



Politeness Strategies in WhatsApp Text Messaging: A Case Study of Lecturers' Politeness in Sending Text Messages to Students in Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta

Miftahush Shalihah; Tri Winarsih

Universitas Aisyiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: miftadialaula@unisayogya.ac.id

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v6i7.1323>

Abstract

Lecturers and students frequently interact in both formal and semi-formal settings. Communication between students and professors must, of course, be maintained in such a way that it is always polite, even in informal situations. The availability of social media undoubtedly enhances contact between teachers and students. However, the use of social media has an impact on the language style of lecturers and students. This research aims to explain and examine the ethics of lecturers when responding to students' text messages using the WhatsApp messaging application. Furthermore, this study examines violations from etiquette norms in short messages from the lecturer to the students. This study was qualitative in nature. The primary data of this research were the screenshots of interactions between instructors and students via the WhatsApp messaging application. This research also employed observation, note-taking, and interviews. According to the preliminary study, there are still numerous short messages between lecturers and students that do not match the courtesy standard. The unfulfilled value of politeness is the use of slang, impolite ways of expressing intentions or the use of inappropriate linguistic aspects.

Keywords: Lecturer; Student; Politeness; WhatsApp; Text Messages

Introduction

Text-based communication is one of the smartphone's available modes of interaction. Text messages have become an integral part of interpersonal communication, and they offer several advantages that facilitate and ease communication. It facilitates immediate and quick communication. Today, nearly everyone possesses a mobile phone, making text messages extremely accessible. They can send and receive messages as long as they have a signal or Internet connection. Texting is not restricted to a particular platform or device, making it accessible to a wide variety of individuals. Moreover, text messages frequently include timestamps, allowing you to readily refer back to previous conversations. Text messages are a non-intrusive mode of communication, unlike phone calls or face-to-face

interactions. They enable individuals to communicate without disrupting their daily activities or disturbing others. This makes text messaging appropriate for situations where immediate response or verbal communication may not be possible or appropriate.

WhatsApp (WA) is one of the most extensively used text messaging applications. WA is a messaging application for smartphones that can be downloaded from the Playstore or AppStore. WA is a popular messaging application that allows users to send text messages, make voice and video calls, share media files, and engage in group chats. It was created in 2009 by Brian Acton and Jan Koum, and it quickly gained widespread popularity due to its ease of use, cross-platform compatibility, and strong privacy features.

The widespread use of instant text messaging such as WA has introduced several new issues related to politeness. The form and manner of language utilized in text messages sent via smartphones is one of the issues that must be taken seriously. This is because many written communications disregard aspects of proper language usage. This phenomenon of reduced courtesy is frequently observed in written communications between students and lecturer. Many students disregard the courtesy principle in language. In reality, courtesy is essential for establishing strong relationships and mutual respect. Politeness is one of the most essential rules of verbal and nonverbal communication. Furthermore, written language can result in multiple interpretations by the reader.

Technology has influenced how people communicate, including through text messages. It would be unfair to say that technology is responsible for the decline in politeness. However, it cannot be neglected that technology has changed the dynamics of communication and affected how people express themselves. Each individual's way of life is unquestionably influenced by technological advancements, which even alter the way we communicate. The advancement of technology has made it simpler for people to access information. It results to the massive and improperly filtered information which ultimately forces everyone to use it in their daily lives. When it comes to the society in Indonesia, many people neglect that Indonesian customs and manners differ from those of the West. The lack of politeness in this written message is, of course, not limited to students; it can also be observed among Lecturers. Naturally, lecturers as role models for students must also set a good example in terms of language courtesy.

Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) is one of the campuses in Yogyakarta, Indonesia which is devoted to the Islamic faith. The academic community at UNISA hails from all Indonesian regions. Obviously, the diversity of cultures introduced by each individual to UNISA also results in a variety of forms and styles of written communication. It is also undeniable that some students and lecturers disregard politeness when sending written messages. It is obviously very unfortunate considering that UNISA is an Islamic campus that teaches moral and ethical teachings to its lecturers and students.

Literature Review

Certainly, each language has its own set of norms. The rules of a language pertain not only to its grammar and sentence structure, but also to its politeness norms. Politeness is a component of pragmatics. Pragmatics is defined as the meaning of a speech in context (Thomas, 1995). Another scholar, Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as the study of meaning as communicated by presenters (or writers) and interpreted by listeners (or readers) is another definition of pragmatics. While, Mey (1993) defines pragmatics as the condition of language use that is determined by the social context.

Multiple contexts external to a language influence the use of politeness in speech. One of the external contexts of language politeness is the communication context, such as the speakers' social status.

When employing politeness strategies, distance, power, and imposition are used as reference points. Distance implies proximity or familiarity and unity between speakers and their speech companions. Power is related to a variety of factors, including age and position. Imposition encompasses several factors that endanger the position and freedom of action of the speaker (Grundy, 2000). In a similar vein, Lakoff argues that politeness in language is used to define interpersonal relationships in terms of formality, intimacy, solidarity, and respect (Coulmas, 2003).

The relationship between a spoken utterance and the listener's estimation of how that utterance should be pronounced is the politeness of language (Grundy, 2000). Watts, meanwhile, defines language politeness as behavior that demonstrates regard and tolerance for the speech partner (Rahmiati, 2017). Politeness is the use of language with courtesy and delicacy when communicating orally or in writing. Generally, politeness pertains to the relationship between two participants known as speakers and addressee. According to Wardhaugh, language politeness is language behaviour that takes into consideration solidarity, power, intimacy, the status of the relationship between participants, and appreciation (Rahmiati, 2017).

Awareness of social conventions also influences politeness. Fairclough (1989) defines politeness as the use of language based on an awareness of distinctions in power, social level, distance, etc. According to Brown and Levinson, language unity is the speaker's effort to sustain self-respect, or the face of both the speaker and the listener (Markhamah, 2011). Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness as paying attention to the positive and negative emotions of others, specifically the desire to be acknowledged and the desire not to be disturbed or burdened. Being courteous is not a simple task. This is due to the fact that politeness requires not only linguistic but also social and cultural comprehension of a community group (Holmes, 2001).

Regarding politeness, numerous theories have been presented by scholars. This investigation will employ Geoffrey Leech's theory on the principles of politeness. This is due to the fact that Leech's theory is more comprehensive and its discussion is more in-depth than other theories of language politeness. Six maxims comprise Leech's politeness principle are the Tact Maxim, the Generosity Maxim, the Approbation Maxim, the Modesty Maxim, the Agreement Maxim, and the Sympathy Maxim (Leech, 1983).

Every maxim has its own set of principles. The tact maxim is defined as a skill of understanding shown by someone who handles people and situations without causing offence (Purwanti, 2021). In this maxim, speakers are expected to minimize their benefits own benefits and maximize the benefit for others (Shalihah, 2020). By adhering to the tact maxim when speaking, one may avoid anger, jealousy, and an unfriendly attitude towards the speech partner. In the generosity maxim, the speaker should minimize self-benefit and maximize others' benefit (Eshtereh, 2020). The aim of the generosity maxim is to make the speaker's profit as small as possible and the loss as large as possible (Purwanti, 2021). If a speaker employs the maxim of generosity, it means that he/she is being generous to others. However, if someone violates this maxim, the speech partner will be displeased or irritated. The approbation maxim requires the speakers to minimize dispraise to other and maximize praise to other (Eshtereh, 2020). In other words, the approbation maxim is an attempt to avoid saying unpleasant things about others, especially the listener (Haryanto, 2018). In the modesty maxim, the speakers are expected to minimize self-praise and maximize expressions self-dispraise (Eshtereh, 2020). This maxim requires all communicators to minimize their sense of self-worth. In the modesty maxim, communicators are expected to be humble by minimizing their own praise (Purwanti, 2021). In the agreement maxim, one is expected to minimize expressions of disagreement and maximize expressions of agreement between oneself and other parties (Situmeang, 2015). The agreement maxim highlighted that all communicators speak to one another in a way that mutually appropriates or creates compatibility among them in communication.. The last, that is the

sympathy maxim, a person is expected to maximize sentiments of sympathy and minimize feelings of antipathy (Eshtereh, 2020).

Politeness provides a purpose in and of itself. In this sense, the definition of language politeness reflects a nation's culture, particularly the society in which the language is spoken. However, technological development seemed to have transformed everything. Eastern culture has begun to lose its politeness. The value of modesty has declined in many areas of life. Many people communicate using technological gadgets rather than in person. The amount of external information that quickly flows through our devices has an impact on how we use language. Even while communicating using written language, we must follow language ethics and be polite to other parties. Individual existence is ultimately influenced by social media. Despite the fact that social media is a virtual world, it mirrors the actual one, and communication ethics must still be considered.

Prior to this study, a number of comparable studies had addressed language politeness on social media, especially WhatsApp. However, these studies focused primarily on student politeness when sending text messages to lecturers. Tri Rina Budiwati's study entitled "*Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa dalam Berinteraksi dengan Dosen di Universitas Ahmad Dahlan: Analisis Pragmatik*" (2017) is a good example. In this article, the researcher discusses how students should address their lecturers. In this instance, the researcher examines students' WhatsApp and Line Chat conversations. Helmita's "*Kesantunan Berbahasa Antara Mahasiswa dan Dosen Melalui Media Sosial What's Up*" (2018) is the title of the second journal that addresses a similar topic. Again, the subject of Helmita's investigation are the students' utterances. The findings of this study indicate that many students continue to use disrespectful language when communicating with their lecturers through the WhatsApp application. In addition, Liza Lailatul Husna conducted research that was essentially identical. Husna conducted research titled "*Strategi Kesantunan Bertutur Mahasiswa Kepada Dosen Melalui Komunikasi Whatsapp*" (2020). The focus of the research distinguishes this study from the three previous studies. In the previous study, the focus was on the speeches or utterances of the students to their lecturers; in this study, the emphasis will be on the speeches or utterances of the lecturers to their students.

Method

This was a descriptive study employing qualitative methodology. This method was nearly identical to qualitative methods because it described the phenomenon or situation that was the focus of the study (Selinger & Shohamy, 1989). According to Mahsun (2014), qualitative research aims to comprehend social phenomena, including language phenomena, by producing descriptive data in the form of words. This method was employed because the collected data consisted of brief messages sent by lecturers to students via the WA messaging application. This qualitative research was descriptive in nature as it explained language politeness and the violation of the principle from the lecturer's language when replying to students' messages through the WA messaging application. This investigation was conducted at Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA). The researcher chose UNISA as the location for the study because UNISA is an Islamic university whose academic community demonstrates high standards of politeness and courtesy. In addition, the researchers are an integral element of UNISA.

The source of these research data is the text messages sent to students by lecturers through the WA messaging application. The data sources analysed were utterances written by lecturers in brief messages sent to their students via the WA message application. The research data consists of students who were assigned to respond to short communications from students via WhatsApp. Respondents in this study were UNISA students from 17 disciplines, including 3 diploma study program, 12 undergraduate study program, 1 postgraduate study program and 2 profession study programs. The researchers randomly selected two students from each study program. In order to collect data, the researcher requested that the students who are willing to be the respondent to submit screenshots of their conversations with their

lecturers. In order to acquire data, researchers recorded all text messages sent by students to lecturers and vice versa. In addition, the researchers conducted interviews with lecturers regarding their perspectives on student text messages, as well as interviews with students regarding their perspectives on lecturer text messages. The researcher identified the data on the data page after acquiring the data. The researcher then categorizes the data according to the obedience and violation of politeness principles. The researcher completed by analysing and describing the data. This research paper includes tables displaying the frequency of occurrence of the data to enhance the description of the data in his research. All data were analysed using Leech politeness theory.

Result and Discussion

A. Result

The obedience and violation of Leech's politeness principle in lecturers' text messages in replying their students' messages are presents in the table 1.

Politeness Principle Obedience						Politeness Principle Violation						Total
TM	GM	ApM	MM	AgM	SM	TM	GM	ApM	MM	AgM	SM	
30	80	5	6	10	2	22	22	50	0	0	1	228
(13.15%)	(35.08%)	(2.19%)	(2.63%)	(4.38%)	(0.87%)	(9.64%)	(9.64%)	(21.93%)			(0.43%)	(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 lecturers' text messages are 228 utterances. After the analysis, it is found that the text messages sent by the lecturers reveal both obedience and violation of politeness principle. The tables shows that there are 133 utterances which obey the politeness principle and 95 utterances which violate the politeness principles.

From the 228 utterances, there are 30 lecturers' utterances (13.15%) which obey the tact maxim and 22 utterances (9.64%) which violate it. Tact maxim is also known as wisdom maxim. This maxim requires each participant "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 speaking partner.

The second politeness principle is the generosity maxim. There are 80 utterances (35.08%) which obey the generosity maxim, makes it the most occurrence politeness principle obedience. On the other side, there are 22 utterances (9.64%) which violate the generosity principle. 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 analysis, there are 5 lecturers' utterances (2.19%) which obey the approbation maxim. Surprisingly, there are 50 lecturers' utterances (21.93%) which violate it, makes it the most occurrence politeness principle violation. According to the approbation maxim, individuals are expected to minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other and maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other.

The next is the modesty maxim. From the table, it can be seen that there are 6 utterances (2.63%) which obey the modesty maxim and there is no violation on it. In modesty maxim, individuals are expected to minimize praise toward themselves and maximizing praise toward others. In other words, this maxim requires participants to be humble by reducing praise to himself.

After the modesty maxim, there is the agreement maxim. The agreement maxim focuses on the expression of agreement or alignment in communication. There are 10 utterances (4.38%) which obey agreement maxim and there is also no violation on this maxim. According to the agreement maxim, participants are expected to be able to foster mutual compatibility. Participants have to maximize agreement between themselves and other people and minimize disagreement between self and others.

The last principle is the sympathy maxim. In this research, there are 2 lecturers' utterances (0.87%) which obey the sympathy maxim and 1 violation (0.43%) of sympathy maxim. The sympathy maxim is politeness principle which requires the participant to maximize sympathy and minimize antipathy between self and other.

B. Discussion

1. Tact Maxim

The tact maxim occurs in 30 lecturers' utterances (13.15%). Tact maxim is also known as wisdom maxim. This maxim states that every participant has to follow the principle of "minimize 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. According to Leech's politeness theory, asking for help and saying thank you are the example of the tact maxim. When asking for help or thanking, a person is supposed to reduce threat on others and be sensitive to the feelings of the person being requested. The example of tact maxim obedience is as follows:

Lecturer : Dik, bisa minta tlng tidak? (*Dik, could you please help me?*)

Student : Bagaimana ibu? (*How may I help you, Ma'am?*)

Lecturer : ***** belum menjawab. Presensi sore ini belum diseting kayaknya. Oke dik, ini ***** sudah menjawab. Trimakasih ya. (***** *had not replied my message yet. I think this afternoon's attendance list hasn't been set yet. OK Dik, ***** already reply my text message. Thank you*)

Student : Baik ibu. (*Yes, Ma'am.*)

Lecturer : Dik, blm bisa juga presensinya. ***** trkendala jaringan krn mati listrik katanta. Minta dibantu disetingkan ya dik. (*Dik, I cannot open the attendance list yet. ***** constrained by the network due to power outages. Could you please help me to set it up, Dik.*)

Student : Baik ibu saya coba cek dulu. Sudah saya ganti jdawal untuk hari ini jam 15.30 Bu. Apakah sudah bisa? (*Yes, Ma'am, I'll try to check first. I have changed the schedule for today at 15.30 Ma'am. Can you open it?*)

Lecturer : Alhamdulillah, bisa. Trimakasih ya dik (*Alhamdulillah, I can open it. Thank you, Dik.*)

Student : Sama-sama ibu (*You're welcome, Ma'am.*)

In the conversation, the lecturer started the conversation. Because she got difficulty in changing the schedule in the system, she texted her student, asked for help. She asked for her student's help twice by asking "Dik, bisa minta tlng tidak?" and "... Minta tolong dibantu disetingkan ya dik". After the student helped her, she also thanked her students twice by saying "... Trimakasih ya." and "Alhamdulillah, bisa. Trimakasih ya dik".

The lecturer sent the text by maintaining a polite and respectful tone. She started her message by addressing the student "Dik". It should be noted that address differs stylistically from greeting in two ways. First, address is used almost solely for power and solidarity. Between two people, it remains constant

throughout a relationship unless that relationship changes. Greeting may be varying between two people. The variety depends on their mood. Two people, who address each other the same way each time they meet, may vary their greeting. The second, address can be repeated constantly throughout a conversation to reinforce the relative intimacy and power between people. Greeting, on the other hand, only sets the stage (Shalihah, 2018).

In this conversation, the word “*Dik*” is a type of kinship address term. This type of addressing is mentioned by Chaika (1982) and Wardaugh (1986). The kinship address term is the use of kin-term such as father, mother, uncle, aunt, sister or brother (Shalihah, 2018). The word “*Dik*” in Indonesian language is used to address someone who is younger in family, whether the younger person is male or female. In this conversation, the lecturer addresses her students by using the word “*Dik*” to show politeness while in the same time, she is minimizing the status differences. According to Holmes (2001), there are two kinds of politeness, positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive politeness is solidarity oriented and minimizing status differences (Shalihah, 2018).

In choosing the address term of “*Dik*”, the lecturer tries to get closer and familiar with his students. He tried to minimize the distance with the students. By doing so, she acted as she is “the elder sister” of the student and show the intimacy between them, minimizing the social status and power differential.

The conversation was between a lecturer and a student from Faculty of Health Sciences. Based on the interview with the lecturer, she mentioned that many of lecturers appeared to be intimate/closer to the students, even discussing various issues in class. Some lecturers refer to their students as “*Dik*” because they attempt to get closer to students so that they can study comfortably. Students are expected to achieve their highest level of academic performance (excellent marks, high GPA, graduating on time, cum laude) in a suitable learning atmosphere. Furthermore, they stated that after graduating, these students would become colleagues for their lecturers both on and off campus.

The next following example is the violation of tact maxim:

Student : Assalamu’alaikum wr wb Ibu *****, saya ***** 18 ingin bertanya apakah hari ini ibu ada waktu luang? Karena saya bermaksud untuk mengkonfirmasi tentang proposal SCIFi Bu. (*Assalamu’alaikum wr wb Ms. *****, I’m ***** 18. I would like to confirm if you have free time today? I would like to confirm about the SCIFi proposal, Ma’am.*)

Student : (after 4 days) Assalamu’alaikum wr wb Ibu *****, saya **** 18 ingin bertanya apakah hari ini ibu ada waktu luang? Karena saya bermaksud untuk mengkonfirmasi tentang proposal SCIFi Bu. (*Assalamu’alaikum wr wb Ms. *****, I’m ***** 18. I would like to confirm if you have free time today? I would like to confirm about the SCIFi proposal, Ma’am.*)

Lecturer : Setelah jumatatan ya (*After Jum’ah prayer.*)

In the conversation above, the student initiated the conversation. She wanted to consult the paper with her supervisor. She asked the availability time of her supervisor. Unfortunately, her supervisor did not reply her message. She then sent the same text to her supervisor after 4 days, asking for the availability time. After this second message, the supervisor replied her text. However, the way the lecturer replied it seems impolite and violating the tact maxim.

As it seen from the conversation, the student’s text is politely sent by starting it with greeting *Assalamu’alaikum*, addressing the lecturer using the word “*Ibu*”, introducing herself, asking the availability time and stating what she needs. However, the way the lecturer replied the text seems to violate the tact maxim. The lecturer replied it 4 days after the first text and did not answer the greeting. As

it is mentioned above that in tact maxim, someone is expected to maximize benefit for others. In this case, the student needs some assistances from her supervisor, but the supervisor does not reply it. This means that the lecturer does not provide services as expected and needed by his students. In fact, a lecturer's role is to assist students and offer academic services in accordance with their demands. By not replying the students' text, he lecturer also may give the impression that she does not care about the students' attempts to interact or ask for help. This can be interpreted as a disregard for their needs and expectations, which is violating the tact maxim in communication.

The interview with the lecturers reveals that there are a number of reasons why a lecturer can frequently forget to respond to text messages or acknowledge greetings sent by students. The multiple responsibilities he/she currently performs, such as teaching, conducting research, performing administrative activities from campus, and so forth, are some of the variables that could have an influence the lecturers in replying students' text messages. Additionally, there are so many students who send messages, and because the lecturers want to respond right away, he/she occasionally forgets to respond with greetings. It is because answering question from students is more important to him/her. Moreover, most of the lecturers are already married, so when they are at home, they hardly ever check their telephones and miss messages that arrive because they are dealing with taking care of their families.

Furthermore, each instructor has a different language style. It is possible that the lecturers' informal speech made them ignore the greetings offered by the students. Apart from the fact that lecturers violate the principle of tact maxim by failing to explicitly respond to student messages or foregoing greetings, it is important to keep in mind that this does not necessarily indicate a lack of respect, care, or attitude of the lecturer to their student.

2. Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim occurs 80 times (35.08%) in lecturers' utterances. In generosity maxim, someone is expected to maximize the benefit to others and minimize cost to self. According to Leech, the expression that included in generosity maxim such as sharing knowledge, offering assistance, and giving compliments. The example of generosity maxim obedience can be seen in the conversation below:

Student : Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Bu, saya ***** , mahasiswa arsitektur angkatan 2019. Saya mau konsultasi terkait perkuliahan, kira-kira ibu ada waktu kapan ya? (*Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Ma'am, I'm ***** , an ***** student class of 2019. I would like to consult regarding lectures, I wonder when do you have free time?*)

Lecturer : Wa'alaikumsalam, hari ini saya di kampus mas. Atau besok jam 9. (*Wa'alaikumsalam. I am at campus today, Mas. Or tomorrow at 9.*)

Student : Baik Bu, hari ini saja. (*Yes, Ma'am. I'll see you today.*)

Lecturer : OK, saya dikampus setengah 10 ya. (*OK. I'll be there at 9.30 a.m.*)

Student : Baik Bu. (*Yes Ma'am.*)

Lecturer : Saya mungkin agak telat 15 menit ya Mas. (*I might be 15 minutes late, Mas.*)

Student : Iya Bu. (*Yes Ma'am*)

The conversation was started by the student. The student sent the text politely by greeting the lecturer with "assalamu'alaikum", addressing the lecturer using the word "Ibu", introducing himself, and delivering his intention in sending the text message. The lecturer replied the text by answering the greeting "wa'alaikumsalam". By answering the greeting, the lecturer already obeys the generosity maxim. It is because the lecturers show a willingness to interact with the student. The lecturer also gives a

complete information about when she can be met and also the possibility of being late. The lecturer obeys the generosity maxim by giving complete information so that she could give a good assistance to her student. Thus, she is maximizing the benefit for her students.

From the conversation, it can also be seen that the lecturer addresses her student by using the word “*Mas*”. *Mas* is another kinship term which is originally used to address older brother. However, nowadays it is used to address older man for politeness purpose without mentioning kinship relation (Mardiah, 2018). Thus, it can be concluded that by addressing her student “*Mas*”, the lecturer is trying to be polite to him.

The next example is the violence of generosity maxim.

Student : Assalamu’alaikum Pak. Saya ***** dari kelas ***** ingin bertanya, besok pada hari kamis tanggal 5 Maret 2020 jam 15.30 ruang C.506 bapak ada jadwal dengan kelas kami materi tentang Aspek Etik, legal dan fungsi advokasi palliative care, apakah bapak bisa masuk? Terimakasih. Wassalamu’alaikum. (*Assalamu’alaikum, Sir. I am ***** from class ***** would like to confirm that tomorrow on Thursday, 5 March 2020 at 15.30 in room C.506, you have a schedule in our class with material on ethical, legal and advocacy aspects of palliative care. Would you mind to attend the class? Thank You. Wassalamu’alaikum.*)

Lecturer : Ya. (Yes.)

The conversation above shows that the student sent a polite message to the lecturer. The same with the previous example, the student started the message with greeting *assalamu’alaikum*, she introduced herself, telling the purpose of sending the text and thanking the lecturer. However, the lecturer answered the student with only one word “*Ya*”. By doing so, the lecturer is violating generosity maxim. As it is stated before that in generosity maxim, someone is expected to maximize benefit to others. In this case, the lecturer is expected to give good response by answering the greeting and thanking the student that she already reminded him about the schedule. The short answer can create the impression that the lecturer is dismissive to the student. This may leave the students feel with the impression that their message is not appreciated.

The interview with the lecturer reveals why the lecturer only give a very short answer. The lecturers said that they might be busy when they replied the students’ text messages with a very short answer. As it generally known that lecturers have so many responsibilities in the same time such as teaching, doing research, doing analysis, or documenting administrative task in the university. They are not intended to be rude, but they want to answer the question directly. On the other hand, they think that the short reply is very clear and enough to answer students’ question. They usually give a short reply is the question sent by student is about yes-no questions, timing questions and confirmation text.

3. Approbation Maxim

In this research, there are 5 obedience (2.19%) in approbation maxim and, surprisingly, 50 violations (21.93%) in approbation maxim. It is clear that in approbation maxim, the speaker should avoid to say something disgraceful about the others, especially about the hearer. Here is the example of approbation maxim obedience:

Student : Assalamualaikum bu, saya ***** dengan NIM ***** izin mengirimkan hasil screen shoot pembelajaran tutorial dan mengumpulkan hasil dari tutorial. (*Assalamualaikum Ma'am, I ***** my student number is ***** allow me to send the screenshots of the learning tutorials and submit the results from tutorials.*)

Lecturer : Wa'alaikumsalam. Alhamdulillah. Terima kasih ya. (*Wa'alaikumsalam. Alhamdulillah, thank you.*)

In the conversation above, it can be seen that the student sent a polite text message. She started the text by greeting “*assalamu'alaikum*”, addressing the lecturer using the word “*Bu*”, introducing herself, and asking for permission by saying “*izin*”. The lecturer then replied the text by answering the greeting “*wa'alaikumsalam*”, praising the God by saying “*alhamdulillah*” and saying “*terima kasih*”. The lecturer replied the text politely and she is obeying the approbation maxim. Gratitude expression like thanking someone for his/her assistance is an example of approbation maxim obedience.

Surprisingly, most of the lecturers violates the approbation maxim. One of the indications of obeying approbation maxim is by answering the greeting from the sender. However, almost all the lecturers seem to directly answer the students' questions without answering the greeting. If the lecturers do not reply the greeting, it is assumed that the lecturers do not accept the student's polite greeting or attempt to start a conversation. The student's greeting may seem unappreciated due to this violation of approbation maxim.

The violation of approbation maxim can be seen in the following conversation:

Student : Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Bu ***** , mohon mengganggu waktunya, perkenalkan saya ***** dari ***** 4A Kelompok A1. Senin, 2 Maret 2020 pukul 08.00, R. Antenatal Care 1 (It. 3). Materi: Intervensi pada Bayi Baru Lahir. Apakah ibu dapat hadir tidak nggih? Terimakasih. Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. (*Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. Ms. ***** , I'm sorry for interrupting your time, I am ***** from ***** 4A Group A1. On Monday, 2 March 2020 at 08.00, in room R. Antenatal Care 1 (floor 3), you have a class with us. The material: Intervention in Newborns. Would you attend the class? Thank You. Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.*)

Lecturer : Bentar mbak.... Saya carikan ganti dosen dulu... saya masih ada acara di UGM besok. (*Wait, mbak.... I'll look for a substitute lecturer first... I still have an agenda at UGM tomorrow.*)

Student : Nggih Bu. (*Yes Ma'am.*)

(After a while) Assalamu'alaikum Bu ***** , pripun Bu, besok ada kelas mboten nggih? Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb. (*Assalamu'alaikum Ma'am. What about tomorrow, Ma'am? Do we have class? Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.*)

Lecturer : Maaf mbak... Cari dosen g ada yang bisa... Semua full. Woo iya mbak kosong dulu yak. (*I'm sorry, mbak. There is no lecturer available. They are all teaching. So, there will be no class tomorrow.*)

From the conversation, it clearly seen that the lecturer did not answer the student's greeting twice, that is assalamu'alaikum. In fact, the lecturer replied the student's text messages by addressing her “*mbak*”. This address term is similar to the address term of “*mas*”. The word “*mbak*” usually used to address older sister, but now it is used in term of to be polite to other people. She also offered to find a substitute lecturer to teach. However, since the lecturer is failed in replying the greeting, she is violating approbation maxim.

After interviewing the lecturer, she said that she did not intend to disrespect the greeting from the student. In addition, she knew that the greeting “*assalamu'alaikum*” means that we pray for the good of other people. However, at the time the student sent the text messages to her, she was attending important agenda at other university, but she also did not want to ignore the text messages from students. Therefore, she immediately replied to the intentions desired by the students but forgot to return the greeting.

4. Modesty Maxim

In modesty maxim, someone is expected to minimize praise to self and maximize dispraise self. After analysing the data, it is found that there are 6 obedience (2.63%) of modesty maxim and there are no utterances which violate this maxim. Here is the example of modesty maxim:

Student : Assalamu'alaikum ibu. Mohon maaf nanti kelasnya via zoom ya bu? (*Assalamu'alaikum Ma'am. I'm sorry, is our next class conducted via zoom?*)

Lecturer : Iya mbak. (*Yes, mbak*)

(After a while) Mbak ***** zoom kampus sedang padat digunakan. Saya mohon maaf atas perubahan dadakan ini, dan terimakasih atas permaklumannya. Bisa diakses pada topic 12. Batas diskusi sampai pukul 17.30. Terimakasih. (*Mbak ***** the zoom is being heavily used. I apologize for this sudden change, and thank you for your understanding. The exercise can be accessed on topic 12. The discussion limit is until 17.30. Thank You.*)

Student : Baik Ibu, akan saya sampaikan ke teman-teman nggih bu. (*Yes, Ma'am. I'll share it to my friends.*)

Lecturer : Minta tlg untk disampaikan jg ke temen2 kelas A yah. Karna pj blm merespon. Terimakasih *****. (*Please help me to share it to your friends in class A, because the coordinator (of class A) has not responded yet. Thank you *****.*)

Student : Baik Ibu. (*Yes Ma'am*)

The lecturer's utterances in the conversation obey the modesty maxim. The lecturer said "*Saya mohon maaf atas perubahan dadakan ini dan termakasih atas permaklumannya*" to convey that there is a mistake and she might be involved in doing mistake. Apologizing to the students is a polite way for the lecturers to convey that they acknowledge any mistakes they may have made or any potential problems they may have caused.

5. Agreement Maxim

In the agreement maxim, one is expected to minimize expressions of disagreement and maximize expressions of agreement between oneself and other parties. In this research, there are 10 agreement maxim obedience (4.38%) and there is no violation of agreement maxim. The example of agreement maxim is as follow:

Student : Assalamu'alaikum bu, saya ***** dari ***** 2018. Mau mengkonfirmasi untuk teori gizi kuliner tanggal 6 hari jum'at jam 15.30 mau tetap masuk atau di reschedule saja ibu? (*Assalamu'alaikum ma'am, I'm ***** from ***** 2018. I would like to confirm your attendance for culinary nutrition theory class on Friday 6th at 15.30. Would you mind to come to the class or do you wish to reschedule the class, Ma'am?*)

Lecturer : Masuk aja dik, inshaAllah. (*I'll have the class, inshaALLAH.*)

Student : Oke baik bu terimakasih. (*Yes, Ma'am. Thank you.*)

Lecturer : Dik, kalau direschedule hari selasa gimana? (*Dik, what if the class is rescheduled to Tuesday?*)

Student : Selasa tanggal berapa ya ibu? Kalau selasa tanggal 10 kita full bu. (*What date is Tuesday, Ma'am? If Tuesday the 10th, we are having full schedule, Ma'am.*)

Lecturer : Jam 15.30 pun? (*Even at 3.30 p.m.*)

Student : Iya bu. (*Yes, Ma'am.*)

Lecturer : Oke. (Ok).

From the conversation, it clearly seen that the student and the lecturer were negotiating about the class. The lecturer asked for a reschedule. The way she asked for a reschedule is obeying the agreement maxim. She started it by asking “*Dik, kalau direchedule hari selasa gimana?*”. She used a kinship address term if “*Dik*” to get closer to the student. After that, she was trying to negotiate to the student to move the schedule to the day she wanted. Unfortunately, the students are having a full day. She was still negotiating by asking “*Jam 15.30 pun?*”. However, when the student said that they also had a class at 3.30 p.m., she just replied it with “*Oke*” which means that it does not matter to her and she is fine not to change the schedule.

6. Sympathy Maxim

The notion of sympathy maxim is that minimize antipathy and maximize sympathy. After analysing the data, it is found that there are 2 obedience (0.87%) of sympathy maxim and 1 violation (0.43%) of sympathy maxim. Here is the example of sympathy maxim obedience:

Student : Assalamualaikum bu.mohon maaf mengganggu . Mau ngasih kabar. ***** sama ***** kecelakaan saat perjalanan ke Semarang. Kecelakaan di Magelang. (*Assalamu'alaikum, Ma'am. I'm sorry for disturbing your time. I want to inform you that ***** and ***** got an accident on their way to Semarang. The accident was in Magelang.*)

Lecturer : waalakumsalam.. innalillahi wa inna ilaihi rojiun.. gimana kondisinya mas.. semoga segera membaik.. (*Wa'alaikumsalam. Innalillahi wa inna ilaihi rojiun. How's their condition, Mas? I hope they get better soon.*)

Student : Amiin.. (sending a picture to the lecturer)

Lecturer : itu foto ***** dan *****? sprtinya mereka kondisinya baik2 aja.. (*That's the picture of ***** and ***** , isn't it? It seems that they are OK.*)

Student : Alhamdulillah udh sampai semarang kok bu tpi giginya patah. (*Alhamdulillah they are already arrived in Semarang, but their teeth are broken.*)

Lecturer : oo.. bgitu.. mereka sdh sampai semarang? (*Ooh.. I see. So, have they arrived in Semarang?*)

Student : Udah bu. Tpi kata e badan e msih skit giginya juga soalnya nabrak mobil. (*Yes, Ma'am. But they say they still feel unwell because their teeth are broken since they hit a car.*)

Lecturer : oo ya.. alhamdulillah.. kalo sdh sampe smrg.. ya.. gigi patah pasti ngilu.. suruh minum obat anti nyeri, biar ngga terlalu sakit. semoga segera pulih kondisinya.. (*Ooo yaa.. Alhamdulillah if they have arrived in Semarang. Well, a broken tooth definitely hurts. Tell them to take painkillers, so they don't hurt too much. I hope they recover soon.*)

Student : Iya bu. Makasih. (*Yes, Ma'am. Thank you.*)

The conversation above is between a student and a lecturer. The student informed the lecturer that two of his friends got an accident. Hearing the bad news, the lecturer replied “*waalakumsalam.. innalillahi wa inna ilaihi rojiun.. gimana kondisinya mas.. semoga segera membaik..*”. The phrase of

“*innalillahi wa inna ilaihi rojiun*” is originally from Arabic language. It means "To Allah we belong and to Him we shall return." This phrase is usually used by Muslims to express their sadness and sorrow. By saying this phrase, the lecturer is expressing her sympathy, so she is obeying the sympathy maxim. At the end of conversation, the lecturer also said “*semoga segera pulih kondisinya..*”. This sentence clearly shows that the lecturer sent her best hope to the students who got an accident to recover soon. By saying so, she is obeying sympathy maxim.

In the analysis, it is also found a violation of maxim sympathy. The violation can be seen in the conversation as follows:

Lecturer : Mana laporan PKLnya? Katanya Kamis OK. Keburu libur. (Where is the fieldwork report? You said you'll submit it on Thursday. Holiday is coming.)

Student : Maaf bu saya belum sempat mengirim kembali revisi laporan PKL saya bu sebab kemarin sedang mengurus penutupan KKN saya bu dan juga saya sedang kurang sehat bu. InsyaAllah besok saya kirimkan (laporan PKL nya) bu. (*I'm sorry, Ma'am, I haven't had time to send back my revised fieldwork report, Ma'am, because yesterday I was handling of closing ceremony of the community service, Ma'am, and also, I wasn't feeling well, Ma'am. Inshaallah I will submit it tomorrow, Ma'am.*)

The conversation above shows the lecturer's utterances which is violating the sympathy maxim. The lecturer was asking the student to submit the fieldwork practice report. However, the way she asked the student is quite rude and impolite. The lecturer's text does not use any greeting. She is directly asked “*Mana laporan PKLnya?*”. The lecturer also added “*Katanya Kamis Ok.*” indicating that she asked the student's promise for submitting her assignments on Thursday, but it was obviously not submitted even though it was over Thursday. The lecturer then stated “*Keburu libur.*”, indicating that she has waited for holiday and does not want to be bothered by any office work, including any student who submit assignments. The student explained that the delay in submitting reports was due to his involvement in the community service as well as being unwell. The lecturer did not respond to the student's message again after he stated this. This is clear that the lecturer violates sympathy maxim.

In asking the student about their assignment, the lecturers should be able to properly express themselves. If it is by text messages, it will be better if the lecturers start the text messages by greeting the students first and then asking politely why the report has not been submitted. In this case, it is unnecessary to mention holidays or anything else that is unrelated to the assignments.

Conclusion

Based on the data obtained, it is possible to conclude that not all lecturers consider language politeness when responding to students' text messages. The noncompliance text messages by lecturers in replying to students' messages generally occurs in the form of failing to return greetings, giving short answers, and/or employing fairly demanding language.

The first thing that frequently occurs is that instructors do not respond to the greetings written by students in each of their letters. Several lecturers who were interviewed about this issue stated that they did not answer the greeting because they forgot to respond them. They were focused on student statements or questions, so they promptly answered to the point, and some who said they answered orally but not typed it and directly answered student questions. There were also lecturers who stated that students did not write their messages politely, hence lecturers were hesitant to respond to students' messages.

Concerning the lecturer's short answers, such as OK or Yes, several interviewed lecturers stated that they answered the students' text messages while they were busy or engaged with other assignments, in a rush, or on their way going somewhere. They thought that what is important is to respond to students' text messages and students should not be ignored.

There are also several lecturers who replied to the students' text messages directly to the point because the students' written language was impolite such as no greeting, directly ask to meet the lecturer without asking his/her availability time, or sending text messages too early in the morning or too late at night. Some lecturer was a little uneasy with the students' attitude. There are also lecturers who openly criticize the manner in which students express their intentions. The lecturer stated that she tried to convey what was wrong with the student's text messages as polite as possible. This is done so that students are not offended and can express their intentions more gently afterwards.

Meanwhile, some other lecturers appeared to be familiar with students through their text messages interactions, even discussing unrelated topics in classes. Some lecturers even address their students as 'Dik', 'Mbak' and 'Mas'. This is because they make an effort to be close or to build intimacy to students in order for them to feel at ease while learning in the university. With a pleasant study environment, it is intended that students will achieve their academic goals (excellent grades, high GPA, graduation with honors, graduate on time, cum laude). Furthermore, they stated that after graduating, these students would become colleagues for their lecturers both on and off campus.

References

- Budiwati, T.R. (2017) *Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa dalam Berinteraksi dengan Dosen di Universitas Ahmad Dahlan: Analisis Pragmatik*. The 5th URECOL Proceeding. Yogyakarta, 18 February 2017: UAD Yogyakarta.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaika, E. 1982. *Language The Social Mirror*. Newbury House Publisher Inc.: USA.
- Coulmas, F. (2003). *Sociolinguistics. The Handbook of Linguistics*. Edited by Mark Aronoff and Janie Röss-Miller. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.
- Eshreth, M. K. M. and Badran, H. (2020) *The Application of Leech's Politeness Maxims in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice*. Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies (IJELS). Vol. 6, No.2. pp. 59-75.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Haryanto, et al. (2018). *Politeness Principle and Its Implication in EFL Classroom in Indonesia*. *Linguae*. European Scientific Language Journal. Vol. 11, Issue 4. pp. 99-112.
- Helmita. (2018). *Kesantunan Berbahasa Antara Mahasiswa dan Dosen Melalui Media Sosial What's Up*. *Jurnal Puitika* Volume 14 No. 01. pp. 61-71.
- Huzna, L.L. (2020). *Strategi Kesantunan Bertutur Mahasiswa Kepada Dosen Melalui Komunikasi Whatsapp*. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 9, No. 4. pp. 13-22.

- Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. 2nd Ed.* London: Longman.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* New York: Longman Library.
- Mahsun. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa.* Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Mardiah, Z. et all. (2018). *Sapaan “Mbak” dan “Mas” Merebak Digunakan di Jakarta. Sebuah Kajian Sosiolinguistik.* Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya 16. Jakarta: 10-12 April 2018: Unika Atma Jaya. pp. 532-536.
- Markhamah. (2011). *Analisis Kesalahan dan Kesantunan Berbahasa.* Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University Press.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics. An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.
- Purwanti, E. and Herbianto, H. (2021). *Politeness Principles Violation of “Mind Your Language” Comedy Series: A Pragmatic Analysis.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHESS 2021). Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, Volume 626. Pp. 79-86.
- Rahmiati. (2017). *Analisis Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa UIN Alaudin Makassar dalam Berkomunikasi dengan Dosen.* Al Daulah: 165.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Act. An Essay in the Philosophy Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinger, W.H. and Elana Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shalihah, M. (2018). *A Pragmatic Analysis on the Types dan the Purpose of Address Terms Used by the Main Character in Jane Austen’s “EMMA”.* Enjourme (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English. Vol 3, No. 2 December 2018 pp. 52-60.
- Shalihah, M. and Zuhdi, M. N. (2020). *Language Politeness in Students’ Text Messages Sent to the Lecturers through WhatsApp Application: A Sociopragmatic Study.* Enjourme (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English Vol. 5, No. 2 December 2020 pp. 134-148.
- Situmeang, G. R. (2015). *An Analysis of Politeness Principles of Lecturer’s Utterances.* Explora Journal of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Linguistics.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics.* New York: Longman Library.
- Wardaugh, R. 1998. *An Introduction to Linguistics. Third Edition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).