



POLITENESS SPEECH ACT OF REFUSING IN THE SPEECH OF BOARDINGHOUSE MEMBER WITH DIFFERENT FIRST LANGUAGE

Novi Eka Susilowatia^{1*}, Muhammad Hambali²
Universitas Negeri Malang¹, University of Brawijaya²

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 02-12-2022

Accepted: 09-12-2022

Published: 18-12-2022

Keyword: speech act,
refuse, politeness,
different first language

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the form of politeness of speech acts of refusing in the speeches of boarding house members with different first languages. The diversity of first languages mastered by boarding house members makes communication between boarding house members interesting. Moreover, boarding house members who come from different cultural backgrounds and ages can influence the politeness strategies that must be used in communicating with fellow boarding house members. The subjects of this study were 8 boarding house members with different first languages. Data was collected by participatory-observation techniques. The results of the study show that there are several forms of speech acts of refusal produced by members of the boarding house. From the results of this study, it can be seen that the first language mastered does not have much effect on the politeness form of the speech act of refusing.

INTRODUCTION

The language used by people in any interaction and anywhere has several functions. In this regard Brown and Yule (1983, in Wahab, 2004) state that language has two very important functions in human life. First, is the transactional function, namely the function of language which is to express the contents of any sentence, for example, language is used to express factual information and proportional information.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: novi.eka.fs@um.ac.id (Novi Eka Susilowati)*, mhambali@ub.ac.id (Muhammad Hambali).

ISSN : 2523-613X (Online) - ISCE : Journal of Innovative Studies on Character and Education is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Second, is the interactional function, namely the function of language used to form, foster, and maintain social and individual relationships. When viewed from these two functions, it is no exaggeration to say that the second function places language at a higher level.

Recognizing that language is a cultural product, the language used by a group of people influences the values or cultural norms believed by that group of people. Language can reflect the culture that is owned, the level of education, work, and cultural norms that exist in society. Thus, the saying that language reflects the nation is still relevant to understanding the culture of a group of people.

Each group has its own culture. Thus, each of these groups also has its language. The language is built on the habits of group members which are then used to interact with group members.

Considering that language is part of the culture, which is not the same in each region, it must be realized that cultural norms that belong to certain groups may not necessarily be owned by other groups. It could be that the pattern of language in a group can be accepted by members of the group, but cannot be accepted by other group members. All of this depends on the habits of the members of the group in using a language and the norms that apply to the speech community. Habits and norms are very subjective, in communication activities, something is said to be good for one group, but not necessarily said to be good for another group.

As previously stated, each region has different cultures and norms. This certainly affects the acts of language carried out by its members. For example, in Javanese society, one of the idealistic characteristics of Javanese ethical values is the value of tolerance or tolerance. This implies that in communicating, the speech participant must have the ability to respect, appreciate, and maintain the existence of fellow human beings. Thus, communication can work well if understood when the speech participants can respect, appreciate, and maintain harmony in interaction. Javanese ethical values are different from ethical values in other societies.

In a society with a different cultural background, politeness strategies in communication must of course be given more attention. This is because there are differences in the values of politeness norms in each region. For this reason, it will be quite interesting to examine the use of language along with language politeness strategies for speech participants with different cultural backgrounds – including language backgrounds.

On the other hand, concerning communication and language, it is known that the primary function of language is a tool to convey messages or meanings from speakers to speech partners which are manifested in the form of symbols, words, or sentences. However, according to Searle (in Rani, et al, 2006: 158), in communication, speaking is not only interpreted as an activity to convey a certain meaning to the speech partner. Furthermore, Searle explained that language communication is not just symbols, words, or sentences, but it would be more appropriate to call it a product or result of symbols, words, or sentences in the form of speech act behavior. More specifically, speech acts are interpreted as attempts by language users to perform certain acts, for example praising, apologizing, asking, or criticizing (Ellis, 1995:159).

If someone wants to convey something to others, then something he wants to convey is the meaning or intent of the sentence. However, to convey the meaning or intention, speakers must express it in the form of speech acts. The speech acts he chooses to vary greatly, depending on the context. Therefore, it is very possible that in a speech act, the speaker utters a unique sentence because he has to adapt his utterance to the context. Thus, when talking about speech acts, they cannot be separated from the context in which the utterance occurs. This is based on the fact that the same utterance can be interpreted differently if the context in which the utterance occurs is also different.

In communication activities, there is an interaction between speakers (P) and hearers (T). To carry out these activities, speakers and interlocutors need to pay attention to the principles of cooperation and politeness in language so that the interaction between the two of them can run well. In this case, politeness takes precedence over cooperation because with politeness good cooperation will be established. Thus, the interaction process is expected to run well. The use of politeness principles is also intended to consider the meaning of a speech or a conversation.

Politeness is an important principle to apply in communication. Language politeness can be carried out by a participant because it is motivated by respect for other participants. The measure of politeness itself is marked by several value aspects, for example, young people should respect older people more, not interrupt other people's conversations, low intonation of voice, and pay attention to what the speech partner is saying. Politeness is defined as the basis for producing peace in

society and a tool for maintaining human cooperation (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Politeness is a form of social norm, so it is subjective. Thus, something is said to be polite to a person or member of a particular group, but not necessarily said to be polite to another person or group member. Watts (2003:1) states that it is not easy to define politeness. To reach an agreement on the definition of politeness, it is usually difficult to provide a definition that can accommodate an understanding of politeness as a whole because of subjectivity in understanding politeness. However, society has a general convention as to say something is polite or not. For example, in communication activities, speakers and hearers must both have the awareness to respect,

To protect the face of the speech partner, in carrying out speech acts, the speech participant must be good at choosing language politeness strategies. Politeness strategies are strategies used in social interactions to make these interactions work harmoniously (Prayogo, 2009:4). Politeness strategies are used to protect the listener's face (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Concerning speech acts, Searle divides speech acts into several types. One type of speech act is to refuse. In this study, research is limited to the study of politeness strategies in speech acts of refusing. Refusing is a negative verbal response to an invitation, request, or offer (Kartomihardjo, 1990:4). Refusing is a form of speech act that can threaten the listener's face. For this reason, choosing the right politeness strategy is quite influential in reducing the face threat.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Refusing Strategy Concepts and Forms

Refusing is one type of illocutionary act. Refusing is a term used to give a negative verbal response to an invitation, request, or offer (Kartomihardjo, 1990:4). In line with Kartomihardjo's opinion, Ellis (1993) also stated that refusal occurs in the form of responses to types of illocutionary acts (eg invitations, offers, requests, and giving suggestions). In this case, there is an imposition of responsibility between speakers and hearers. However, those who are more burdened with responsibility are speakers rather than hearers (Ellis, 1993:178). Therefore, refusing is a form of face-threatening speech act.

Some experts have distinguished forms or formulas of refusal. One of them is Beebe, Takahashi, and Ullis-Weltz. The refusal semantic formula developed by Beebe, 393 | ISCE : Journal of Innovative Studies on Character and

Takahashi, and Ullis-Weltz can be observed in table 1 below.

Type	Semantic Formulas	Example
Direct (Direct)	1. Performative (direct form) 2. Non-performing statements (indirect form)	I refuse. I can't.
Indirects (indirect)	3. Statement of regret (statement of regret) 4. Wish (hope) 5. Excuse, reason, explanation (apologies, excuses, explanations) 6. Statement of alternatives (optional statement) 7. Set conditions for past or future acceptance (sets past or future conditions for acceptance) 8. The promise of future acceptance (a promise to receive in the future) 9. Statement of principle (statement of principle) 10. Statement of Philosophy (philosophical statement) 11. Attempt to dissuade the interlocutor (attempt to ask interlocutor) 12. Acceptance that functions as refusal (except as a form of refuse) 13. Avoidance (eg silence or hedging) (avoidance [e.g. silent or subtly avoiding])	I'm sorry. I wish I could help you. I have a headache. I'd prefer to.... If you'd asked me earlier I'd have.... I'll do it next time. I've never done business with friends. One can't be too careful. It won't be any fun tonight. Well, maybe. I'm not sure.

**Table 1. Semantic Forms Used in Refusing (Based on Information Collected by Beebe, Takahashi, and Ullis-Weltz, 1990)
(Source: Ellis, 1995:179)**

Apart from Beebe, Takahashi, and Ullis-Weltz, other forms of refusal performance were also presented by Kartomihardjo. Kartomihardjo (1990) distinguishes forms of refusal into direct and indirect forms. The direct form is conveyed through the use of the

word "no" or its equivalent, with or without an apology preceded. As for the indirect form itself, it is still divided into several types. Here are the details.

No	Form	Example
1	Giving reasons for refusal with or without an apology	Sorry, I'm leaving. I want to go now.
2	Use of terms or conditions instead of a disclaimer	If you are responsible for the transportation, I will.
3	Use of suggestions or other options so that the respondent is free from the task of complying with the speaker's invitation, offer, or request	Just take your sister.
4	Use of thanks as a refusal	Thank you I'll be home soon, okay?
5	Use of comments as a disclaimer	Must now? Can you?
6	Use of nonverbal cues or resistance	Using a head shake Using a hand wave Be quiet

Table 2 Indirect Forms of Refusing
(Source: Kartomihardjo, 1990)

Based on the table above, it appears that Kartomihardjo divides the indirect form of refusal into six types. Thus, if added to the direct form, then the form of refusal initiated by Kartomihardjo consists of seven types. This number is indeed less than the amount stated by Beebe, Takahashi, and Ullis-Weltz. However, the essence of the two forms is relatively the same.

METHOD

This research approach is qualitative research. This study seeks to find out the forms and politeness strategies of refusing speech acts used by boarding house members with different first language backgrounds. The choice of this approach is also based on the research background. As is known that qualitative research is research conducted in natural settings. In this study, the background used is also a natural setting. Therefore, the selection of this approach is considered sufficient according to the characteristics of the study.

After the research design, this type of research is descriptive research. This is based on the premise that in this research, the researcher is only trying to describe

the form of the speech act of refusal used by boarding house members with different first language backgrounds. In addition, in this study, researchers also only try to describe the politeness strategies used in refusing.

The data used in this study are oral speeches performed by boarding house members in non-scientific activities because these speeches occur during dinner activities. A speech is a speech in the form of a refusal of a request, offer, or solicitation. The speech is the result of conversations between boarding house members and conversations between boarding house members and researchers.

Other data is in the form of descriptions of supporting materials related to this research problem, namely information from the research subjects themselves in the form of personal information, for example, the subject's origin/birth, level of education, and age of the subject. The data were obtained from unstructured interviews with research subjects. However, these other data are not always obtained from interviews. The data is also obtained from information in conversations that take place naturally and are not deliberately conditioned by the researcher.

The data in this study are the refusal utterances made by the speech participants in conversations that took place in a boarding house with boarding house members coming from various regions, cultures, and languages. The regional, cultural, and language backgrounds are (1) Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Tulungagung, Lamongan, Malang, Probolinggo, and Madiun with the first language (L1) Javanese, (2) Banyuwangi with L1 Osing, (3) Pamekasan with L1 Madurese, (4) Lombok with L1 Sasak, and (5) Krawang with L1 Sundanese. Data were obtained from all members of the boarding house who lived in the boarding house with a total of 8 people. In this case, the data used is the speech of the language, not the origin of the language speakers.

The conversations that took place at these locations vary. However, the data taken in this study were from conversations that occurred during the dinner process. Several things underlie the selection of this time. The reasons were (1) at dinner time, most of the boarding house members gathered so that it was possible to observe the speeches of the boarding house members with different cultural backgrounds; (2) when the activity was taking place, there were various topics of discussion, starting from the topic of dinner, activities that had been carried out

(lectures, afternoon naps, etc.), activities that were being carried out, and activities that would be carried out (eg evening prayer, doing assignments, watching movies, studying the next day, etc.).

Collection activities are carried out by paying attention to natural speech carried out by researchers and boarding house members. In this case, the researcher participates as a participant. The researcher acts as a participant observer. Therefore, the presence of researchers in collecting data is needed.

In collecting data, the researcher listened to the utterances performed by the research subjects. However, in more detail, in this study, the researcher did not only listen but also participated in the conversation so the researcher was also active in reproducing the speech. It's just that, the utterances conveyed by the researcher are only in the form of inducements to bring up intuitive speech acts of refusing the research subject. Not only that, but the researcher also recorded and recorded conversational activities to document the speech performed by the research subjects. Recording activities are carried out using a recorder on a mobile phone. The recording activities are carried out using observation guidelines prepared by researchers for research purposes.

The focus of this study's observations is the subject's speech which reflects refusal. The speech is a speech with one topic and subtopics or more. These aspects of refusal are reflected in various utterances along with the lingual and non-lingual contexts that lie behind them. Therefore, proportionally, data collection is done by "recording" the discourse unit and the context that underlies it.

In this research, there are several steps of activities carried out. First, the researcher collects data in the form of speech acts of refusal performed by research subjects. Second, after the data is collected, the next activity is data reduction. Reduction is done by identifying utterances that fit the research needs. In the conversations conducted by research subjects, there are several types of speech acts. For this reason, the researcher identified these speech acts to suit the research needs. In this study, the speech act needed is the speech act of refusing. For other speech acts, the researcher dismissed the data because it did not fit the needs of the study.

The third step is to provide data identity that fits the criteria. The identity of the subject in this study was hidden and replaced with a new identity to maintain

subjectivity and to maintain the research code of ethics. Next, the fourth step is to classify the data. Data classification is intended to select and sort data in the form of acts of refusal and strategies of acts of refusal. At this stage, the researcher analyzes the data obtained and relates it to existing theories. After that, the fifth step is to present the data. Finally, the sixth step is to conclude the results of the data analysis that has been done.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

In the utterances made by the research subjects, it appears that forms of refusal speech acts are uttered quite often. The illocutionary power of this speech act reflects that the speaker does not accept invitations, offers, or requests made by the speaker. From the results of the data analysis, it also appears that the speech act of refusing has a heterogeneous form. This heterogeneity concerns the forms and strategies used in expressing the speech act of refusing.

Forms of Speech Acts of Refusing

Based on the results of data analysis, information was obtained about forms of speech and acts of refusal in the speeches of boarding house residents with a different first language. Here's an explanation.

Using the word "no" or its equivalent, with or without an apology

As a form of refusal, the use of the word "no" and its equivalent is often used. The use of this word is mainly used by speakers who have equal or almost the same position, power, social distance, or age. The use of this word is sufficient reason for T to express his refusal quite politely because there is no particular reason that makes T think of using another, more polite form. The use of this form is considered polite enough when it is used for peers who are quite close, although other forms are also considered to be no worse than this form.

The use of the word "no" and its equivalent is a direct form of expressing refusal. The illocutionary power of refusal in this form is quite explicit. The following quote is an example of using the word "no" and its equivalent in refusing.

(1) DS : Eh, habis ini ke kamarku, ya? Ada sesuatu. Facebook-ku.
(Er, after this go to my room, huh? There is something. My Facebook.)

NI : Nggak ah, aku mau ngerjakan tugas, nih.

(No, I want to do the work, here.)

Context : DS invited NI to his room to help DS check the problem on his Facebook.

Quote (1) above shows that NI uses the word "no" to express its refusal of DS's invitation. At that time, DS was having problems changing his account name on Facebook. Therefore, DS asked for NI's assistance to change the account name. Unfortunately, NI has activities and can't help DS.

In this speech, DS and NI are peers. Both are at the same level, in terms of class and age. Therefore, the use of the word "no" and its equivalent is considered sufficient to express refusal. The use of the word is also considered polite enough for them even though this statement could be considered rude if it is not preceded or ended with an apology.

Provide reasons for refusing, with or without an apology

The use of reasons to show refusal was caused by T's attempt to convince P that his refusal was not arbitrary. T has a higher priority to do than accepting P's invitation, offer, or request. Accompanied by reasons, T hopes that P understands and knows with certainty T's position when refusing P's invitation, offer, or request. T hopes that P will not be offended by the refusal of T if there is strong evidence or reasons related to the refusal.

In addition to the reasons above, T or P will likely feel bad when T refuses P's invitation, offer or request. It could be that P feels slighted, belittled, or ignored when his invitation, offer or request is refused. Likewise with T. His refusal could make T feel bad for P because he could not comply with P's invitation, offer, or request. Therefore, the reasons given by T are expected to be a tool to neutralize P's mood. If P accepts, the feeling of discomfort at T may be reduced or may be lost. This can be seen in the conversation snippet below.

(2) WF : Eh, Rul, kamu mau nggak ntar nganter aku ke Miauw. Sewa kaset. Kita nonton.

(Er, Rul, do you want to accompany me to Miauw or not? Rent cassette. We watch.)

NI : Aduh, Mir. Capek aku. Maaf, ya? Nggak apa-apa, kan?

(Oops, Mir. I'm tired. Sorry, yes? It's okay, right?)

Context : WF asked NI to accompany him to a VCD rental to borrow a film.

In quote (2), NI refused WF's request. He also includes reasons to justify his

refusal. However, it was felt that this reason could make P feel uncomfortable so T felt the need to confirm to P that the reason was accepted and did not make P feel uncomfortable. The use of interrogative sentences “nggak apa-apa, kan? (It's okay, right?)” is the form used by T to ensure that P accepts T's reasons broadly. Based on these data, it can be concluded that the language form of refusal is often followed by reasons so that the refusal conveyed does not sound too harsh, firm, or harsh (Kartomihardjo, 1990:56).

Use of terms or conditions as a substitute for disclaimer

The use of terms or conditions as a substitute for refusal is also quite common in the speech of research subjects. In the speech they did, they several times gave terms or conditions as a form of their refusal. This is done so that their refusal does not seem harsh or too to the point. Here's an example of the conversation.

- (3) US : Ayo nanti kita nonton. Aku tadi dapat film baru.
(Come on, we'll watch later. I just got a new movie.)
AH : Seandainya Mbak mau ngerjakan tugasku, mau dah aku.
(If you want to do my assignment, yes, I want to join you.)
Context : AS invites AH to watch a movie, but AH wants to do an assignment.

From speech (3) AH provides a condition for accepting AS's invitation. These conditions must be met if the US wants its request to be fulfilled even though in actual conditions the speaker does not want to accept the speaker's invitation. It's just that so that the refusal looks subtle, the interlocutor gives conditions in the hope that the speaker cannot fulfill these requirements so that his refusal is fulfilled.

Submission of this condition does not indicate the speaker's refusal because if the speaker meets the speaker's requirements, the speaker will accept the speaker's invitation. Submission of these conditions still allows speakers to fulfill the requirements (Kartimihardjo, 1990:59). If the requirements are fulfilled by the speaker, the speaker will also fulfill the invitation, offer, and request of the speaker. By the speaker, this conditional refusal can be used to test the seriousness of the speaker. Because if the speaker means it, he will surely be willing to fulfill the conditions put forward as long as the requirements are reasonable. If the conditions put forward by the speaker are unreasonable, then the speaker will be reluctant to fulfill them so that the "trick" of the speaker to refuse the speaker's invitation, offer, solicitation or request will be successfully carried out. This impossible requirement

makes the speaker know the sincerity of the speaker in accepting the invitation, invitation, offer, or request of the speaker. If the conditions put forward are cliché or something impossible to implement, then the respondent's willingness to comply with the invitation is not serious. In other words, an abstruse refusal is synonymous with a true refusal (Kartomohardjo, 1990:60).

Use of other proposals or options to free responder from duty fulfill the speaker's solicitation, offer, or request

According to Kartomihardjo (1990:61), the use of suggestions or choices is a constructive subtle refusal. The speaker in this case feels cared for, not just refused but given other possibilities to help solve the problem. Here's an example.

(4) WF : Ayo besok kemas-kemas. Kita segera pindah.

(Let's pack up tomorrow. We're moving soon.)

LF : Habis ujian aja, Mbak.

(After the exam doesn't do it, sis.)

AH : Yes, Mir. Werightstill bother. not like you.

Context : WF asked his friends the next day to pack up because they were moving soon.

Based on the dialogue above, LF provides an alternative to refusing WF's invitation. It is hoped that this choice can be used as a consideration for WF to choose another day related to his invitation so that the invitation can be fulfilled. Through this choice, it appears that LF did not immediately refuse WF's invitation but postponed the time to accept LF's invitation. Thus, this choice can simultaneously solve the problem "presented" by WF.

Use of acknowledgments

In conversation, thanks are not only used to give appreciation for other people's gifts or praise. More than that, thank you can also be used as a form of refusal. Here is an example of using thank you as a form of refusal.

(5) RA : Krupuk... krupuk...

(Crackers... crackers...)

IL : Makasih. Aku mah udah punya.

(Thanks. I already have.)

Context : RA offered crackers while eating to his friends, but IL already had crackers, so he refused RA's offer.

Acknowledgments are used as a form of refusal. This gratitude is given because the speaker has offered the speaker something that is owned by the speaker. A thank you is also done as a form of appreciation of the speaker to the speaker because the speaker feels that he is being cared for. Not only that, but the greeting is also done by the speaker to inform that the speaker has been able to overcome his problems (Kartomihardjo, 1990:62). In this case, the speaker usually feels relieved even though the offer, invitation, solicitation, or request is refused.

Use of comments

The use of comments usually relates to a solicitation, offer, invitation or request. In this case, it seems that the speaker doubts the truth of what the speaker said.

(6) AH : Ntar deh kalau aku kaya tak ajak makan di Assalamu'alaikum deh kalian.
(Come on. if I'm rich don't invite me to eat at Assalamu'alaikum deh you guys.)

WF : Ke Assalamu'alaikum? Emang duitmu cukup?

(To Assalamualaikum? Is your money enough?)

Context : AH dreams of inviting his friends to eat together at the Assalamu'alaikum shop if he is rich.

The comments made by WF above show WF's doubts about AH's invitation. This hesitation made WF refuse AH's invitation to eat at the Assalamu'alaikum shop. WF conveyed this refusal by including a comment in the form of a joke to AH. Jokes or jokes of this kind are sometimes needed to make the refusal seem more polite and subtle. Jokes can also encourage the realization or maintenance of one's intimate relationships (Leech, 1993:228). In fact, at the research location, joking has become a "custom" of research subjects. These jokes usually appear in the form of sounding (ceremonial insulting dialogue) between speech participants (Leech, 1993:239).

Use of signs or nonverbal refusal

The use of nonverbal cues or refusal can be done in three forms, namely shaking the head, waving the hand, and keeping silent. These cues do not include verbal cues but are called kinesics. In the data obtained in this study, not all of these cues were performed by the research subjects. The data in this study indicate that

the research subjects used to shake their heads and were silent when expressing refusal. Here's an example.

(7) AN : Mbak, ini ada tahu krispi.

(Sis, here is crispy tofu.)

AR : (shake his head)

Context : AN offered crispy tofu but AR didn't want to and there was food in his mouth so he could only shake his head to show his refusal.

The response by shaking the head was also performed by the research subjects. However, this response is rarely used. This response only appeared because the time conversation took place at dinner so it was not possible for the participants to be said to be chewing food at that time. this makes the speech participant have to speak when there is no food in his mouth. If there is food, the speech participant cannot speak so he can only use nonverbal cues to respond to the speech of his speech partner, including shaking his head in response to offers, requests, invitations, or invitations. Moreover, this response also includes a response that is classified as impolite (Kartomihardjo, 1990:67). This response can lead to misunderstandings.

Another nonverbal response that the speech participant performs is a silent signal. This response is also given to an offer, invitation, solicitation, or request. Here's an example.

(8) DS : Ukhti, lauk?

(Sis, side dishes?)

RE : (Be quiet)

Context : DS offers a side dish that he got from his brother's house, but RE doesn't like the side dish so he refuses DS's offer with silence.

The use of this sign is sometimes used. The use of these signs sometimes also makes the speaker unable to understand the speaker's intent so refusal is an interpretation that the speaker might make. It's just that, the use of this silent gesture seems impolite because the speaker seems to ignore or even ignore the offer, solicitation, invitation, or request of the speaker. The use of this sign might

cause a reaction that the speaker does not want. However, as with the response of shaking the head, the response with silence is also rarely performed by the speaker.

Discussion

Based on the data analysis that has been done, it can be seen that the first language used by the speaker does not have much effect on the use of the form of the speech act of refusing. From the presentation of the data, it is known that only speakers with L1 Javanese use a slightly different language than speakers with L1 other than Javanese. One of these differences can be seen in the length of the speech. The length of the utterance is especially manifested in the expressions of refusal accompanied by reasons. Mostly, speakers with L1 Javanese feel that the longer the speech, the more polite the speech is. Rahardi (2005:54) states that in Indonesian society, especially in Javanese culture, there are indications that the longer a speech, the more polite it is.

In the Javanese speech community, politeness is often marked by ambiguity, indirectness, ambiguity, and the like. The person involved in the conversation is expected to be able to read the hidden intentions of the speech partner. In other words, participants in a speech must be able to read the *sasmita* or hidden intentions of the speaker. Kartomihardjo (in Rahardi, 2005:58) states that it is closely related to one's self-esteem. Because of this, the utterances of refusal made by participants speaking L1 Javanese and originating from Java tend to be longer and vague to maintain politeness.

In the speech performed by the research subject, it is also known that the speaker uses a lot of direct speech acts in expressing his refusal. Even so, some direct speech acts in refusing are still followed by reasons, comments, or choices. This is intended so that the refusal made is considered polite enough because the continuity of a speech act also determines the politeness of one's language. Speaking too directly and without further ado accompanied by clear and candid evidence will make the speech rude and impolite (Rahardi, 2005:55).

Kartomihardjo (in Rahardi, 2005:58) states, one of the strategies chosen is to use blurry speech earlier. With this blurry utterance, the speaker is expected to be able to read "*sasmita*" or the hidden intention of the speaker. *Sasmita* (hidden meaning) is closely related to one's self-esteem. *Sasmita* is used a lot so that one's intentions are achieved without hurting other people's feelings, while self-esteem is

404 | ISCE : Journal of Innovative Studies on Character and

guaranteed because the intentions conveyed are only in a veiled form. Therefore, sasmita can also be said as a means of saving face.

From a social perspective, it appears that power plays a significant role in determining the choice of politeness forms and strategies. Speech participants who are the subject of research choose a higher politeness strategy if they refuse offers, invitations, solicitations, or requests made by, for example, the head of the boarding house. This is because the chairman is the leader in the boarding house so he has more power in the boarding house. This implies that the request, solicitation, invitation, or offer made will be responded to well by the speech participant whose position is lower than his. Even if the said partner gives a negative response to a request, solicitation, invitation, or offer from the chairman,

Apart from being owned by the head of the boarding house, power is also owned by members of the boarding house who are of higher age and social status. This means that members of the boarding house have a "hidden agreement" within the scope of the speech community that older members are considered to have a higher social status. It's just that, the age of the young and old in this speech community is not only seen from the actual age (age) but also the class of students. The older the class, the older they are considered even though in terms of age this is not the case. The older boarding house members are also considered to have more power than the other boarding house members. Therefore, in refusing invitations, requests, offers, or invitations made by these three people,

CONCLUSIONS

Based on data analysis, it is known that the use of politeness strategies in the speech of the speech participants is influenced by social and societal contexts. In the social context, it appears that the participants are speaking enough to prioritize solidarity among themselves so they tend to choose politeness strategies that can maintain this solidarity. The maintenance of solidarity is carried out to protect the face of the speech partner. One of the ways to guard against this face is by using long and ambiguous speech. In this utterance, the speaker uses a vague meaning to maintain solidarity with the speaker. If the speaker refuses the speaker's offer clearly, it is feared that the speaker will be offended so that the solidarity between them is no longer harmonious. Therefore,

REFERÉNCES

- Brown, P and Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawud. (2008). *Perspektif Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Malang: Penerbit Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Ellis, R. (1995). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ibrahim, A.S. (1994). *Panduan Penelitian Etnografi Komunikasi*. Surabaya: Penerbit Usaha Nasional.
- Jumadi. (2005). *Representasi Kekuasaan dalam Wacana Kelas*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Kartomihardjo, S. (1990). *Bentuk Bahasa Penolakan (Penelitian Sociolinguistik)*. Penelitian tidak diterbitkan. Malang: Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Pascasarjana Proyek Peningkatan Perguruan Tinggi IKIP Malang.
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Terjemahan oleh M.D.D. Oka. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rani, A., Arifin, B., and Martutik. (2006). *Analisis Wacana: Sebuah Kajian Bahasa dalam Pemakaian*. Malang: Bayumedia.
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Act an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wahab, A. (2004). *Kesantunan Penolakan Berbahasa Indonesia di Kalangan Masyarakat Aceh Utara yang Ada di Malang*. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Malang: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Watts, R.J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.