Interlocutors' Responses to The Realization of Positive Politeness Strategies in Classroom Discussion Through Online Media

Dian Aprianti✉, Januarius Mujiyanto, Issy Yuliasri

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	The education sector is one affected by the pandemic. The teachers and students are encouraged to conduct teaching and learning through online media. It is assumed that online learning involves the Politeness of students' utterances. Moreover, online learning brings out the characteristics of the realization of positive politeness strategies during the discussion. This study used Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory to investigate the realization of positive politeness strategies in the classroom discussion through online media by Pascasarjana Students at Universitas Negeri Semarang and the relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses. In addition, it used Levinson's (1983) theory to investigate the interlocutors' responses to politeness strategies. This research uses qualitative research with the data from the utterances during classroom discussion during a semester by Pascasarjana students in the 2019/2020 academic year. Transcription of speech data follows Sacks' transcription symbols (1998). The findings reveal the realization of fifteen positive politeness strategies. They also show the relation between the positive politeness strategies taken and the interlocutors' responses, categorized into preferred and dispreferred reactions. In contribution to the education sector, this study provides benefits for increasing students' understanding regarding the use of positive Politeness and interlocutors' responses, especially in Pragmatics. Moreover, the students are expected to create valuable communication. In addition, the study also benefits the student's comprehension of the factors that influence the relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses.

✉Correspondence Address (author1):
Kampus PascasarjanaUnnes, Jl. Kelud III Semarang 50237
E-mail: apriantid610@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Considering that during the pandemic, which forces teachers and students to do virtual learning, this study aims to identify politeness strategies realized in class discussions through online media. Investigating interlocutors' responses to the politeness strategies also determined the relationship between interlocutors' responses to the positive politeness strategies. There is a phenomenon that is not used to being done in virtual learning. Therefore, there is a need to investigate this research to investigate the characteristics of the realization of positive politeness strategies, the interlocutors' responses to the politeness strategies and their relationship, which may differ from face-to-face learning in the classroom.

Politeness means not imposing, giving options, and making someone feel good (Lakoff, 1973). Politeness relates to a face that is emotionally embedded in someone's self-image or someone's face that can be improved, removed, maintained, or even always had to be considered when interacting (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In interacting, someone works together to keep their face to each other, but it depends on the speaker who can keep the hearer's face.

Furthermore, positive politeness is done because the speaker has a close social distance relationship, likes the hearer, and wants to do what the speaker is asked (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In this occurrence, the hearer's face does not feel threatened because of the closeness or because they already know each other, so the potential threat to the hearer's self-image is not upset.

Moreover, communicating and interacting cannot be separated from the response from the interlocutor. Similarly, in classroom discussions, the response from the interlocutor can be in the form of acceptance and rejection. In addition, interlocutors' responses can be varied. The response spoken by the other person can be preferred or dispreferred. Dispreferred responses are commonly marked in complex and lengthy forms. Meanwhile, preferred responses are more straightforward (Levinson, 1983).

Interaction is a form of communication that teachers and students can do. The interaction can create an atmosphere that influences the choice of politeness strategy. Some researchers found positive, negative, and redressive action in bald on-record politeness strategies and other findings of bald off-record strategies in classroom interaction (Fitriyani & Andriyanti, 2020; Rahayuningsih et al., 2019; Wangia & Otonde, 2020; Yan, 2016; Sülü, 2015; Ramos-González & Rico-Martín, 2015; Sukarno, 2015). Yan (2016) reported disagreement politeness strategies among students from different cultures and countries. Asian students use different politeness strategies because of social distance and power. Rahayuningsih et al. (2019) analyzed politeness strategies with social factors. It deals with the dominance of politeness strategies which reveals the closeness and solidarity between the teacher and the students due to power, the degree of imposition, and distance.

Moreover, Wangia and Otonde (2020) found politeness strategies applied in senior high school. It indicates that politeness strategies are the main section of language use. For making a particular context, politeness strategy should be learned. Besides that, politeness strategies can be sensitive based on the culture you talked about. Therefore, the fact in teaching a speaker a hearer should be accurate.

Other researchers also showed positive and negative politeness strategies or both in classroom interaction (Tan et al., 2016; Aziz, 2017; Mahmud, 2019; Tan, 2012; Adel et al., 2016; Eshghinejad, 2016; Song; 2014). Tan et al. (2016) investigated politeness strategies in students' interviews for applying for a job in a bank company. It reveals a positive politeness strategy in the interview. Meanwhile, the negative strategy is found in requesting or repeating clarification. Adel et al. (2016) revealed that close relationships, feedback, and friendship showed positive strategies. Aziz (2017) examined politeness strategies focusing on an agreement. It indicates agreement strategies that showed the hearer's positive face, for instance, agreeing with the speakers' responses, repeating and completing the talk and giving a positive reaction. Moreover,

gender and culture also influenced choosing the agreement strategy.

In addition, Alakrash and Bustan (2020) conducted research examining politeness strategies. It deals with the use of request strategy by two different background cultures of the students. The interview of the students in the university is used to collect the data. Furthermore, it indicates that the student's requests from Malay used an indirect strategy while Arabian students used the form request strategy explicitly.

Zainurrahman and Kofau (2020) discussed politeness on social media, mainly on YouTube videos. It reveals positive politeness strategies where it is the norm in virtual communication for people who know each other or strangers. Meanwhile, negative politeness strategies are used to save face. They conduct negative politeness strategies to communicate formal communication. In addition, Pratama (2019) also indicated that politeness is vital in reducing conflict in using social media and communicating in the cyber world. Social behaviour is at least affected by the world of social media or the cyber world. Therefore, politeness will be used in communicating even with online media.

Positive politeness strategies are a significant part of communication. Some researchers conducted a study related to the topic. Prayitno et al. (2018) indicated that teachers and students respect each other, have empathy, have sound wisdom, and prioritize tasks. In addition, Pramujiono et al. (2020) found that positive politeness strategies can strengthen the close relationship between lecturers and students. They also showed that recounting that was used revealed the function and the realization of positive politeness strategies to instil character values that can be taken from their experiences that they told to other students and supported students to be disciplined and develop their creativity. Desta et al. (2019) indicated positive politeness strategies. Five strategies dominated the most in Anak Sasada's movie: noticing the hearer, using group identity markers, giving or asking for a reason, asserting or presupposing the

speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's wants, and Giving Gifts to Hearer.

To fill the gap, this research focused on studying the interlocutors' responses to the positive politeness strategies in classroom discussion through online media. Graduate students of Universitas Negeri Semarang were involved as the research subjects. In achieving the extensive analysis, the study investigates three questions: (1) How is the realization of positive politeness strategies in classroom discussion through online media by Pascasarjana Students at Universitas Negeri Semarang ?; (2) How do interlocutors respond to the realization of politeness strategies ?; and (3) How is the relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses in classroom discussion through Online Media by Pascasarjana Students at Universitas Negeri Semarang?

METHODS

In this study, a qualitative approach was applied to expose the realization of positive politeness strategies in classroom discussion through online media. The study subjects were Pascasarjana Students of English Language Education in the second semester of the 2019/2020 academic year at Semarang State University. The data were in the form of utterances taken from the classroom discussions through online media. Observing the video and transcribing the utterances were conducted in collecting the data. In addition, the data in a video had been transcribed into a dialogue list. While as the data analyzer, the writer analyzed and observed every utterance. The utterances were observed to determine the realization of positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses.

Transcription of data used Sack's transcription symbol (1998). The utterances were identified and classified into positive politeness strategies based on Brown and Levinson (1987). Levinson's theory (1983) was also applied to classify the interlocutors' responses. In order to maintain trustworthiness in the research, the

researcher applied triangulation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Triangulation was used to indicate validity accurately (Cohen et al., 2018). In making the valid data, the researchers used investigator triangulation. The investigator's triangulation results were interpreted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the findings and discusses the types of positive politeness strategies and the interlocutors' responses. In addition, it discusses the relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses in classroom discussion through Online Media.

The Realization of Positive Politeness Strategies
Noticing and Attending to the Hearer
This strategy shows that the speaker pays attention and is close to the hearer. The speaker must pay attention to the conditioning aspect so that would seem like the hearer wants to agree. An example is given below:

ST6: **Hi presenters,** *[thank you for your nice presentation.*
ST1:   *[* **Hi ST6.**
ST6:°*Mm*°*I have a question regarding derivation.*

The utterances revealed a positive politeness strategy in the form of a notice strategy and attended to the hearer. It can be seen in the utterances, **'Hi presenters.'** It showed that ST6 saluted ST1 before she was permitted ST6 to ask the question based on the presentation. Notice used by ST6 is in the form of an informal solution. The utterances showed that both ST6 and ST1 were close. ST6 noticed the presenter before asking. ST1 also responded by showing notice and paying attention to ST6 by uttering, 'Hi ST6,' which ST1 showed informal solutions before ST6 asked questions related to the topic that the presenters had conveyed.

Likewise, Rahayuningsih et al. (2019) found that notice and attend to the hearer. The students conducted the positive politeness strategies to maintain solidarity and relationship between the speaker and the hearer, it also made the interaction in the class comfortable, and the students were not felt embarrassed if they made a

mistake. The obtained findings are also in line with Desta et al. (2019) and Tan et al. (2016) in their finding that the strategy of noticing the hearer showed the speaker pays attention to the condition of the hearer.

Exaggerating
This strategy indicated the exaggeration accompanied by the intonation, stress, and other aspects, as well as with intensifying modifier.

*ST2: We did **very great** discussion for today.*

The data above showed the exaggeration, as the presenters who led the discussion were happy and enjoyed the discussion. The discussion ran well, and after they presented the topic, the students gave comments and questions during the discussion. Thus, the presenters tried to show appreciation to the audience who joined the discussion. Besides, ST2 wanted to show her appreciation to all the students who participated in the discussion.

The finding similar to Fitriyani and Andriyanti (2020) found some positive politeness strategies for the students and the teacher in the classroom, such as exaggerating, avoiding disagreement, giving/asking for the reason, presupposing common ground, and including both the speaker and the hearer. They applied the strategy to maintain the hearer's positive face.

Intensifying Interest to the Hearer
In this strategy, speakers and hearers can contribute to each other and increase the interest in the conversation, in this case triggering interest in the interlocutor so that the interlocutor is more involved in the interaction or conversation. As we can see the result below:

*ST2: For example, like **you know?** you try to focus on the Grice maxim mm focus and focus°um° what is it ya pay attention to the quality quantity like that.*
ST5: Oh we can see such as to the maxim. Okay, okay.

The discussion showed that ST2 tried to explain ST5 by mentioning the example. ST2 also tried to involve ST5 as a participant in the discussion. ST2 wanted to get closer to the hearer of ST5 interest ST2 had explained in the discussion, and ST5 could join the discussion among them. The situation from the discussion

revealed that the speaker is close to the hearer. They have a close distance. ST2 had higher power than ST5 in the discussion because she was a presenter. Even ST2 also invited the listener to be involved during the explanation and continued with the topic being discussed. For the rank of imposition, she wants to impose ST5's positive face. In addition, ST5 showed that she agreed to ST2's answer. The hearer indicated her interest by giving comments back on what had been explained by the speaker.

The findings are also in line with Fitriyani & Andriyanti (2020). They found the strategy of intensifying the hearer by showing the expression to the hearer. Therefore, they could contribute to the conversation.

Using In-Group Identity Markers

This strategy shows group membership. In other words, the speakers have similarities with the listeners. The speaker showed that they were in the same group membership. Thus, showing closeness to each other and addressing terms indicated terms used for specific groups with the same goal can also function as a form of honour. The following was the result of the strategy:

*ST2: If no, give us time, then we will prepare the answer for you **guys.***

The data showed the use of group identity markers. After ST2 collected the participants' questions, she asked the hearers to let them time a while to discuss the answers. Also, she mentioned *'guys'*, which indicated a positive politeness strategy. It showed that she wanted to claim common ground and was in the same purpose with them. It revealed that ST2 got closer to the hearers. However, ST2 had higher power with her position as a presenter who led the presentation and discussion. Then, she did not pressure and force her power on other participants who joined the discussion. ST2 tried to get closer to all the hearers. In addition, she wanted to impose the hearer's cheerful face. She wanted the hearers to allow ST2 and her partner to give time to discuss the answers. Therefore, applying generic terms and address forms created closeness and did not seem rigid among the presenters and the listeners in the conversation.

Similarly, Wangia and Otonde (2020) showed positive politeness strategies in classroom interaction by showing identity markers. The strategy was used in a particular context, and they mentioned that teaching in the politeness form should be sensitive to the culture.

Seeking Agreement

This strategy claims equality by finding ways to agree with the hearer. The speaker presses his/her agreement with the hearer to satisfy the hearer to agree or to confirm his/her opinion.

*ST4: And then, WE as children of God, it means that human, **right?***

The conversation indicated the strategy by using the safe topic technique. After the presenters had been presented, they opened to a question and comment session. ST4 commented on the second presentation because ST4 was interested in the topic. ST1 allowed ST4 to convey her comment. Then, ST4 gave her comment and also her knowledge about the topic. ST4 explained her insight and opinion because she felt that ST1 had missed explaining the subsection of the topic. Besides that, ST4 tried to persuade and pressure an agreement on what she said about her opinion to ST1.

The strategy was applied because ST4 wanted to claim by find a way to get ST1 to agree with ST4. It can be seen that ST4 suppresses her agreement with ST1. It can be proved by uttering, *'right'*. It indicated that it was seeking agreement by using the safe topic technique. ST4 wanted to press ST1 to agree with what he said. And then, ST4 gave her opinion and an example that emphasized that what she was explaining agreed with ST1. Thus, the use of the utterance confirms that ST1 agrees with ST1's opinion, even though ST1 did not answer and did not respond directly after ST4 made a 'safe topic' when ST4 gave her opinion. Because of that, he expected the presenter's approval of her opinion. The agreement strategies were also found, such as agreeing, repeating, and completing the talk (Aziz, 2017).

Avoiding Disagreement

Findings of this study reveals the strategy of avoiding disagreement by using the technique of token agreement. The strategy showed the speaker agree or pretend to agree with the hearer. The speaker tried to pretend her/his disagreement by showing her/his agreement in the beginning and then indirectly conveying her/his disagreement.

ST2: =YES, but GRAMMAR is still important ST7, okay=

The data showed the strategy of avoiding disagreement using the token agreement technique. In the discussion session, ST2 had prepared to answer ST7's question. ST2 tried to give her opinion as a presenter to the question that ST7 raised. The discussion interactively did well. ST7 also gave her feedback on ST2's point of view. Because of ST7's curiosity about ST2's explanation and opinion, ST7 continued to ask a second question which grew from the previous question. Then, ST2 responded about her token agreement, where in the beginning, she showed her agreement and followed that she did not agree to ST7. ST2 applied the strategy because she wanted or seemed to agree with ST7.

The strategy of avoiding disagreement was also found in Yan (2016). His finding indicated disagreeing with the hearer, which had a lower level. In line with Eshghinejad (2016), the strategy of avoidance of disagreement indicated that the speaker applied the conclusive marker to draw a mutual conclusion with the hearer.

Presupposing/Raising/Asserting Common Ground

This study found the use of the technique of gossip, small talk, point of view operations, and presupposition manipulations. The following was the result of the strategy:

*ST3: **Oh, I see,** ˚or˚ we can change it with oviparity, viviparity and ovoviviparity.*

The data was taken after the presenters had presented their presentations. Previously, the lecturer praised the presenters because they did the presentation well. Then, the presenters conveyed to the participants that they had many discussion sessions through an opening question and answer session. However, the lecturer

confirmed to the presenters before they opened the next session by giving suggestions to the presenters related to the topic that the presenters had conveyed. The lecturer suggested that the presenters change the example that the presenters gave in the presentation. ST3 applied the strategy to express her understanding of the lecturer's explanation.

This finding is in line with Tan et al. (2016) revealing a positive politeness strategy, including noticing and attending to the hearer and raising or asserting common ground.

Joking

This strategy reveals a joke based on the background similarities between the speaker and the hearer. As we can see the result below:

ST2: So it's a habit in Indonesia, the answer is yes I do, yes I do. Isn't that right? ((laugh))
ST7: It's like congratulation for your graduation. ((laugh))

The data found the strategy of making a joke. In the discussion session, when ST2 answered ST7's question. Then, ST9 asked to comment on the presenters. Certainly, ST2 gave ST9 opportunities to convey her comment. After that, ST9 conveyed her opinion on the topic that ST7 asked. The discussion ran interactively among them. They seemed to be close to each other. It can be seen by making jokes among them. That indicated that they were close to each other. ST2 made a joke, and ST7 did the same as did by ST2 to make a joke.

Similar to Rahayuningsih et al. (2019), Eshghinejad (2016) and Zainurrahman and Kofau (2020), in their findings, the strategy joke is carried out because the speaker and the hearer have the same background.

Asserting or Presupposing the Speaker's Knowledge of and Corncerning for Hearer's Wants

In this strategy, the speaker and the hearer involve cooperatively in an activity. The speaker and the hearer share their purpose so that it can work to fix a cheerful face, as shown in the data found below.

*ST2: Relating to your question, **I know** that, TALL and SHORT is gradable antonymy which means ˚um˚*

that it does not have absolute meanings that can be conveniently summarized by meaning postulate.

The data had been taken in discussion sessions, mainly answering the question and commenting on the participant. After ST1 answered the question for the participant, then she allowed ST2 took a turn to answer ST4's question. Before ST2 answered the question, she thanked ST4 for giving her an exciting question. Then, ST2 answered the question. Afterwards, ST2 applied the strategy to show her knowledge and concern for ST4's wants. In addition, ST2 involved cooperatively with the participant. Therefore, ST2 cooperatively answered and commented on ST4's question, and ST2 wanted to impose ST4 into a positive face.

The finding also aligned with Desta et al. (2019) found the strategy of asserting or presupposing the speaker's knowledge. This strategy can be shown by asserting the speaker's knowledge and concern for the hearer's wants.

Offering or Promising

Offer and promise are also found as politeness strategies in this study. This strategy is conducted as self-reflection among the speaker and the hearer, as the speaker wants for himself.

ST2: If no, give us time, then we will prepare the answer for you guys.

Based on the data showed that ST2 applied the strategy because she wanted to show the hearers that her group would prepare and give the best answer. It can be seen that ST2 knew that the hearers wanted to get the answer based on the curiosity of the participants asked the presenters and did not want to let them down. ST2 wanted to ensure that she and her partner would give the best answer. Therefore, St2 wanted them to agree.

In line, Wangia and Otonde (2020) revealed the strategy of offers/promises. They showed the strategy in a specific situation and mentioned that the politeness strategy should be conducted in the teaching and should be aware of the culture's background.

Being Optimistic

The strategy of being optimistic indicated that the speaker assumed that the hearer wanted the speaker wants to assist and acquire it for the speaker and the hearer.

ST2: And I will continue to answer or maybe mba ST4 have you: prepare yourself?
ST4: =Yes, ST2.

The data revealed that ST2 appreciated ST9 because she gave an additional comment about the topic, and ST2 conveyed that she would continue. However, in the middle of her utterances, then she asked ST4 whether she wanted to answer the following question or not. It can be seen that ST2 tried to cooperate with ST4. ST2 assumed that ST4 would cooperate in answering the next question. By using this strategy, ST2 did not ask directly to ST4. ST2 did not want to threaten ST4's face, so ST2 secretly uttered so that ST4 would cooperate with ST2.

The obtained findings, in line with Eshghinejad's (2016) result, revealed the strategy of being optimistic. His finding indicated the hearer wants the speaker' wants for the hearer and trying to obtain him/her.

Including both Speaker and Hearer in the Activity

This strategy has a characteristic that is the use of the inclusive *'we'*. The strategy is used to show that the speaker cooperatively takes action to overcome the threat face of the hearer.

L: Let's give the presenter biggest applause.

The data indicated that the lecturer applied the strategy because he wanted to soften the request to all participants who presented in the discussion. The lecturer asked the hearer to give applause to the presenters who had presented and responded to the questions comprehensively. The lecturer wanted all the participants to have the same idea as him to appreciate the presenters.

Similarly, Sulu (2015) and Fitriyani and Andriyanti (2020) found the strategy of including both the speaker and the hearer in the activity, which invites speakers and listeners to do activities together.

Giving or Asking for a Reason

This strategy indicates that the speaker wanted the hearer to give the reason and persuaded the hearer into the speaker's thought. Thus, it assumed that the hearer also wanted the speaker's desire.

ST7: Based on your explanation ˚mm˚ I got that command question and request is (.1) are classified of illocution act, is it right? and please give, ˚um˚ what please give um˚ the explanation more (.1) and the reason why command question and request (.) classifying into ˚um˚ Illocution acts?

The data showed ST7 wanted to confirm with the presenters about the topic. It began with the topic that the presenters had presented. ST7 confirmed clarity about the material and wanted the presenters to give more explanation. Besides that, ST7 had curiosity and asked to get the reason from the presenters. ST7 applied the strategy to include the presenters in the conversation discussion. ST7 explained what he wanted the presenters to give her the reason. In addition, ST7 applied the strategy to test and saw whether the presenters were cooperative. Therefore, in that context, ST7 requests and wants the presenters to give comments and reasons.

Similarly, Mahmud (2019) indicated the strategy of giving or asking for a reason. His finding showed that the speaker applied the strategy by repeating the explanation to strengthen and repeat the previous explanation.

Assuming or Asserting Reciprocity

The strategy can be deemed to be threatening the face each other. The strategy indicated that the speaker would do something if the hearer did something for the speaker.

ST2: If (.) if there is something error with my slide. Please, ask me, please talk to me.
ALL: =Okay [Yes [Ya
ST1: We will talk if there is something [with your presentation.

ST1 conducted the strategy between the presenters and the participants. ST1 would tell if ST2 found an error in the presentation. The action would be threatened the face. Therefore, ST1 tried to confirm reciprocity with her. It was clear that both the speaker and the hearer did reciprocity and indicated that they were cooperative.

It is the same with Yuniarti et al. (2020) found the strategy of assuming or asserting reciprocity. The finding showed positive politeness strategy occurred because of the suitability of the culture and the speech partner itself.

Giving Gifts to Hearer

The strategy involved the speaker deciding to repair the hearer's face and fulfil the hearer's desires.

ST7: I think it's almost (.) almost the same with the Yes I do as you, right?
ST2: Yes, okay. Thank you Bu ST9 very good additional.

The strategy indicated that ST2 wanted to involve ST9 and the other to fulfil ST9's desires to be liked and understood. ST2 wanted to repair ST9's face and realize this using the strategy. ST2 knew what ST9 wanted and wanted her to be satisfied after she gave all the participants her insight into the topic. Therefore, what ST9 had explained and given her point of view to all the participants and the presenters made the presenter want to satisfy ST9 and made her into cheerful face and fulfil ST9 desires on a certain level.

In line with Zainurrahman and Kofau (2020), the strategy of giving a gift to the hearer expressed appreciation and informal situation. This strategy was carried out because both the speaker and the listener accept each other and have a close relationship.

The Interlocutors' Responses to the Realization of Politeness Strategies
Preferred Responses

The preferred response was used to show the response directly to the speaker. The characteristic of preferred response without markers tended to be shorter.

ST2: = Okay (.2) can you hear my voice clearly?=
ALL: = YES

The analysis indicated that the interlocutor had applied the preferred response to ST2. The choice of responses showed that the interlocutors wanted to express their responses and agree with her. Then, they also responded to ST2 by listening to ST2, who asked about her voice. The

interlocutors showed that there was no problem with ST2's voice. In applying the preferred responses to the presenters, the interlocutors used preferred responses directly, and they did not hesitate with the response delivered. The interlocutors also made sure that they heard her voice.

It is in line with Levinson (1983) indicated preferred is unmarked because it occurs on a more straightforward turn. It is different from dispreferred, in preferred responses are more direct. Thus, preferred responses from interlocutors are expected in interaction or discussion.

Dispreferred Responses

This dispreferred response showed rejected or different points of view or disagreement with the speaker.

ST9: Basically, your explanation is a very clear to me, but I mean is it hard for me to elaborate about the concept and then when I try to analyze the figurative language aa: (.1) in song.

The responses from ST9 indicated that she used the dispreferred responses. By applying dispreferred responses, ST9 revealed that she wanted other reasons and explanations about the concept in the context. Thus, ST9 asked ST4 to give her an explanation because ST9 still was confused. From the utterances expressed in the preferred responses, it can be seen that ST9 used the marker of appreciation and qualifier. In the beginning, ST9 gave her appreciation by uttering that ST4's explanation was obvious. However, showing qualifier with the use of 'but' showed that ST9 still could not catch ST4's explanation with her thought about the concept she meant.

Similarly, Levinson (1983) categorized dispreferred responses, commonly marked in complex and lengthy forms. The selection of dispreferred responses is intended to show answers or responses not simply because of structural complexity.

The Relationship between Positive Politeness Strategies and Interlocutors' Responses

Findings of this study in classroom discussion through online media indicated that the speaker and the hearer applied closeness and

harmony. They applied the positive politeness strategies, which are significant to maintaining a positive relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses. This can be seen from the frequent use of positive politeness strategies that showed closeness, harmony and solidarity among students and lecturers and the highly preferred responses.

The online class discussion under this study also showed speakers' acceptance of interlocutors' responses. Even in the case of dispreferred responses, the smoothness of the discussion was not disrupted due to solidarity and closeness among them.

Similarly, Mahmud (2019) mentioned that politeness was conducted while interacting in the class. Besides the third factor, the study also found the aspects of religion, culture, and the interlocutors which influence the use of politeness strategy. It also, in line with Song (2014), showed that the aspect of different cultures impacted the use of politeness strategy. In addition, the culture was the central aspect in applying the politeness strategy in classroom interaction (Wangia & Otonde, 2020).

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study indicate that all the positive politeness strategies are found in the data. This also reveals that the speaker and the hearer predominantly used the strategy of giving/asking for reasons followed by the strategy of agreement. This happened because, in the discussion session, the speakers and the hearers showed their curiosity and interest in asking and giving reasons to each other and showed agreement during the discussion.

In addition, the interlocutors' responses also express the preferred and dispreferred responses to the politeness strategies. The findings found that preferred responses were more dominant. This occurs because they want to show that they have the same opinion and agree with the speakers.

The relationship between positive politeness strategies and interlocutors' responses reveals that both the speakers and the hearers

have close social distance, which influences the use of positive politeness strategy. The speakers and the interlocutors indicate that they have less power than the lecturer.

REFERENCES

Adel, S. M. R., Davoudi, M., & Ramezanzadeh, A. (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 47–62.

Alakrash, H. M., & Bustan, E. S. (2020). Politeness strategies employed by Arab EFL and Malaysian ESL students in making a request. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,10*(6).

Aziz, A. A. (2017). Agreement strategies among Malaysian Chinese speakers of English. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 23*(1), 1–22.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, L., And, L. M., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012) *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4thed)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (5thed.)*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Desta, D. M., Dirgeyasa, I. W., & Sinaga, L. S. M. (2019). Positive politeness strategies reflected in anak Sasada movie. *Lingüística, 8*(2), 87–99.

Eshghinejad, S. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging: Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher–Student. *SAGE Open, 6*(1).

Fitriyani, S., & Andriyanti, E. (2020). Teacher and students' politeness strategies in EFL classroom interactions. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics), 4*(2),259.

Lakoff, R. T. (1973). *The logic of politeness, or minding your P's and Q's*. 2, 292–305. Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 292–305

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*(3), 597–606.

Pramujiono, A., Suhari, Indrayanti, T., & Rochmawati, D. (2020). Recounting as a realization of Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies in instructional interactions. *397(Icliqe 2019)*, 1095–1103.

Pratama, H. (2019). *Linguistic politeness in online communication* (Issue November).

Prayitno, H. J., Ngalim, A., Sutopo, A., Rohmadi, M., & Yuniawan, T. (2018). Power, orientation, and strategy of positive politeness used by children at the age of elementary school with Javanese cultural background. *Humanus, 17*(2), 164.

Rahayuningsih, D., Saleh, M., & Fitriati, S. W. (2019). The realization of politeness strategies in EFL teacher-students classroom interaction. *English Education Journal, 10*(1), 85–93.

Ramos-González, N. M., & Rico-Martín, A. M. (2015). The teaching of politeness in the Spanish-as-a-foreign-language (SFL) classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 178(November 2014), 1–5.

Sacks, H. (1998). *Social science and conversation analysis*. Oxford University Press, Inc.

Song, S. (2014). Politeness in Korea and America: A comparative analysis of request strategy in english communication. *Korea Journal, 54*(1),60–84.

Sukarno (2015). Politeness strategies in responding to compliments in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91–101.

Sulu, A. (2015). Teacher's politeness in EFL class. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET),2*(4),216–221.

Tan, K. H. (2012). The effectiveness of teaching formulaic politeness strategies in making request to undergraduates in an ESL classroom. *Asian Social Science, 8*(15),189–196.

Tan, K. H., Teoh, M. L., & Tan, S. K. (2016). Beyond "greeting" and "thanking": Politeness in job interviews. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 22*(3), 1–14.

Wangia, J. I., & Otonde, L. A. (2020). Politeness in teacher-student interactions in a Kenyan secondary school context and implications for pedagogy in communication skills. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 10*(02),104–124.

Yan, C. (2016). A contrastive pragmatic study of politeness strategies in disagreement between native speakers of English and Chinese EFL learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 39*(2), 231–245.

Yuniarti, E., Natsir, M., & Setyowati, R. (2020). Positive politeness strategies on Catwoman movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni Dan Budaya, 4*(2), 264–276.

Zainurrahman, & Kofau, M. (2020). (2020). Linguistic politeness in public virtual communication. *Language-Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education, 3*(2), 1–17.