term *relational work* is preferred rather than the term *facework,* which is very similar in use. However, because *facework* has been employed too often in the literature to refer *only* to the description of the mitigation of face-threatening acts (Locher and Watss, 2009: 10).

Locher and Watts divide relational work into two sub-divisions; marked and unmarked. Marked area is on column 1, 3, 4, while unmarked area is on column 2. Unmarked behavior is in which people usually done unnoticed. This area covers appropriate, politic and non-politic behavior. While, marked behavior can be noticed in three ways; as negative if it is considered as impolite/non-politic/inappropriate (column 1), as over-polite/non-politic/inappropriate (column 4), and as positively marked behavior if it is polite/politic/appropriate.

R E L A T I O N A L   W O R K

negatively marked	unmarked	positively marked	negatively marked	
impolite	non-politic	polite	over-polite	
non-politic /inappropriate	politic /appropriate	politic/ appropriate	non-politic/ inappropriate	

| column 1 | column 2 | column 3 | column 4 |

Figure 1. The Continuum of Relational Work of Politeness

Locher and Watts (2005:12)

RESEARCH METHODS

        This study is a qualitative in nature where the data is in the form of utterances by the course participants who take part in the conversation among members of the community of practice in *Kampung Inggris* Pare. In conducting data collection from the fieldwork, the researcher did not work alone, she has been assisted by young researchers who have been trained in collecting the data for this research. The researcher and her assistants took participation in the interactions by registering as active participant in the chosen courses in the fieldwork. The most consideration of choosing the courses among others are (1) from its establishment, at least five years of running the courses or longer (2) from its survey in the internet based on the courses most preferred by the participants, and (3) from its popularity among the course participants. While the recording by other observers who cooperate with researchers in the research is not easily understood and interpreted by researchers because it does not describe on their field-notes, situation and atmosphere during the conversation / interaction is recorded in progress.

        Data analysis is utilized frame and context-based in order to understand and comprehend the meaning of the interactions. For example, the recording of a researcher which has been added field-notes that describe the atmosphere and situation in the field where the conversation/interaction recorded is more easily understood and interpreted by the researcher. The data were used to explore the realization of polite conducts or appropriate behaviour of community of practice of English as Foreign Language speakers in Pare. Therefore, three prominent analyses in this research have been conducted: first, a deeper description of location as research setting and all its aspects. Second, having discussed with relevant theories, the aspects revealed to linguistic politeness has been identified. Third, under the approach of Relational Work by Locher and Watts (2005), the interactions are determined in which continuum they are identified. The data presentation is closed with concluding remark as the final depiction of conclusion of the above mentioned of analysis. Thus, the findings of this study have also been described immediately after the analysis of each sections. From the results of the interpretation will be made a table that describes the distribution of

EFL speakers' interactions that occur in Pare regarded as politeness in Relational Work's continuum.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the facts findings of 1) fieldwork settings and its aspects and 2) aspects revealing politeness in interactions, which function as a description of the setting of the location where the research is conducted and related to the aspects that triggered the emergence of politeness, are correlated with the data findings from the fieldwork then analysed and finally interpreted based on the related theories of relational work approach for politeness by Locher (2004, 2006, and 2008) and Locher and Watts (2005 and 2008). In analysing, the researchers connect the fieldwork setting as a socio-cultural element that affects all behaviour and the use of language of its inhabitants, primarily the use of English as a foreign language as means of interactions by a community of practices that have sprung up in fieldwork. Then, the researcher uses all the aspects that can generate politeness as mentioned above as tool to analyse to get the interpretation of the data in the form of utterances in the interactions as well as the results of observations and field notes that have been made by the researcher.

Interactions which contain dialogues as the main data of this research are treated as preliminary data, which will be sorted out based on analysis needs. Only dialogues that may have tendency of politeness to be used and the rest will be discarded. The selected dialogues will be framed, analysed then interpreted based on the concept of the relation of politeness in the four continuum as mentioned by Locher and Watts. Framing dialogues refers to the context based on the situations which take place in the interactions. Context is required to understand speaker's meaning, while grammar is needed to understand sentence's meaning (Scollon and Scollon, 2001: 28). Both meanings can be obtained in the situation, to be particular is as unit of communication which composed one unity of speech situation, speech event, and speech acts. This unit of communication can be interpreted discursively by using the elements of the 'ethnography of communication' (Hymes, 1976), which formerly termed 'SPEAKING grid' (Hymes, 1962), or 'grammar of context' (Scollon and Scollon, 2001: 32) which consists of the elements of settings, participants, ends, acts, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genres. In this part, the interactions are analysed

based on the settings which later determines the rest of elements to see the existence of politeness, impoliteness, over-politeness, or non-politeness as described by Locher and Watts as the continuum of relational work.

1. Politeness in Classroom Interactions

This setting is chosen as the first focus of analysis because the interactions of EFL speakers mostly take place in classrooms. The interactions in classrooms mostly follow the regularities which are part of norms such as communication between teacher-student which will be a role model of communication. This kind of communication is expected to reflect appropriateness which showing respect to the interactants of interactions (see Mullany in Locher and Bousfield, 2001: 240). In total, the number of classroom's interactions which take place in the whole English course might be more than a thousand in a day. In this regards, the researcher has conducted active participation in ethnographic study in five institutions which have been chosen in accordance with certain requirement such as: 1) having established or continued for a long time, 2) most selected online, and 3) most preferred by course participants. The requirements are set by the researcher after conducting several field surveys; by searching for information online and asking the participants of the course randomly at various courses. Guided by those requirements, the researcher establishes five courses as research locations where the researcher takes part as an active participant, registers and follows the tutorial according to predefined schedule. Initial inversion is used to disguise the names of the courses to maintain the confidentiality of the courses. Toward this paper, three course are taken to be the locus of analysis. To cope that than the initials of the courses are defined as FD, BM, and RK.

a. At FD Course

The first interaction to be analysed is taken from units of communication that took between the tutor and the students in an advance class where English is used as main communication between the interactants. It is written in the brochure that English is used more than 80% in communication during the class interactions. From the recorded data, in practice, the tutor sometimes used code-switching in one sentence or part of the sentence while the students spoke entirely in English or partly in *Bahasa* when they find difficulties to convey the term in English. There is no penalty or fine imposed on the students when they speak in *Bahasa*.

Frame-based context:
The teacher continues the previous course plan with student's presentation. Two students should take turn for that day.

1	T	: Good morning everybody…
2	Sts	: Good morning
3	T	: Welcome to the event. Please do presentation. It's about education.
4		*Tinggal siapa*? *Yang belum cuma* Risda *ya? Apa?* Risd*a udah ya?*
5		*kemudian* Lidya*, kemarin kalau ga salah tinggal* Aini *aja ya*
6		*seorang diri.* Please give applaus…

St. A performed presentation…

7	T	: Wow..wow...wow, very-- interesting. The story is from Japan, but
8		she is from England, right?
9	St A	: Yes, right. She lives in England
10	T	: And, she moves to Japan?
11	St A	: No, Japan is the company who make the hello kitty cartoon.
12	T	: Ah, -- excuse me, hello kitty has Japan family?
13	St A	: No, hello kitty is from England and the character from hello kitty
14		from Japan. *Perusahaannya aja yang berasal dari Jepang*
15	T	: But it is originally from England. *Langsung saja*, hello kitty from
16		Japan but the family is from England. And how is the century of
17		hello kitty?
18	St A	: From 1974
19	T	: And the story of mouth cancer is from 1974. All right, then question
20		time, ladies and gentlemen. *Kok saya yang tanya terus…*
21	Sts	: ……… (10.0) ((silent, no question))
22	T	: Would you share your question, please. The presenter needs your
23		question.
24	Sts	: …… (7.0) ((no question))
25	T	: Hellow--- Please---, *deh*…
26	St B	: …. ((a student raises hand))
27	T	: Yes, Indra.. naa..*muncul satu, gituu…*
28	St B	: Why hello kitty is identic with cat?
29	St A	: Because it is just when many mother like cat.
30	St B	: The cat is their pet?
31	St A	: No, because it is her mother make a character who is sad and you
32		must make a character who looks happy, so the mother makes cat.
33	T	: Next question..
34	St C	: So, what about the mouth cancer? Is she live or died? The mother or
35		the kid?
36	St A	: The kid who has the mouth cancer, after her mother make a
37		character of hello kitty. One week later hello kitty is healthy again.
38		And then she doesn't have cancer again.
39	St C	: Yes. And what is the name of the daughter? *Namanya siapa*?
40	St A	: Kitty white.
41	T	: Oh alright. Next question?

The teacher started the classroom conversation right after she has entered the room. After she greeted the students, without checking the students' attendance she started the lesson by directly asking a student to perform presentation. Then, she started the lesson that day. The situation of the students overall tends to be less active. The students only respond when the tutor ask or instruct to do presentation. The only chance the students show their activities when there is a chance given by the teacher to deliver questions to the presenter on that day. The researcher acts her position as other students. She sometimes feels offended by the language expressed by the teacher. The situation that the researcher experiences sometimes also compared to other students in the classroom by checking the face of the students. They look very tense.

It is observable that the appearance of linguistic markers in the conversation is detected by the responses from the hearers, in this context is the students. Linguistic markers in some cases can be indicators of the emergence of politeness in a conversation (Nurjati, 2018). In this conversation, markers to identify the occurrence of politeness among others are codeswitching and codemixing when the teacher uttered in "….It's about education. *Tinggal siapa*? *Yang belum cuma* Risda *ya?"* (line 3-4), as codeswitching, and in "*Langsung saja*, hello kitty from Japan but the family is from England" (line 15-16) as codemixing. By using codeswitching or codemixing, the teacher directs her students so that whatever is said can be understood by the students does not cause a misperception of what the teacher is intended to say (Mujiono, 2016).

Another marker is using indirectness to mitigate the coercion of an instruction/request (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The use of indirectness is found in teacher's utterance "….All right, then, question time ladies and gentlemen. *Kok saya nanya terus*?..." (line 19-20). It seems that the teacher's intention is in order her students to asking questions, but she does not say directly to her students, rather it is in the form of question that seem to be directed at herself. The use of hyperbole in addressing the students *ladies and gentlemen* even confusing the students.

It is also found in the conversation that directness is also shown in the teachers' utterance when she said "*Would you share your question, please. The presenter needs your questions*" Hearing order directly from the teacher, the students stayed still quietly did not react as instructed by the teacher until she confirmed and

asked the student to ask the question to the presenter in utterance "Hellow--- Please---, *deh…*" Then, the teacher got response as one student raised hand. Directness is a kind of bald-on strategy in politeness which purpose is to avoid misunderstood by putting intended meaning directly without covering it up with any pragmatic meaning (Brown and Levinson, *ibid*).

From relational work approach point of view, the linguistic markers which are appeared in the conversation between the teacher and the students are identified as positively marked which can refer to polite or appropriate referring to the response shown by the students or the hearer of the interaction (Locher and Watts, 2005). This category shown on table of continuum of relational work approach located on column 3 (see Figure 1). Almost all statement from the teacher has quick response from the students, only when the teacher addressing the students using hyperbole, silent response shown by students. It is also a response, meaning that the students might not understand what is intended by the teacher. In this situation, silent response can be categorized into negatively marked which can be meant as over-polite, non-politic, or inappropriate (Locher and Watts, *ibid*). This characteristic is positioned on column 4 of range of relational work of politeness by Locher and Watts (see Figure 1).

b. At BM Course

Conversations that occur in the class of speaking at BM indicate the representation of the theory of relational work stated by Locher and Watts, in this case is the social behavior that is considered appropriate to social context of the interactional situation. Subsequent transactions and interactions between interactans, according to Locher and Watts, are the results of evaluations by the participants/ interactants. It is considered as polite or impolite if it is to be noticeable or marked behaviour. The following contexts based on frames are taken from the classroom interaction at BM where the researcher put herself as participant of the course. To maintain the naturalness of data, the researcher disguises as course participant.
Frame-based context:

1	Teacher	: Your name, bro?
2	S-1	: Edo
3	Teacher	: Edo….and, you?
4	S-2	: Brian

5	Teacher	: Brian. You?
6	S-3	: Fuad
7	Teacher	: Next?
8	S-4	: Rina
9	Teacher	: Hey…bro?
10	S-5	: Ridwan
11	Teacher	: Yes?
12	S-6 (R)	: Yusa
13	Teacher	: ((was appointing to next student sitting beside researcher))
14	S-7	: Fina
15	S-8	: Nita
16	Teacher	: Nita….
17	S-9	: Suci
18	Teacher	: Suci.
19	S-10	: Harsen
20	Teacher	: what?
21	S-10	: H..a..r..s..e..n
22	Teacher	: Oh…Harsen
23	S-11	: Willy
24	Teacher	: ((was writing the student's name on the class wall))
25	S-12	: Assalamualaikum ((A late comer student entered the classroom. He sat close to door))
26	Sts	: Waalaikum salaaam
27	Teacher	: Your name?
28	S-13	: Brian
29	Teacher	: Brian….You are late ↗, you will get powdered…
30	Sts	: ((laughing))
31	Teacher	: You late five minutes…
32	Sts	: ((mumbling))
33	Teacher	: Theen….. Permit?
34	Sts	: Herman
35	Teacher	: For newcomers….You should know… Don't speak Bahasa!
36		There is No Bahasa at all, here!
37		If you speak Bahasa, It means that…you will get powdered…
38		Willy…Willy… ((Teacher asked a student to put powder to late comer))
39		You get powdered because you are late
40	St (R)	: Punishment?
41	Teacher	: Yes, punishment….. Punishment…to make you↗… fix!
42		: For assessment…you need… to get the point from your performance…
43		: as much as you can…by filling quizzes…
44		: If your point is the lowest until the end of the class, you get powdered
45	St (R)	: So, what is the criteria for the lowest and the highest point?
46	Teacher	: Yaaa… actually, to make six at least six answers.
47	St (R)	: Do you count the word? Do you count the word?
48	Teacher	: No, depends on the students.

49	St (R)	: Ok
50	Teacher	: Don't forget, if you want a point just raise your hand. Don't keep silent, you don't get any point.
51		There is squeaking sound from the door. A student come late.
52	Teacher	: Hey, lift up the door when open it↑
53	St 14	: Sorry, Uncle ((said the student who just come late))
54	Teacher	: Give powder to him

The situation in this course is very much different with other courses that the researcher has been conducted. The differences are obviously observed from various things such as the kinds of course, the tutors, the participants, classroom regulation, etc. Those things affect in such a way to the interactions that occur in the classrooms. For instance, the kinds of the course in BM which is the main choice for the course participants in Pare is speaking classes. In most courses, speaking class offers content material such as presentation, debate, and speech which explore much on oral skill in English. As has been observed by the researcher, speaking class in BM implements teaching and learning strategies that minimize the use of *Bahasa* Indonesia and prioritize the liveliness of participants in the classroom. This situation surely affects classrooms' interactions. Tutors who teach in one class based on the terms of the course management. At BM, tutors who teach in speaking classes are those who are popular among the course participants who have had experience learning in the classes taught by those respective tutors. Tutors position themselves as friends for course participants, not as teachers. In fact, the tutor has a famous call by 'uncle' without including the tutor's name. This situation influences the way the tutor interacts with the course participants. It can come across from the throb of conversation as if with a friend where the distance seemed not exist.

Course participants are encouraged to be active in participating the classroom's interaction particularly in speaking class. The contribution of course participant in classroom is influenced by each personal background such as demographic, education, culture, etc. In speaking class at BM, the course participants are partly university student and the rest are secondary school student. Only small part of them are graduated from college or university.

Like other kinds of course in BM, classroom regulation put forward punishment for those who intentionally or unintentionally break classroom's regulation. Punishment is in the form of sprinkling talcum powder to the faces of

course participants who make mistakes. Such penalties do not deter participants of the course, nor make the participants cautious to avoid making mistakes, but instead create a vibrant class atmosphere. In fact, this penalty makes the class more excited because the student's faces are sprinkled with talcum powder as if not care about their face powder splattered. The interaction between tutor and students grows intensely. What is visible is the communication between tutors and course participants in the classroom eliminates the boundary between the tutor and the course participants.

In regard to the previous description about the conversation at BM, politeness in language use can also be detected from the linguistic markers appeared in the interaction uttered by the participants. The linguistic markers which are commonly utilized by the interactants, such as the use of directness in utterance '…*You should know…Don't speak Bahasa…There is no Bahasa at all here*' (line 35-36), and many other, and the use of raising intonation which is found in utterance such as in '…*Brian, you are late* ↗' (line 29), and in '….*Punishment…to make you*↗*… fix!*' (line 41). Those commonly use of linguistic markers in the interactions is supposed to be marked negatively by the hearers. In fact, the students evaluate those utterance as unmarked as if the utterance causing no threatening their face. The students respond equally to utterances which contain directness and raising intonation. As Locher and Watts (2005) conceptualized in relational work in politeness, the characteristic of interaction in BM is categorized as non-politic. Interactions which is considered non-politic occurred in situation in which both parties of the interactants value the norms as what is prevailed in the given situation, in this case is in classroom between teacher and students.

c. in RK course

This course is considered the low cost course from the fees applied to each type of English lesson provided. Among course participants, although the cost of the course is set cheap, but the quality of the courses provided quite well. If seen from the nature of communication occurred, in FD it is noticeable border between teacher and students, and BM with its unnoticeable border between teacher and students, while RK presents noticeable but not quite forcing to the relationship between teacher and

students. From this characteristics, this course is set as one of the fieldwork for the researcher.

Frame-based context:
An introduction happens in a classroom where the classroom teacher asking students the reason they choose the course they take.

1	Teacher	: Yes, Mr. Gunawan?
2	Student1	: My teacher said…eee… I can improve in TKC.
3	Teacher	: Thank you….and now where do you stay? where do you stay?
4	Student1	: In Maja.
5	Teacher	: So, how long have you stay in Pare?
6	Student1	: 3 month.
7	Teacher	: And then…. how long have you been here?
8	Student1	: Until December
9	Teacher	: Oh.. No, I mean… how long have you been here?!
10	Student1	: Ehh….. 3 month.
11	Teacher	: Oh....you have been here 3 month, so your planning to
12		December. Your planning to stay in Pare to December.
13	Student	: Yes.
14	Teacher	: What programs did you take before?
15	Student	: TOEFL.
16	Teacher	: Wow, that's good. Thank you, Next-- Mr. Baktiar!
17		Number one or number two?
18	Student2	: Number one
19	Teacher	: Please…
20	Student	: I take TKC because..eeee..my tutor…eeeh.. Mr. Taka said
21		to me TKC….aaa…is good for you, so I take TKC.
22		Eeee…because my English…eeee…. is not well, that's all…
23	Teacher	: Yes….
24	Student	: Okay…..
25	Teacher	: Thank you, Mr. Baktiar. So, Mr. Baktiar, how long do you
26		want to stay in Pare, I mean.. your planning.
27	Student	: I don't know, until I can more speak well
28	Teacher	: I appreciate that, Mr. Baktiar.

One thing very noticeable is the use of addressing term in the conversation. Addressing *Mister* and *Madam* abbreviated into *Ma'm* are often used to call other person before their name. When students call their teacher, it is unwritten norms to honour teacher by addressing *Mister* before name, which actually translating from *Pak* in *Bahasa*. In RK, addressing *Mister* to male students is also often taken place. This addressing term seems to honour the students, too. It can be found from line 1 of utterance such as in 'Yes, Mr. Gunawan' and in line 16 '…Next-- Mr. Baktiar!' also in line 25 'Thank you, Mr. Baktiar, …'

The use linguistic marker of gratitude is also noticeable when the teacher appreciating to any answer and good conduct done by the students. For the hearer, it tends to maintain face to keep the communication delivered smoothly because saying thank you is a compliment given to the hearer to minimize the threat of the hearer's positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). '*Wow, that's good. Thank you*' (line 16) and in '*Thank you*, Mr. Baktiar' (line 25), and '*I appreciate that, Mr. Baktiar*' (line 26) are utterances given by the teacher to the students.

In addition to the previous linguistic markers found in RK's interaction, it is common to find grammatical errors in conversations among course participants in Pare. One force the use of English as a means of communication in Pare is to hasten fluent speaking rather than the grammatical tidiness. This can be investigated from the urging suggestion of the tutors in classroom. '*I don't know, until I can more speak well*' (line 27). Grammatical error in speaking practice is rarely noticed by the interlocutors. It does not affect the quality of the communication. In some situation, correcting the error is not appropriate. It would not be a little insulting to point out otherwise negligible written/spoken errors. Like any of non-native speaker who has not learned from a very young age, non-native speakers will sometimes say or write things that sound unpleasant in English grammar. This unpleasant sound refers to incorrect grammar.

From relational work's point of view, those linguistic markers of addressing terms, expressing gratitude, and responding to incorrect grammar are classified into appropriate or polite conduct. Specific attention is given to responding incorrect grammar given by the teacher which uttered by the students is a way to minimize the imposition to the students by not mentioning the mistake directly to the students who have uttered it.

2. Study Politeness, Study Pragmatics

Politeness is all about how to say or behave in appropriate way by no threatening of people's face who are exchanging talk in interactions with the aim that the communication is ongoing smoothly. Politeness is as a branch of science that falls within the scope of pragmatics. While pragmatics is seen as a study of the meanings conveyed by speakers and interpreted by listeners. Therefore, this study is more related to the analysis of what people mean by their utterances rather than by separate

meanings of words or phrases used in the speech itself. Having pragmatic ability means being able to go beyond the literal meaning of what is said, in order to interpret the intended meaning that are being said. Having pragmatic ability, a person will be able to communicate because he/she is able to understand and convey words that can avoid conflict and maintain face. Thus, studying politeness means learning pragmatics.

Learning pragmatic for language learners is significant because the focus of pragmatics in the real world involves the use of language in social and cultural contexts. Language learners always have a lot to learn if they choose to avoid cross-cultural misunderstandings. Learners need to be aware of social norms when speech acts tend to be done, cultural reasons why they talk like that, and knowledge of the consequences of speech in a certain culture. In other words, students can take advantage of knowing something about behavioral norms to realize a given speech acts in a given context, they must consider several factors such as: (1) the culture involved, (2) demographic background of the participants such as age and gender, (3) social status and role of listeners, (4) social class and their work (Ishihara and Cohen, 2010: 14). In communication using foreign languages such as English, learners need to have knowledge and understanding in communicating with speakers who use English by knowing who to talk to, the situation and the purpose of the conversation. In addition, it is also important for learners to apply giving feedback in two-way communication to show that we are involved intensely in conversation. Both parties conversing with turn-taking, both of them talk each other other by complying with the acceptable social norms to continue the conversation thoroughly. If one party incorrectly chooses a sentence or uses an inappropriate language, pragmatic failure will occur as expressed by Ishihara and Cohen (*ibid*, p. 15). Therefore, EFL learners must be pragmatic knowledgeable so that they can use their English language skills appropriately to communicate well and smoothly in a given context.

In teaching pragmatics, Ishihara and Cohen (2010: 23-25) offer specific areas dealing with learning pragmatic knowledge. The areas of pragmatic knowledge cover: (1) subject-matter knowledge, (2) pedagogical-content knowledge, (3) knowledge of learners and local, curricular and educational contexts. In subject-matter knowledge, this will include the knowledge of pragmatic norms which may vary depending on gender of the speakers, ethnic background, regional and various contextual factor

which cover knowledge of pragmatic variation, and knowledge of pragmatic norms in target language. In pedagogical-content knowledge, it covers knowledge of how to teach L2 pragmatics and knowledge of how to assess L2 pragmatic ability. In knowledge of learners and local, curricular and educational contexts, it covers knowledge of learner's identities, cultures and other characteristics, knowledge of pragmatic-focused curriculum, and knowledge of the role of pragmatics in educational contexts.

CONCLUSION

The existence of politeness in the communication traffic between members in a community of practice, determines the identity of the use of language in the community. Along with what has been found in *Kampung Inggris* Pare, politeness also has occurred in the interaction between EFL learners in the community of practice. The occurrence of politeness is marked by the existence of linguistic markers spoken by non-native English di Pare speakers in conversations that occur, especially in classrooms in selected courses based on the ranking of fame of those courses. Based on analysis, it can be recognized linguistic markers include codeswitching, indirectness, directness, addressing terms, hyperbole, raising intonation, and expressing gratitude are revealed in the participants' utterances. The use of linguistic markers in conversations is thought to be the occurrence of politeness in interaction by a language society. Although some incorrect grammar is also found in the interactions particularly uttered by the students, but it does not influence the occurrence of politeness in that community of practice. By studying politeness using relational work approach, those linguistic markers uttered by EFL speakers in Pare can be categorized into appropriate and inappropriate depending on the situation at which the conversations have taken place. From the conversations that have been recorded so far, the evaluation is in the range of appropriate or polite. Since politeness cannot be separated from pragmatics, therefore teaching politeness in classroom should be integrated with pragmatics. For further research, it should be considered that the category of impoliteness has not yet revealed from all situations under study. Thus, to represent a wider coverage in relational work of politeness which cover impolite (negatively marked), non-politic (unmarked), polite (positively marked), and over

polite (negatively marked) then the future study should be conducted to all element existed in *Kampung Inggris* Pare which include conversations from these environment: classrooms, camps, cafes, food-stalls, etc.

REFERENCES

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness, Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Hymes, Dell (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In Gladwin, Thomas; Sturtevant, William C. *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, D.C.: Anthropology Society of Washington.

Hymes, Dell. (1976). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Locher, M. A., (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreement in Oral Communication. Language, Power, and Social Process*. Berlin and New York. Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. xvi 365.pb

Locher, M.A. (2006). Politeness behavior within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua* 25 (2006) 249-267. DOI 10.1515/MULTI.2006.015

Locher, M. A. (2008). Relational work, politeness and identity construction. In Gerd Antos, Eija Ventola & Tilo Weber (Eds.), *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics. Volume 2: Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 509-540). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110211399.4.509

Locher, M. A., and Watts, R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational works. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour and Culture*. Volume 1, Issue Page 9-33, ISSN (Online) 1613-4877, ISSN (Print) 1612-5681, January 2005 http://www.reference-global.com/doi/pdf/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9

Locher, M. A., and Watts, R. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behavior. In Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher (Eds.) *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 77-99. DOI: 10.1515/9783110211399.4.509

Mills, S. (2004). Class, gender and politeness. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. Volume 23, Issue 1-2, Page 171-190, ISSN (Online) 1613-3684, ISSN (Print) 0167-8507, 30-03-2004 http://www.reference-global.com/doi/pdf/10.1515/mult.2004.004 (accessed on 12/3/2014)

Mills, S. (2011). Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. *Linguistics Politeness Research Group* (Eds.) Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter

Mujiono (2016). Codeswitching in English Instruction and Factors Affecting the Language of Attitude of Indonesian EFL Learners in Using It. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies.* ISSN 2409-1294 (Print) June 2016, Vol. 2., No. 4.

Nurjati, N. (2018). Linguistic Aspects Revealing Politeness in EFL Community of Practice. *Proceeding of the 2ⁿᵈ Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education Conference (SosHec 2018)*, published by Atlantis Press. https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/soshec-18/25903353

Pramujiono, A., Nurhadi, T., and Nurjati, N. (2015). *Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Interaksi Instruksional di Sekolah*. Surabaya: Adi Buana University Press

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005) (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1.1: 95-119

Watts, R. J. (2005). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behavior: Reconsidering claims for universality. *Politeness in Language* (Eds.: Watts, R.J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2005., pp. 45

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Correcting grammar in public is rude (Andy, https://andilit.com/2013/02/14/correcting-someones-grammar-in-public-is-rude/)

http://www.visitpare.com/kampunginggris/sejarah-kampung-inggris-diawali-oleh-kalend-osen-pendiri-bec/(Accessed on 20-10-2014)