

2023

Politeness Strategies of Manobo Students in a Classroom in Kidapawan City, Philippines

Rea Rodesa Sandoval-Delos Santos, Joseph E. Araneta, Sajed S. Ingilan, & Raymund T. Palayon

Date received: March 10, 2023

Date revised: August 11, 2023

Date accepted: August 14, 2023

Similarity index: 2%

Author Information:

¹Rea Rodesa Sandoval-Delos Santos
rrodesa.sandoval@gmail.com
orcid.org/0009-0008-2822-6411

²Joseph E. Araneta
jearaneta04265@usep.edu.ph
orcid.org/0000-0002-3106-2736

³Sajed S. Ingilan
ingilan.sajed@usep.edu.ph
orcid.org/0000-0002-4466-2028

⁴Raymund T. Palayon
ajarnark@gmail.com
orcid.org/0009-0007-4676-606x

¹Graduate Student
Department of Languages, Literature,
and Arts,
Ateneo de Davao University
Davao City, Philippines

²Instructor
College of General Education,
Management, and Science - Senior High,
Davao Doctors College, Inc.
Davao City, Philippines

³Associate Professor
College of Arts and Sciences,
University of Southeastern Philippines
Davao City, Philippines

⁴Faculty
English Department,
Muban Chombueng Rajabhat University
Ratchaburi, Thailand

<https://doi.org/10.53899/spjrd.v28i2.247>

Abstract

Awareness of the students in the pragmatics attached to language is crucial to communication success within classroom settings. Therefore, students might devise strategies to mitigate threats that can affect interlocutors' engagement in communication. However, cultural and social factors can also influence how people communicate; hence, students from different backgrounds have nuances in the language used. This study is aimed at determining the politeness strategies utilized by Manobo students in their interaction in a classroom in a public school in Kidapawan City, Philippines. Using Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategy framework, the findings reveal that the politeness strategies used by Manobo students in the classroom with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers were positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on-record, and off-record. On the other hand, the politeness strategies among Manobo students were positive politeness, negative politeness, and bald-on record. Hence, the Manobo students have different politeness strategies depending on their relationship with the interlocutors in the classroom interaction. Politeness is relevant and essential in education, such as classroom teaching and learning practice. With a deeper understanding of its role in the academe, there could be more significant ways of improving the learning atmosphere.

Keywords: pragmatics, politeness strategies, Manobo, Kidapawan City, the Philippines

In a classroom environment, learning to connect successfully is one of the purposes of student-to-teacher and peer-to-peer engagements. Learners should have communicative competence encompassing linguistic and socio-cultural, digital, formulaic, and strategic (Celce-Murcia, 2007). It is beneficial for both learners and teachers to be aware of the pragmatic dimensions of social contact inside the four walls of the classroom. While daunting, teachers and learners can find ways to improve more successful teaching materials and approaches (Kasper, 1997).

Fraser (1983) defines pragmatic competence as understanding how the addressee determines what the speaker does and the comprehension of the purposeful, previously unheard-of power indicated by implicit attitudes. With this knowledge, there are cases where the interlocutors can understand each other, and there are communication errors. A core aspect of pragmatic honesty is politeness. It results from the speakers' desire to lessen these direct threats' dangers (Mills, 2003). Some strategies allow the interlocutors to minimize the risks posed by threatening acts called politeness strategies. In addition, according to Goffman (1955), individuals construct a "profile" or an appearance in social encounters. This "face" is often threatened by Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), which contradict the picture the person wishes to create. Thus, Brown and Levinson (1987) developed the Politeness Principle, in which they suggested methods of politeness to correct the magnitude of face-threatening social encounters between locutors.

The study of linguistic politeness has been part of linguistic studies in Western Europe and North America for over 30 years. It has typically been undertaken in pragmatics and sociolinguistics (Bremner, 2012). Politeness concepts and ideas have been described in many respects, so it is imperative to understand why people are so indirect in conveying what they say. The early definition is when linguists relied heavily on Grice's communication model, including those provided by Leech, Brown, and Levinson. Leech (1983) sees politeness as preventing confrontation, and his model of politeness is based on interpersonal rhetoric. Leech (1983, as cited in Jumanto, 2008) suggests politeness maxims that essentially include the technique of holding one's face in interaction, optimizing good things for others, and reducing positive things in oneself, which are usually based on four concepts: expense and profit, scorn and appreciation, conflict and agreement, and compassion and antipathy. His theory of politeness serves as the preservation of good ties and social order, which allows citizens to believe that their interlocutors are cooperative.

Brown and Levinson (1987) see politeness as mitigating the danger of a face. In other terms, politeness is used to soften a face-threatening act. Their model of politeness is designed to account for the person's respectful conversations. A highly abstract notion of "face," which they contend is universal, constitutes their model. Their descriptions of the face were based on Goffman's (1967) concept of the face, which is a public self-image that each person must establish for themselves, is emotionally invested, can be harmed, preserved, or enhanced, and requires continuous care.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), most communication reasons have social repercussions typical of a threatening type. Minimizing these face-threatening acts or FTAs requires a social contact client to meet three competing needs. They are intended to convey the FTA's essential points, be precise or urgent, and, to some extent, keep the listener's face (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Hagge & Kostelnick, 1989). Both authors then suggested four styles of politeness strategies: bald on-record, off-record, positive politeness, and negative politeness. Brown and Levinson claim that politeness consists of seeking to face another tactic and baldness, among others. Acting baldly, without recourse, requires doing so in the most direct, transparent, unequivocal, and straightforward manner practicable. The purpose of bald on-record strategies is not to mitigate the danger to the face of the audience; instead, they are used to answer the other person's needs precisely. Using imperative forms is an example of bald on-record, as seen in the term "drinking water." Using mitigation devices such as 'please' in the word, please drink the water to soften the order. It can also be added that in an emergency, for

example, an order such as not entering a fire has no function of politeness.

The study of Codreanu and Debu (2011) on the polite requests of the Romanian, English, and Hebrew shows that Romanians are more likely to use conventional indirect strategies than other nationalities. In contrast, Australian English speakers prefer conventionally indirect strategies and switch the directness level more often than Hebrew, German, French, and Spanish speakers (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). The reason for this is that every culture prescribes a particular set of norms in using the strategies of producing requests, and a particular language may tend to use more direct or indirect levels of a request than other languages in an appropriate manner within the culture. Valentine (1994) affirms this by suggesting that politeness is cultural, meaning that different societies have different ways of displaying politeness, but all may consider it acceptable behavior. Often, what is considered friendly in one culture may not be considered polite in another, and what is face-threatening in one society may not be polite in another.

In the Philippines, Ingilan (2018) explored the directives and politeness in Tausug Parang Sabil. The study illuminated the negative perceptions of non-Tausug about jihad (holy war) depicted in the folk narrative song titled *Kissa kan Panglima Hassan* (The Story of Panglima Hassan) by exploring the directives and politeness. The study revealed that the directives were utilized by the panglima and the sultan, who are in high power in the Tausug *kawman* (community). Though these leaders had the authority, they imposed lesser threatening acts in their directives. These directives were demonstrated by the use of positive politeness communicated to the face of the hearer. These polite terms negate the power relation between the sultan and the panglima.

A study conducted in Davao City by Fernandez-Dalona, Palang, and Dalona (2021) revealed that it had been observed that the usage of certain words such as *paki* (for *pakiusap*, basically equal to “please”) or *makisuyo* (usually followed by a verbal enclitic) in making requests demonstrates politeness, deference, and reverence for others. However, this is only true to Tagalog speakers (Fernandez-Dalona et al., 2021). In a culturally diverse country like the Philippines, where inhabitants share one ethnicity but are split into various indigenous cultural communities, the interlocutors use different tactics and display their politeness differently.

This is particularly true among Manobo students in Kidapawan City, where there is an educational institution for Manobo students. They use Kidapawan-Cebuano as their lingua franca. Nevertheless, even so, they interact in several ways. In an interview with a teacher conducted by one of the researchers, the interviewee claimed that students often have trouble interacting inside the classroom. Miscommunication is most likely expected due to students’ and teachers’ diverse language and cultural experiences. They assume that Manobo students are shy about talking to them and that their language is a significant factor. In addition, the interviewee suggests that it may have been ingrained in their cultural heritage that they experience prejudice that keeps them from speaking well. This is reaffirmed by Sealza and Sealza (2000), who argued that while Manobo values and understands the need for education, many children cannot continue their studies due to hardship and inequality, which result in inadequate communication in many social interactions.

The Manobo are probably the most numerous indigenous people groups in the Philippines in terms of ties and names. Various subgroups make up the Manobo group. Registered by the National Commission for Culture and the Arts in 2015, the overall national population, including subgroups, has been 749,042 since 1994. Manobo is concentrated in Bukidnon, Misamis Oriental, Surigao Del Sur, Agusan, Cotabato, and the Davao Region. The groups occupy such a vast region of distribution that dispersed groups have adopted the character of distinctiveness as independent ethnic groups, such as the Bagobo or the Higaonon and the Atta.

Manobo, who have been least affected by civilization, still live their indigenous lives, marketed, unsophisticated, and unspoiled in the upper reaches of the rivers. Their methods of cultivation are very primitive. For example, Bukidnon grows maize and rice as their main crops. Some farmers have introduced plowing methods, while others have used the 'slash-and-burn' process. Cotabato uses a farming method called *kaingin*, a process in which the fields are permitted to stay fallow for several periods of time so that the areas of planting can be transferred from place to place. This is rather costly since many plots of land are not used at one time. According to Ethnic Group Philippines, Manobo usually build their villages near small bodies of water or forest clearings, although they also opt for hillsides, rivers, valleys, and plateaus. The communities are small, consisting of only four to 12 houses. In some areas, there are long houses that accommodate a number of families, usually of an extended kind.

According to Datu Anglao, the Manobo community wants their children to have the ability to understand and respect their history, including their values, the structure of government, health practices, and language. They want to give attention and appreciation to indigenous languages such as theirs, which will improve people's awareness of Manobo's indigenous culture and identity, particularly students. Thus, in this study, the researchers discussed how the techniques of politeness are manifested when Manobo students communicate in the classroom to learn how they engage with their teachers and peers and, finally, to understand how they communicate in society.

Materials and Methods

This study employed qualitative research design, particularly descriptive and thematic analysis, to examine the politeness strategies used by Manobo students in interaction with their teachers. The qualitative-descriptive analysis is operational in the study since it focuses on determining facts and meanings in linguistic phenomena such as pragmatic elements in communication. On the other hand, the thematic analysis is functional in finding patterns and trends in the politeness strategies of the Manobo students.

The study was conducted in a school in Kidapawan City and participated by randomly-selected six Manobo students from two Grade 7 sections. This study selected Manobo students from Lake Agco because the school has 98% of Manobo students with Manobo and non-Manobo teachers. They engaged in focus group discussions using an interview guide questionnaire, and their interactions were recorded and transcribed for analysis. For ethical considerations, the researchers asked permission first from the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) concerning Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). After a thorough review, the researchers were instructed to request permission from the Department of Education in Kidapawan City.

Given that this study focuses on politeness strategies, we employed the theoretical framework of Brown and Levinson (1987), which highlighted positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on-record, and off-record, allowing us to establish the concept of this term in the conduct of the study. The analysis of the study was validated by two experts in linguistics to verify the examined results and for more detailed findings.

Results and Discussion

Classroom interactions are rich in linguistic phenomena since students and teachers engage in dynamic communication due to various factors, such as social relationships and diverse backgrounds. These factors can influence their way of communication and understanding the meanings attached to the language they use. The students' pragmatic competence is one of the interesting aspects to explore because of their diversity and nuances. Hence, their politeness strategies in social interactions are

intriguing, especially since they have distinct cultural backgrounds and individuality. The theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) explains the politeness strategies used by Manobo students toward their Manobo teachers, non-Manobo teacher, and peers within the academic setting. It also determines how the students demonstrate their politeness strategies in each interaction.

Positive Politeness Strategies (PP)

Manobo students utilized positive politeness strategies in their classroom interaction with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers. Manobo students exhibited politeness strategies towards both teachers by noticing and attending to the hearer. The only difference is that, with their Manobo teacher, the students mostly used the joking strategy, while with their non-Manobo teacher, they used the strategy of seeking agreement.

Students to Manobo Teacher

Strategy: Noticing and Attending to the Hearer

In the classroom observation, the result came out when S1 used the technique of (PP1) Noticing and Attending to the Hearer during the scenario by being attentive to the teacher even though the teacher did not directly address her. The word “ninyo” (you) used by the instructor does not directly address S1 but addresses all of the students in the classroom, which makes the listener anonymous. However, S1 heard what the teacher said and had the initial response by calling him “Sir” and by recognizing their teacher’s inquiry, the student minimized the danger to the optimistic face of the listener as he fulfilled his need to be noticed and attended.

This exchange of conversation shows that even though Manobo students treat a Manobo teacher as someone with control, they still have a solid emotional connection with him. Despite the shared cultural history of teachers and students, the teacher remained a valued senior and was the supreme authority in the teaching process in the classroom. The power gap between them, however, was very slight.

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 1 T: <i>Nakita ninyo si, sir?</i> (Have you seen, sir?)</p> <p>S1: <i>Naa sya didto, sir, o, nagtataw sa mga bata.</i> (He’s there, sir (o), watching the kids.)</p>	Noticing and attending to the listeners of the conversation	Showing direction to the teacher

As Brown and Levinson (1987) concluded, positive politeness considers the wishes of the listener to be understood and satisfied because of their preferences and aspirations. The purpose of this approach is to mitigate the risk to a constructive audience. This is supported by a report by Abel, Davoudi, and Ramezanzadeh (2015) on the politeness strategies of Iranian EFL students in a class blog. Students used constructive methods of politeness as a test of psychological closeness, reciprocity, and friendship within a group. Similarly, positive politeness methods were also utilized by Manobo students in their classroom sessions with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers.

Strategy: Joking

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 2 S5: <i>Gusto naming silang sakupin dahil marami silang kayamanan at mga pagkain.</i> (We want to invade them because they are wealthy and have a lot of food.)</p> <p>T: <i>Pagkain.</i> (Food.)</p> <p>S2: [giggles] <i>Way kan-on sa ilaha.</i> (They don't have rice.)</p> <p>Ss: [Laugh]</p>	Joking	Reducing the seriousness of the discussion

In Sample 2, S5 recites his answer “Gusto naming silang sakupin dahil marami silang kayamanan at mga pagkain” (we want to invade them because they are wealthy and have a lot of food). The end word “pagkain” (food) was reiterated by the teacher, which shows his interest in the answer of S5. In addition, S2 said the joke, “Way kan-on sa ilaha” (they do not have rice), and laughed, which can be indicated as a form of joking (PP7). The joke shows that S2 is also attending to what his classmate and teacher are saying, for he also reacted when the teacher repeated the word “pagkain.” This way of joking reduced the seriousness of the discussion because this made the whole class laugh. In line with the positive politeness strategy introduced by Brown and Levinson (1987), joking is one of the positive politeness strategies indicating that the interlocutors are close enough. They mutually shared background knowledge and values. The teacher and students’ responses indicated they wanted to make each other comfortable and feel close to each other.

Students to Non-Manobo Teacher

Strategy: Noticing and Attending the Hearer

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 3 T: Okay. Everybody, please stand. Everybody, please stand.</p> <p>Ss: Good afternoon, ma'am Jeysah. It's nice to see you this afternoon.</p> <p>T: Please take your seats.</p> <p>Ss: Thank you, ma'am.</p>	Noticing and attending the hearer	Showing respect

Similar to the interaction of Manobo students with their Manobo teachers, it can also be seen in Sample 3 that students displayed appreciation for their teachers by referring to their greetings. They often used the In-Group Identity Marker (PP15) technique that was achieved by using the

community's name marker "Ma'am" to call a female teacher considered a decent citizen. This suggests that Manobo students often deem their non-Manobo instructors to be more dominant and maintain a distance from her.

Strategy: Seeking Agreement

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 4 T: <i>Pwede pud i-word.</i> (You may put through a word.)</p> <p>S3: <i>Ma'am. Magsulat ko'g word, ma'am.</i> (Ma'am, I will write a word, Ma'am.)</p> <p>T: <i>Sige, payts.</i> (Yes. You can do it.)</p>	<p>Seeking agreement by the addressee's statements through specific statements or repetitions</p>	<p>Following instruction</p>

In Sample 4, S3 used a positive politeness strategy by finding consensus with the addressee through the use of clear phrases or repetitions (PP4). He only decided to follow what the instructor had just told them to write, which is "Pwede" (you may). S3 continued the instruction by saying, "Magsulat ko'g word, ma'am" (Ma'am, I will write a word, ma'am). The utterance of the speaker made the hearer plain and heard.

The results of the study are supported by the studies of Ide (1989) in Blum-Kulka, (1992), who argued that politeness is dependent on status and social level (Manobo and non-Manobo), power and institutions of parenthood, circumstance (formal or informal) and considers that the concept of desire (face wants) is related to a specific community. In addition, Yule (1996) also argued that contact between people is affected by social distance and proximity. Their methods were primarily influenced by their cultural context, in which the power relationship between the teacher and the student is often unfair – the teacher is considered more honorable than the student. The respondents of this study have clearly shown consistency when using a proper politeness technique, particularly when engaging not only with their peers but also with their teachers.

Summary of Frequency of Strategies

With the information gathered by the researchers through data collection, observation, and FGD, it has been shown that students often used positive politeness with their teachers. They were eager when it comes to learning, and they did not forget to associate their learning with fun so that they could understand their lessons better.

Negative Politeness Strategies

Manobo students utilized negative politeness strategies in their classroom interaction with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers. Manobo students exhibited negative politeness strategies towards both teachers by being indirect and using hedges and questions. The only difference is that the students mostly would state FTA as a general fact with the Manobo teacher, while the non-Manobo teacher would tell or ask questions.

Supported by Brown and Levinson (1987), they stated that hostile politeness strategies address the hearing's need for freedom of action and to make their own choices. By employing this technique,

the speaker can pay gratitude deference to the addressee in exchange for the Face Damaging Act and thereby prevent incurring (or may thus reduce) future debt; he can preserve a social gap and avoid the danger (or possible loss of identity) of acquaintance to the addressee; he can grant the addressee a genuine 'out.'

Students to Manobo Teachers

Strategy: Indirect

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 5 T: <i>Oras: 9:22. Bilisan ha. Bilisan sa likod. 9:22 na. 8 minutes na lang.</i> (Time check, it's 9:22. Faster. Faster at the back. It's already 9:22. You only have 8 minutes left.)</p> <p>S2: <i>Sir, sa number 1 pa mi.</i> (Sir, we're still in number 1.)</p> <p>T: <i>Ha? Number 1? Uy Number 1 pa. Bilisan.</i> (What? Still in number 1? (Uy) You're still in number 1. Faster.)</p>	Being indirect	Expressing they cannot finish on time

Sample 5 reveals that Manobo students expressed their negative politeness by being indirect (NP1). The instructor said, "Oras: 9:22. It is Bilisan ha. Bilisan has her likes. 9:22 a.m. 8 minutes na lang" (Time check, it is 9:22. Faster. Faster at the back. It is already 9:22. You only have 8 minutes left), which asks them to respond quickly. S2 replied with, "Sir, sa number 1 pa mi." This shows an informal way of implying that they cannot finish on time, and the instructor may want to prolong the time and have to wait longer than 8 minutes. The student's tactic shows that he is concerned with the influence and space between the student and the instructor by not explicitly telling the teacher to prolong the time since it is his right to prolong the time.

Strategy: Using Hedges and Questions

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 6 [7:49-8:35 students are answering] S8: <i>Sir, pwede mutan-aw sa notes?</i> (Sir, can we open our notes?)</p> <p>T: <i>Para madali ninyong ma-answer?</i> (So that it's easier for you to answer?)</p>	Using Hedges and Questions	Expressing difficulty

Sample 6 reveals that S8 used a question (NP2) to express difficulty in the exam, which made him ask the instructor, “Sir, pwede mutan-aw sa notes?” (Sir, can we open our notes?). This assertion is a tactic of S8 to inform the instructor to shift his test guidance to “open notes” so they could answer the questions more easily. The usage of the query eliminates the face-threatening act communicated by the utterance, which leaves the teacher’s face free from imposition.

Strategy: Stating that the FTA is a General Rule/Fact

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 7 T: <i>Perlas ng Silangan. Mao na ang isa sa tawag sa bansang Pilipinas, Perlas ng Silangan. Kanina, may nagsabi- sa ano ni Pinantao, hindi yun- icorrect lang nato. Hindi 21 million. 20 million.</i> (Pearl of the Orient. That is one of the names attached to the Philippines, Pearl of the Orient. Earlier, someone said Pinantao. It's wrong. We have to correct it. It's not 21 million. It's 20 million.)</p> <p>S1: 21 ang nasulat sa ano, Sir. (21 was the one written, Sir?)</p> <p>T: 20 million yun lahat bilang bayad pinsala (It was a total of 20 million as payment for damages.)</p>	<p>Stating that the FTA is a general rule/fact</p>	<p>Expressing disagreement (Awareness of social distance and relationship)</p>

Sample 7 above expresses the student’s dissatisfaction with the teacher’s correction of his reaction. It uses a negative politeness tactic. It only notes that the FTA is a general rule/fact (NP) in which it states that its response is truthful and that it reads from the book given by the organization. Through this strategy, he was able to express his disagreement and reduce the danger of a face to the audience. This technique can only be used in the relationship between a Manobo instructor and a Manobo student. Brown and Levinson (1987) concluded that the declaration of the FTA as a general law or reality is one way of disassociating the speaker and the audience from the actual imposition of the FTA and, thus, a way of expressing that the speaker does not wish to intervene, but is compelled to do so only by circumstances.

Students to Non-Manobo Teachers
Strategy: Being Indirect

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 8 T: <i>Make it fast, guys.</i></p> <p>S5: <i>Excuse me, ma'am. Human na mi.</i> (Excuse me, ma'am. We're done.)</p> <p>T: <i>Kinsa mag-answer? May I see your paper.</i> (Who wants to answer? May I see your paper?)</p>	Being indirect	Asking the teacher to check the students' works

In Sample 8, students used an indirect negative politeness strategy (NP1). After finishing their job, they spoke to the instructor, "Excuse me, ma'am. Human na mi." (Excuse me, ma'am. We are done). The word "Excuse me" is a respectful expression that eliminates the FTAs intrusion of the instructor. "Human na mi" (We're done) is an informal way to ask the instructor to verify their work. It is seen that S5 finds the wish of the hearer to be unimpeded in taking action.

Strategy: Using Hedges and Questions

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 9 T: <i>I-open man nako ni unyag balik. Tan- awon lang nako kung ma-remember ninyo unsa ang mga Wh-questions.</i> (I will open this again later. I will check if you can still remember the Wh- questions.)</p> <p>S2: <i>Dili lang sa kuan Ma'am ha? Dili lang sa i...</i> (But not in the (kuan), Ma'am (ha)? Let's not...)</p> <p>T: <i>What Wh-question are we going to use if we ahm- we want to get information about a certain person.</i></p>	Using question	Expressing favor

Although the student expressed a favor in Sample 9 by the use of question (NP2), "Dili lang sa kuan, Ma'am ha? Dili lang sa i..." (But not in the (kuan), ma'am (ha)? Let's not...). They had a quiz, and the instructor had to close the visual aid. S2 expresses the favor of not closing and uses a challenge to help minimize the effect of the FTA on the audience. The speaker knew that the instructor was the hearer and should be the one to guide the students. Further, it is interesting to discuss the usage of the disagreeing formulaic expression "dili" and the pragmatic marker "kuan". The disagreeing formulaic

expression in Sample 15 functions as a request to appeal. Araneta and Ingilan (2022) claimed that the disagreeing formulaic expression *dili* can also convey an appeal to stop doing something wrong. In the case of Sample 15, student 2 appealed to the teacher not to include a topic in their assessment. In using the pragmatic marker *kuan*, the speaker used it as a placeholder, substituting a word in the utterance but never providing the intended word. However, the participants in the conversation understood what *kuan* means in the utterance, which is related to the topic in their activity or assessment. Araneta and Ingilan (2019) postulated that *kuan* functions as a placeholder to replace or substitute for the words the speaker is supposed to utter but is unable to mention the intended words.

Strategy: Telling or Asking the Reason

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 10 Eman: <i>Excuse me, ma'am Jeysah. Wala gyud ko kabalo sa answer kay wala ko nahatagan og hands-out.</i> (Excuse me, ma'am Jeysah. I don't know the answer because I didn't receive the handouts.)</p>	<p>Telling or asking the reason</p>	<p>Explaining lack of knowledge (Limitation of intellectual ability)</p>
<p>Erica: <i>Ma'am, sorry kaayo, ma'am, kay wala koy answer, ma'am, kay wala pa man gud ko nimo nahatag og handsout, ma'am.</i> (Ma'am, I'm really sorry, ma'am, because I don't have answers, ma'am, because you didn't give the handouts, ma'am.)</p>		
<p>Nicole: <i>Excuse me, ma'am. Wala gud ko kabalo, ma'am, kay wala man gud ko nimo nahatag og handouts.</i> (Excuse me, ma'am. I don't know, ma'am, because you didn't give me the handouts.)</p>		

Sample 10 is an excerpt from the FGD. It has been found that Manobo students have also provided reasons (PP12) to demonstrate constructive politeness techniques towards their non-Manobo teacher. The student's argument, "Kay wala man gud ko nimo nahatagan ug hands-out" (because you did not give me the handouts), implies that they lack information about the examination because the instructor refused to give them handouts. However, the use of "Excuse me, ma'am," "I'm sorry," and the assertion of "reason" corrects the threat, which lets the audience understand why the students need to state the FTA. The abovementioned negative politeness strategies shown by the respondents of the study are typical, especially when there are difficulties when it comes to their learning process, and they show it to their teachers, both Manobo and non-Manobo.

Summary of Frequency of Strategies

With the information gathered by the researchers through data collection, observation, and FGD, it has been shown that the students from the school used the negative politeness strategy whenever

they felt like their teacher's pace in teaching was faster than their expected learning pace. The students kept their politeness by properly calling their teachers, such as "Sir" and "Ma'am", but one observation is that they voiced out what they wanted and needed in crucial circumstances.

Bald On-Record

Bald on-record strategies were utilized by Manobo students in their classroom interaction with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers. Manobo students exhibited bald on-record strategies towards both teachers by directly addressing the person, having little or no desire to maintain the locutor's face, and being task-oriented. The only difference is that with non-Manobo teachers, the students would use the FTA for the interest of the speaker.

Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that the purpose of bald on-record tactics is not to mitigate the danger to the face of the audience; instead, they are used to answer the other person's needs specifically. These needs are apparent in the following samples presented.

Students to Manobo Teachers

Strategy: Directly address the other person

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 11 T: <i>Imong i-explain, ha, og unsay pasabot sa Sphere of Influence? Sige daw. Start na.</i> (You explain what's the meaning of sphere of influence. Okay. Let's start.)</p> <p>S4: <i>Pila ka sentence, sir?</i> (How many sentences, sir?)</p> <p>T: <i>Wala. Kanang direct to the point lang. Basta ipaliwanag.</i> (No [specific number of sentences]. Just be direct to the point. Just explain it.)</p>	<p>Directly address the other person to express his/her needs</p>	<p>Adding contribution to the topic (Maintaining an atmosphere of Enthusiastic Learning)</p>

In Sample 11, the instructor provided advice as to how the student could do the task in the classroom and finished it with "Start na" (Let us start). Because the teacher could not include the number of sentences in his instruction, the student wanted to know how many sentences should be written, and she asked, "Pila ka sentence, sir?" (How many sentences, sir?). The speaker told the Hearer of His Needs (BO) specifically in this approach, and he was straightforward and succinct.

Strategy: Having little or no desire to maintain someone’s face

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 12 T: <i>Asa na tong isa ka-pentelpen para magamit natin? O eto. Sino pa? O Velasco. Lejano.</i> (Where’s the other felt tip pen so that we can use it? Here. Who needs one? (O) Velasco, Lejano.)</p> <p>S9: <i>Ha?</i> (What?)</p> <p>T: <i>Isulat lang sa pisara. Lakaw na. Bilisan. Bilisan.</i> (Just write on the board. Go. Faster, faster.)</p>	<p>Having little or no desire to maintain someone’s face</p>	<p>Asking for repetition</p>

Example 12 demonstrates the student’s lack of commitment to the class. When the instructor called his name to give his response to the board, he said absently, “Ha?” The speaker’s tactic is a way to demonstrate that he has no idea what to do, so he asks specifically, “Ha, huh?” (What?). It indicates that the speaker had little to no need to hold a hearing face (BO) since the class was supposed to listen and be attentive to the teacher, and students were expected to be physically and mentally present.

Strategy: Task-oriented

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 13 T: <i>Unsa ilang ginagamit para dili na sila magdugayan para makuha nila dayon ang kanilang pinaplano?</i> (What are they using in order to avoid being late in getting what they had planned?)</p> <p>S3: <i>Ako, sir. Ako, sir. Sir! Tawaga ko, sir.</i> (Sir, me. Me, sir. Call me, sir.)</p> <p>T: <i>Yung iba naman siguro.</i> (Let’s have the others.)</p>	<p>Task-oriented</p>	<p>Expressing urgent want to participate</p>

There is only one occurrence in which a student used a bald strategy to be task-oriented (BO). The speaker offered instruction in the classroom to communicate with their Manobo instructor. In Sample 13, the instructor asked the students about their classes. Since S3 understood what to answer during the class discussion, he told the instructor to say, “Ako, sir. Ako, sir. Sir, sir! Tawaga ko, sir” (Sir, me. Me, sir. Call me, sir). In this sense, even though the instructor did not grant the student’s assignment, the speaker could please the listener’s face as the involvement in the classroom was anticipated.

Students to Non-Manobo Teacher

Strategy: Directly Address the Other Person to Express His/Her Needs

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 14 T: <i>Dili na ninyo sya isulat-</i> (Do not write it anymore.)</p> <p>S9: <i>Letter lang, ma'am?</i> (So, it's only the letter, ma'am?)</p> <p>T: <i>Letter lang. Yes, letter.</i> (It's only the letter. Yes, it's just the letter.)</p> <p>S1: <i>Ingon ani, ma'am? Tapos ang rhyme scheme, ma'am?</i> (Like this, ma'am? And then the rhyme scheme, ma'am?)</p>	<p>Directly address the other person to express his/her needs</p>	<p>Expressing urgency</p>

Previous samples are a situation in which the hearer is specifically addressed to communicate his/her expectations (BO). In Sample 14, during class observation, S9 wanted to know whether she should just write "letter", and S1 needed to verify with the instructor if her method of figuring the rhyme was correct. This is confirmed by Brown and Levinson (1987), suggesting that sometimes using a bald-on-record strategy can shock and shame the addressee, and this is used in cases where the speaker has a close relationship with the audience or where knowledge needs to be exchanged quickly.

Strategy: Having Little or No Desire to Maintain Someone's Face

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 15 T: Yes, that's number 5. What do you think is the theme or the message of the poem? <i>Sige</i>. I'll consider one word. One word actually can already express the message of the theme of the poem.</p> <p>S6: <i>One. Isa lang, ma'am?</i> (One. Only one, ma'am?)</p> <p>T: <i>Pwede. Pwede.</i> (It's fine. It's fine.)</p> <p>S1: <i>Ani, ma'am. Pwede man duha, ma'am no?</i> (Like this, ma'am. It's fine if we have two, right, ma'am?)</p>	<p>Having little or no desire to maintain someone's face</p>	<p>Lacks comprehension to the instruction. (Limitation of Intellectual ability)</p>

Sample 15 reveals that students have little to no ability to hold the face of the listener (BO4). It is presented as they show their lack of awareness of the teacher’s teaching, “I’m going to consider one word.” In other words, they should write more than one word or one word. S6 and S1 asked the instructor several questions about the teaching that was very explicit in the teacher’s voice. Their comments also did not mitigate the danger to the face of the listener since they were supposed to compose after the advice had been given. This is confirmed by Brown and Levinson (1987), which claimed that having little to no desire to preserve a person’s face is used to convey a clear message to the hearer without a desire to preserve the face of the hearer. In the study results, Manobo students only used this technique against their Manobo teachers and non-Manobo teachers if they feel an immediate need for information.

Strategy: Being Task-Oriented

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 16 T: <i>Exchange papers. Keep quiet with the answer kay madungog.</i> (Exchange papers. Keep quiet with the answer lest you will be heard.)</p> <p>S5: <i>Ma’am. Ikaw nalang mag-answer, ma’am.</i> (Ma’am, just answer it, ma’am).</p> <p>T: Okay.</p> <p>S5: Hay! Thank you!</p>	Being task-oriented	Giving suggestion

Sample 16 reveals that the instructor directs the students to “Keep quiet with the answer kay madungog” (Keep quiet with the answer lest you will be heard). S5 then says, “Ma’am, ikaw nalang mag- answer” (Ma’am, just answer it, ma’am). This assertion is task-oriented (BO2) because it meets the teacher’s wish that other students will not hear the responses. Manobo students’ comments on this strategy are imperative for their Manobo and non-Manobo instructors. Brown and Levinson (1987) concluded that this approach is a straightforward way of saying things, without reducing taxes, in a direct, transparent, unequivocal, and succinct fashion.

Strategy: Doing the FTA in the Interest of the Hearer

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 17 T: <i>Kay. Number 5. Number 5. I will not remove the visual aids. So that it would be easy for you to answer. O, spoon feeding na kaayo ni ha. Kay. Number 5.</i> (Kay. Number 5. Number 5. I will not remove the visual aids. So that it would be easy for you to answer. It's already spoon feeding. Kay, number 5.)</p> <p>S4: <i>Number 6 na, ma'am.</i> (We're already in number 6, ma'am.)</p> <p>T: <i>Ay, number 6?</i> (Really? We're in number 6?)</p>	Doing the FTA for the interest of the hearer	Guiding the hearer

In Sample 17, the student called the FTA for the benefit of the listener (BO5) as he said, “Number 6 na, ma’am” (We are already in number 6, ma’am). It is a straightforward comment directed to the instructor. The FTA is straightforward and succinct for the benefit of the listener since it directs the instructor to correct the number for the class exam. These results are confirmed by the evidence obtained from the focus group debate.

The students’ gestures are blunt, but they benefit the listener. By reminding the listener of the time, she is not going to be late for the next class. Also, the repeated use of the respectful word “Excuse me” and the in-group identity marker “Ma’am” suggest a reverence for the listener. Students understand entirely the psychological difference between them and the teacher in these sentences. This bald record technique can only be found in the relationship of Manobo students with their non-Manobo instructors. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the speaker uses this technique to support the listener’s attention.

Summary of Frequency of Strategies

With the information gathered by the researchers through data collection, observation, and Focus Group Discussion, it has been shown above that the students from the school most of the time showed the Bald-On Record Strategy to their non-Manobo teacher. It is evident in the transcribed conversation between students and teachers that they are frank and blunt with what they say, as if talking casually to their non-Manobo teacher rather than one who is also a Manobo.

Off Record Strategy

Included in the findings of the study and through the observation and discussions, the Manobo students were also found to use strategies that are off-record in their classroom interaction with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers by giving the teachers hints of what they want to say. According to Brown and Levinson, going off the record is when the speaker wishes to do the Face Threatening Act but wants to escape liability for doing so; he should do so off the record and leave it to the addressee to determine how to view it.

In the study of Umayah, Putra, and Suprianti (2017), it revealed that students used off-record to speak to the instructor while the context of the remarks was implicitly specified. This is because of the social distance between teacher and students, the preservation of the general environment of the teaching and learning process, the reduction of stress (tension reduction), and the development of teacher-student social experiences.

Students to Manobo Teacher
Strategy: Giving Hint

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 18 T: <i>Base sa Kasunduang Versailles, kinsa dapat mag-angkon sa silangan?</i> (Based on the Treaty of Versailles, who should have owned the east?)</p> <p>Ss: [silence]</p>	Giving hint	Expressing lack of knowledge on the topic

Sample 18 reveals that Manobo students used an off-record strategy that gave a hint (OR1). When the teacher asked the students about their subject, “Base sa Kasunduang Versailles, kinsa dapat mag-angkon sa silangan?” (Based on the Treaty of Versailles, who should have owned the East?), the students did not expressly say anything to convey their lack of information on the topic. Instead, they stayed quiet, which sent the instructor a clue that they did not know the answer to the question.

Students to Non-Manobo Teacher
Strategy: Giving Hint

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 19 T: Stanza, what else? Ay. Chia. Give me another element.</p> <p>S11: [silence]</p> <p>T: <i>Dapat memorize na na ninyong basic elements of poem ha. Okay. Give me two.</i> (You should have memorized the basic elements of poem. Okay. Give me two.)</p> <p>S11: [silence]</p>	Giving hint	Lack of Knowledge

In Sample 19, Manobo students often used an off-record strategy that offers a clue (OR1) to their non-Manobo teacher. The teacher asked Chia to send the student an element of a poem, but Chia remained silent. Then, she was asked to send two elements again, but she was still quiet. Her silence means that she did not understand the subject and that the teacher has to search for another student

who knows the answer. This study provides an outcome that Manobo students use an off-record strategy and rely upon the hearer's ability to decipher and interpret their utterances. Using an off-record strategy removes them from imposing possible FTA towards the hearer.

Summary of Frequency of Strategies

With the information gathered by the researchers through data collection, observation, and Focus Group Discussion, it has been shown above that those students from the school used the off-record strategy from time to time. Sometimes, some of them found it hard to understand the lessons well, but they used this kind of strategy for their teachers to further explain what they are talking about in class.

Politeness Strategies among Manobo Students

The data on the politeness strategies of Manobo students towards their peers were also generated from the transcript of the videos and audio recorded by the researchers. It has been found out that the Manobo students used Bald on-record, negative politeness, and positive politeness strategies.

Positive Politeness Strategy

Manobo students used politeness strategies towards their peers by joking, avoiding disagreement by using false agreement, and telling and asking for reasons. Abel, Davoudi, and Ramezanzadeh (2015) claim that students use positive politeness techniques as indicators of psychological closeness, reciprocity, and friendship within a group.

Strategy: Joking

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 20 S3: <i>10 ta karon?</i> (It's [February] 10 today?)</p> <p>S2: 3! Excited! (It's 3. Excited!)</p> <p>S3: Ay! Excited! [giggles]</p> <p>S2: <i>Hapit na Valentines!</i> (It's almost Valentines!)</p> <p>T: <i>Excited sa Valentines.</i> (We're excited for the Valentines!)</p> <p>S3: <i>Ee! Grabe. Wala gani, sir.</i> (No. We're not, sir.)</p> <p>S2: <i>Layo pa, De. 7 days pa.</i> (It's far, De. We still have 7 days.)</p>	Joking	Providing correct information

In Sample 20, S3 verified to S2 that the date was "10." S2's reply, "3! Excited", is a way to correct "10" with "3." Her response minimized the FTA to S2 when she added, "...Excited! Hapit na Valentine's Day" (...Excited! It is almost Valentines!). It is a means of mocking the audience by joking (PP7) to advance the date when she could not date Valentine's Day. S2 carried out this technique to create an FTA and, at the same time, to maintain a social connection with the listener.

Humor or joke is used to create a connection between the listener and the speaker. The results of the study reveal that Manobo students maintain a close bond in the classroom by telling each other jokes. This is confirmed by Yule (1996), who claimed that distance and social closeness affects the connection between the listener and the speaker. People who communicate with others include culture, relative status, social status, age, and degree of politeness. It can also be noted that, unlike the joke of students about their teachers, there is no in-group identification marker or mention of any name. This only means that students feel relaxed enough to tell other students a joke since they belong to the same society, social class, and age group.

Strategy: Avoiding disagreement by using false agreement

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 21 S3: <i>Nag-date ta!</i> (We had a date!)</p> <p>S2: <i>Nag-date diay ta? Unsaon nato pagdate na naa'y bisita?</i> (Dod we have a date? How can we have a date when there's a visitor?)</p> <p>S3: <i>Pagkahapon kaya. Pagkaudto nag-date.</i> (In the afternoon. In the noon, we had a date.)</p> <p>S2: <i>O, sige ikaw kay nag-date.</i> (Alright! You had a date.)</p>	<p>Avoiding disagreement by using false agreement</p>	<p>Dismissing conversation</p>

Sample 21 introduces S3 and S2's claims that they have a date. S2 employs a tactic to prevent conflict by using false consensus (PP5) when ignoring a discussion with "O, sige ikaw kay nag-date" (Alright! You had a date). This argument was made so the speaker might seem to agree on the concept or what the listener wished to believe. Brown and Levinson (1987) stressed that politeness is necessary to prevent a deterioration of communication. Thus, avoiding confrontation is a respectful means of making the hearer seem to be in sync with the idea put forth by the speaker.

Strategy: Telling or Asking the Reason

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 22 S1: <i>Classmate, pwede ko mukopya sa imong notes? Kay absent man gudko aning adlaw.</i> (Classmate, can I copy your notes. I was absent on that day.)</p> <p>S2: <i>Pwede ba ko makishare ug notebook nimo? Wala man gud ko ani paglesson sa teacher.</i> (Can I share with your notebook? I was absent when teacher discuss this lesson.)</p>	Telling or asking the reason	Asking favor
<p>Sample 23 S1: <i>Sorry, ha. Dli nako pwede ipairam akong calculator kay gamiton man gud nako ugma.</i> (Sorry, I cannot let you borrow my calculator because I will be using it tomorrow.)</p> <p>S2: <i>Sorry, ha. Dili gud pwede kay gamiton man gud namo ugma. Sa uban nalang.</i> (I'm really sorry. I cannot let you borrow it because I will be using it tomorrow. Just borrow from the others.)</p>		Expressing refusal

Samples 22 and 23 are drawn from the transcript of the focus group debate. There are recent results in which Manobo students are now saying or looking for a justification to explain a constructive strategy of politeness in the classroom. In Sample 22, the speakers said, “Pwede ba ko makishare ug notebook nimo? Wala man gud ko ani paglesson sa trainer” (Can I share with your notebook? I was absent when the teacher discussed this lesson) and “Classmate, pwede ko mukopya sa imong notes? Kay absent man gud ko aning adlaw” (Classmate, can I copy your notes? I was absent on that day). These statements suggest that the speakers ask a favor by mentioning the reason (PP12) why they need to borrow a note. The use of “Sorry” and the explanation for “kay gamiton ugma” (...I will be using it tomorrow) in Sample 23 makes the FTA rational. It would then be better for the hearer to accept the rejection of the speaker. By telling the reason (PP12) that they are calling for a favor and refusing to do so, the hearer is led to see the reasonableness of the speaker’s FTA.

Negative Politeness Strategy

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that speakers use negative politeness strategies not to hinder the freedom and attention of the listener. This is found in the interaction of Manobo students with their peers, wherein they maintain harmonious relationships in the classroom by using negative politeness strategies towards their peers by being indirect and using questions.

Strategy: Being Indirect

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
Sample 24 S3: <i>3? Ay 2 ko noh?</i> (Number 3? Wait, I'm number 2, right?) S5: <i>O!</i> (Yes!) S7: <i>Oi! 2 diri!</i> (Hey! We're number 2 here!) S1: <i>Diri. Diri 2!</i> (Here. Number 2 here.) S3: <i>Pila ka, Kim?</i> (What's your number, Kim?) S2: <i>3?</i> (Number 3?) S1: <i>Lima lang. Lima mi.</i> (We're 5. We're just only 5.) S6: <i>2 ka?</i> (Are you a number 2?) S1: <i>Diri.</i> (Here.)	Being indirect	Refusal to accept more members.

In sample 24, during the activity and observation, students share their group numbers to find their classmates. S1 then made it known that the membership cap for each party is five, “Lima lang. Lima mi,” (We are 5. We are just only 5). The speaker is indirect (NP1) by using the phrase implicitly indicating that their party has full members and that they refuse to allow further members. This comment allows the speaker to minimize the FTA to listeners who have not yet formed a group.

Brown and Levinson (1987) stressed that being indirect is met with contradictory tensions: the urge to make the listener “out” by being indirect and the desire to register. In the data, it can be observed that the traditional indirectness used by Manobo students against their peers is resolved. They use words and phrases distinct from the literal sense to convey the imminent threat in their comments.

Strategy: Using Question

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 25 T: <i>Okay. Exchange papers.</i></p> <p>S1: <i>Aha na imo, Roy?</i> (Where is yours, Roy?)</p> <p>T: <i>Huy. Counter clockwise.</i> (Hey. Counter clockwise.)</p> <p>S10: <i>Kadali lang, ma'am. Sige.</i> (Wait, ma'am. Okay...)</p>	Using question	Asking the hearer to act

In Sample 25, the teacher instructed the class to rotate their papers clockwise. S1 was talking to S10, "Aha na imo, Roy?" (Where is yours, Roy?). This question suggests that S1 is telling S10 to get his paper and include it in the rotation. By posing a question (NP2), S1 softens the order placed on the listener. The usage of the query (NP2) by S1 minimized the possibility of correction to the hearer. The results of the study indicate that Manobo students have effectively conveyed the FTA to their peers with the aid of questions. This strategy helped them to escape the imposition and coercion of other students and to develop a friendship with each other.

Bald On-record Strategy

Manobo students used bald on-record strategies by being task-oriented, having little or no desire to maintain someone's face, and doing the FTAs for the interest of the hearer. Yule (1996) claimed that distance and social closeness affect the connection between the listener and the speaker. Their communication depends on their culture, relative status, social status, age, and degree of politeness. It can also be noted that most strategies fall under bald on-record. This only means that students feel relaxed enough to talk to other students directly since they belong to the same society, social class, and age group.

Strategy: Task-oriented

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 26 T: <i>K. Kindly collect your paper. The sheet of paper, please. Next, group 2.</i></p> <p>S3: <i>Huy, lingkod lang, ha. Palakpak mo ug magkuan.</i> (Hey, just sit down. You clap your hands when (kuan).)</p>	Task-oriented	Requesting for audience

In Sample 26, it can be shown that there was a group demonstration, and it was the turn of Group 2 to show their work. The presenter told her colleagues, “Huy! Lingkod lang ha. Palakpak mo ug magkuan” (Hey, just sit down. You clap your hands when (kuan)). S3 was calling for an audience, so she challenged her group mates to sit and cheer as she began talking. The speaker used the strategy of being task-oriented (BO2) when he pronounced the act directly without being ambiguous. This result is confirmed by the evidence obtained in the focus group debate. This aligns with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) statement that a task-oriented approach poses little to no danger to the audience if the participants have a near social relationship. As the speaker and the listener work in the same environment, share the same history, and have known each other for a long time, task-oriented comments do not influence or pose a minimal challenge to the face of the listener.

Strategy: Having little or no desire to maintain someone’s face

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 27 T: We have, Christine, Ynna, very good! And Princess Nunez. Very good! Seven, six! We have Angel, we have Angel the second. Five?</p>	<p>Having little or no desire to maintain someone’s face</p>	<p>Speculating</p>
<p>S1: <i>Nagsunduganay man ning tulo!</i> (Those three are cheating.)</p>		
<p>S2: <i>Huy, wala mi nagpasundog ana!</i> (Hey, we’re not cheating.)</p>		

In Sample 27, S1’s sentence, “Nagsunduganay man ning tulo!” (Those three are cheating). It was speculated that her three classmates stole the answers, letting them get the same grades. Her comments were made explicitly to the listener (BO4). In addition, S2’s defensive phrase, “Huy! Wala mi nagpasundog ana” (Hey, we are not cheating), is direct, too. They use “Huy” to suggest that the two speakers have known each other for a long time. Thus, the utterance has little or no threat to the hearer. These statements support the findings that Manobo students are clear and straightforward when talking to their peers. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this technique is used to express a straightforward message to the audience without maintaining his face. This strategy is used by Manobo students when they need to confirm or ask for information or when they have a close connection between the speaker and the audience.

Strategy: Doing the FTAs in the interest of the hearer

Sample Utterances of Manobo Students	Politeness Strategy	Interpretation
<p>Sample 28 Ss: [applause]</p> <p>S2: <i>Tama ni?</i> (Is this correct?)</p> <p>S1: <i>Mali. "U" man na. Dapat "Y"</i> (That's wrong. That is U. It should be Y.)</p>	Doing the FTAs for the interest of the hearer	Correcting spelling

In Sample 28, it can be observed that the S1 used the strategy of uttering the FTA for the benefit of the hearer (BO5) by changing the spelling of a phrase by saying, "Mali. U guy, man, na. Dapat Y" (That is wrong. That is U. It should be Y). The first "mali" (wrong) utterance of S1 is meant to be aggressive because it is derogatory and explicitly said to the listener. However, the following paragraph in which she made her correction makes her statement helpful to the hearer. That is, to instruct him to pronounce the word correctly. Brown and Levinson (1987) that speakers who are similar to each other are doing the FTA for the good of the audience. Since Manobo students are close to each other, they use this tactic to support their peers and classmates during their class interaction.

The findings of the study showed that Manobo students used all the politeness strategies in their classroom interactions with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers and peers. Students understand their relational isolation and connection to other participants in different ways. Blum-Kulka (1992) concluded that politeness is conditioned by force, distance, and friendship. In addition, Yule (1996) stressed that social isolation and social closeness are influences that affect people's experiences. The findings also indicate that the linguistic speech of Manobo students is minimal. It is correct that Sealza and Sealza (2000) have claimed that Manobo values and understands the need for education because, during data collection, students show enthusiasm and focus in the classroom.

In comparison, demonstrations of positive politeness, negative politeness, baldness, and off-record tactics can be observed in the relationships of Manobo students with both Manobo and non-Manobo instructors. It can be concluded that these techniques are consistent among Manobo students. Compared to Indonesian students in the study of Umayah, Putra, and Suprianti (2017), students often use positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-the-shelf approach in classroom interactions. This is reinforced by Tamara (1994), who claimed that the techniques of politeness rely on the culture of the listener. That is why the concept of politeness is culturally relative. This means that a friendly approach to another society does not necessarily mean the same thing to another culture. What is called respectful behavior in a society may not be tolerated in other cultures. It has been shown that the methods of politeness rely on culture.

Summary of Frequency of Strategies

With the information gathered by the researchers through data collection, observation, and focus group discussion, it has been shown that students from the school greeted their classmates or peers with the different strategies shown. It will depend on what kind of conversation they are having, whether or not it is serious. The strategies give the students a personal experience whenever they talk to their peers in school.

Manobo Students' Demonstration of Politeness Strategies between a Manobo and non-Manobo Teacher in Their Classroom Interaction

Based on the transcription of the 30-hour observation of the researchers through classroom interaction and Focus Group Discussion (FGD), the result shows differences in the students' ways of conversing with their Manobo teacher from the non-Manobo instructor. During the observation, both teachers ended up doing extra lectures as they had to cover many skills in a short time, particularly when it was hard for their students to understand the lesson. Apart from that, the students were able to understand and observe the rhythm of problem-solving and proper communication with the assistance of both educators.

It is also shown in the transcripts that all students provided respect and polite attitudes to both of their teachers. However, it is evident that they are more comfortable with their "Sir" than their "Ma'am" since he is one of them and can understand the students' struggles in learning better than anyone. Their conversations with their Manobo teacher are all easy-going, and they use the Joking strategy to overcome difficulty. It is advantageous that they could also use a different language in a classroom setting. It has been observed that they were blunter in speaking to their non-Manobo teacher than their Manobo teacher. It was fortunate that the teacher displayed friendliness and openness to the culture of the students, gave attention to each student, taught at a slow pace so that the students could follow, trained the students for the lessons by talking to them first, motivated the students to engage, and a sense of humor to escape boredom. The non-Manobo teacher was kind enough to experience that being rigid did not include students in the learning process and resulted in, if not absences and dropouts, non-compliance to the activities given at school.

Conclusion

The politeness strategies used by Manobo students in the classroom with their Manobo and non-Manobo teachers were positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on-record, and off-record. On the other hand, the politeness strategies among Manobo students were positive politeness, negative politeness, and bald-on record. Positive strategies of politeness were illustrated by recognizing and attending to the respondent, finding compliance with the addressee's comments by using clear statements or repetitions, increasing the audience's attention, and laughing. In the case of negative politeness tactics, students used queries and claimed that the FTA was a fact or a general law. The third predictor of negative politeness, which is stated, was only exhibited by the students towards their Manobo instructor. In the case of strategy baldness, students explicitly approached the listener to communicate their desires, had little or no incentive to hold someone's profile, were task-oriented, and did the FTA in the listener's interest. The fourth measure of baldness reported was communicated only by students to non-Manobo teachers. Finally, the students were seen off the record by giving their Manobo and non-Manobo instructors a clue.

Moreover, in the contact between Manobo students, the technique of constructive politeness was illustrated by making jokes and preventing disputes by using false consent. Negative politeness was conveyed by the use of questions and indirect responses. Finally, bald on-record was seen as task-oriented, showing little to no incentive to hold someone's face and doing the FTAs to benefit the listener. In the school, Manobo students were primarily interested in reacting to teacher teaching, questions, and support. Since linguistic capability was restricted and the social gap generated by age difference and institutional environment is high, students preferred to use some interpersonal role symbols, such as partnership, agreement, conflict, reaction, response, and affirmation, and use non-verbal expressions.

Linguistic expressions in the verbal interaction of Manobo students with their teachers were addressed: they expressed enthusiasm, joked, asked for thought, clarified and asked for information,

showed understanding of subjects, agreed and showed respect, and showed a good emotional relationship. The strategy of positive politeness was carried out mainly by reducing the threat of the face by using group identity markers, noticing and attending to the listener, agreeing, increasing the audience's interest and jokes, and telling or asking for reasons. Negative politeness techniques were used to render imperative expressions, to soften direct expressions by saying that FTA is a reality, to be indirect, and to use hedges and questions to reduce the imposition and strength of the message. The bald on-record strategy was used by Manobo students when working for their teachers and peers to show urgency, send directions and guidance, and make demands and refusals. The off-record technique was only used by students when communicating with their teachers when they did not understand the subject.

In addition, there was a close emotional relationship and a small social distance between Manobo students in peer-to-peer interaction in the classroom. Positive politeness was primarily caused by jokes, agreement, and telling and asking reasons. Negative politeness strategies were also used by being indirect and using questions. The Manobo students also employed the bald-on-record strategy towards their peers in expressing urgency, giving commands and instructions, and giving corrections.

It is important to read and broaden the knowledge regarding human behavior, particularly on students' expressions of politeness towards their teachers. Understanding why students employ these politeness strategies with both their teachers and peers is of particular significance. Hence, this study can offer a framework for knowledge of the politeness techniques that can be applied not only within a particular IP context but also across diverse indigenous cultural communities throughout the Philippines.

References

- Abel, 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. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2016.20377>
- Araneta, J. & Ingilan, S. (2019). Exploring the pragmatic functions of Cebuano kuan in conversations. *International Journal of Education Research for Higher Learning*, 25(2), 63-84.
- Araneta, J. & Ingilan, S. (2022). Pragmatic functions of formulaic expressions in Cebuano. *Southeastern Philippines Journal of Research and Development*, 27(2), 61-83.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). 10. The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. *Politeness in Language*, 255-280. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886542>
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Bremner, S. (2012). *Politeness and face research*. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0917>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 41-57.
- Codreanu, A., & Debu, A. (2011). Politeness in requests: Some research findings relevant for intercultural encounters. *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, 2(2), 127-136.
- Fernandez-Dalona, I. M., Palang, L., & Dalona, A. (2021). *Cross-cultural pragmatic competence and its implications for educational practice*. Tashkent Davlat Yuridik Universiteti Ixtisoslashtirilgan Filiali, 23-26.
- Fraser, B. (1983). *The domain of pragmatics Dalam language and communication*. Jack C. Richards & Richard W. Schmidt.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18(3), 213-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1955.11023008>.
- Hagge, J., & Kostelnick, C. (1989). Linguistic politeness in professional prose: A discourse analysis of auditors' suggestion letters, with implications for business communication pedagogy. *Written Communication*, 6(3), 312-339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088389006003004>
- Ingilan, S. (2018). Exploring the directives and politeness in Tausug Parang Sabil. *International Journal of Education Research for Higher Learning*, 24(1), 71-88.

- Jumanto, J. (2008). Komunikasi Fatis di Kalangan Penutur Jati Bahasa Inggris. *Semarang: World Pro*, 23.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Second language teaching & curriculum center*. University of Hawaii.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Routledge. London: Longman.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness (No. 17)*. Cambridge University Press.
- National Commission for Culture and the Arts. (n.d) *Peoples of the Philippines*. Manobo.
<https://tinyurl.com/ys9xxwny>
- Sealza, I. & Sealza L. (2000). *Child labor among indigenous peoples: The case of a Manobo in Bukidnon Province*.
- Umayah, S., Putra, I.N.A.J., & Suprianti, G.A.P. (2017). Politeness strategies in teacher-students classroom interaction at the eleventh grade students of SMK PGRI 1 Singaraja. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 5(2).
- Valentine, T. M. (1994). *When "no" means "yes": Agreeing and disagreeing in Indian English discourse*. International Conference on World Englishes Today.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.