SOCIAL DIMENSIONS ON POLITENESS STRATEGIES OF REFUSALS USED BY AMBONESE AND AMERICAN

Azwan
English Department of Letters Faculty, Iqra Buru University
Namlea, Maluku, Indonesia

Abstract

The aims of this study were to identify the politeness strategies used by Ambonese and Americans in refusing requests, as well as the effects of social relationships. A descriptive qualitative approach was used in the study. The data of American conversations were collected from youtube.com and direct observation by recording conversations between interlocutors by 20 respondents of Ambonese in any situation. The data was analyzed and classified using six politeness systems by Yassi, and politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. The results show that in interactions between strangers, Ambonese people tend to use a bald on record strategy, which is frequently combined with a negative politeness strategy, whereas Americans tend to use a negative politeness strategy, which includes expressing apology followed by a direct expression of refusal or using off record strategy. In intimate relationship, Ambonese people tend to use positive politeness strategy, whereas Americans tend to use off record strategy and negative politeness strategies. In hierarchal relationship, Ambonese tend to use negative politeness strategies by inferior to superior person, while Americans tend to use negative politeness strategies or off record strategies. Culturally, Ambonese people were influenced by local wisdom to maintain solidarity in responding and addressing, which is called Pela Gandong, whereas Americans were influenced by the freedom to express themselves.

Keywords: *Social Dimensions, Politeness Strategies, Refusals, Request.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The politeness of language in all countries are different and varied. The different is caused by the different culture and tradition in the country. it makes language has its own system for expressing politeness in various speech acts. While The politeness is first and foremost a social characteristic before it is a linguistic act. Every language

The ability to recognize speakers' communicative intentions and pragmatic meaning in speaking or writing to convey the purpose is critical to communication success. However, each person has a unique way of conveying their intent or purpose, which is influenced by a variety of social factors and speech situations. As noted by Tanck, (2003) in Sattar et al., (2011) that Speakers employ a variety of speech acts in order to achieve a communication goal. Include Searle's speech act categories like representatives, directives, commissives, expressive, and declarations. In addition, in the categories of speech acts, there are some specific measures such as; apologies, requests, complaints, and refusals (Kasper & Rose, 2001 in Sattar et al, 2011: 69).

The refusal speech act is one type of speech act that is particularly vulnerable to the occurrence of gaps and misunderstandings between individuals. When making any utterance, the speaker performs this act. It has been observed that when a person refuses someone right away, that person feels awkward because it appears to be an insult to that person.

Refusal strategies are different from one country to another and from one culture to another one. Not all languages or cultures use the same way in refusing an offer, request, invitation, or suggestions. Some discourse studies related to politeness strategies of refusal that presented in some articles and many leading research have done by comparing American society and other societies and even in Indonesia. For instance, Al-Kahtani (2005), Tanck (2003), etc. Beebe *et al.* (1990) reported that American participants shifted the order of a semantic formula based on the interlocutor's status such as equal or not equal. The American participants used regret first and then excuse in the second order when responding to a request from a friend as an equal status. However, in responding to a request from a person of unequal status, the participants' responses changed to positive opinion in the first position, followed by regret in the second position and excuse in the third position. Nadar, (2005), conducted a research under the title *"Penolakan Dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia"* they concluded that refusals in English and Indonesian language are different in the tendency of using speech acts. Ebsworth & Kodama (2011) also conducted a research under the title "*The pragmatics of refusals in English and Japanese: Alternative approaches to negotiation"*, they concluded that both American and Japanese groups tried to be considerate to others in order to avoid conflict; however, they took different approaches.

In another study, Nelson et al., (2002) conducted a research under the title "*Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Strategy Use in Egyptian Arabic and American English* Refusals" they concluded that the American and the Egyptian participants used similar strategies. Wang (2001) also carried out the study "*Refusal Realization Patterns in English and Chinese*", she concluded that (1) the directness level were correlated with politeness strategies, but not all the indirect refusals were polite. (2) The three social factors mentioned by Brown et al., (1987) were important in speech act behavior but their roles in the two languages were different. (3) Though both Chinese and Americans preferred indirect refusals, the Chinese were much more indirect, but Wang did not discuss in detail how the roles of social factors were different in the two cultures.

Based on some researches and explenations above, there were some handful investigations and researches on the politeness strategies of refusals. Therefore, this research makes an effort to study the comparison of the Ambonese and American in refusing requests. The researcher focused on the politeness strategies of refusals from two different cultural backgrounds, in terms of the social relationship between the interlocutor such as intimacy, stranger, and hierarchy. It aims to disclose the politeness strategies patterns of refusal to requests used by Ambonese and American in communications. The researcher believes that Ambonese society (referred to the people in Maluku province generally) have their own way of politeness strategies in refusing requests.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Refusals

Refusal is referred to a face-threatening act in speech acts. It is a sensitive situation

ELLITE
Journal of Education, Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching

in the communication process, which might create a positive or a negative affect over the communication (Nelson et al., 2002). According to Brown et al., (1987), each person has *Face* that must be tended, because the refusal itself is an action that can threaten a hearer's face, called *Face Threatening Act (FTA)*. Therefore, a form of refusal or rejection should be expressed politely, so it can be acceptable for the hearer and to minimize misunderstanding in communication process. Due to the essence of politeness theories is we change our language based on who is the hearer and some involvement factors. In this case, politeness plays an important role to protect "*face*" during the realization of speech act such as refusal, because refusal speech act is a negative response to answer an offer, request, invitation, or suggestions. As defined by Searle & Vanderveken, (1985) in Sattar et al., (2011) that *"The negative counterparts to acceptances and consentings are rejections and refusals. Just as one can accept offers, applications, and invitations, so each of these can be refused or rejected"*.

2.2 Face Threatening Act (FTA)

According to Brown and Levinson, (1987) in his concept of 'face' There is a variety of speech that tends to an undesirable action, that is called FTA (*Face Threatening Act*). They also propose a theory in which the use of politeness is culture-sensitive, and seriousness of an act is predicted by the sociological variables such as; social power (P), social distance (D) between a speaker and a hearer, and the absolute ranking (R) of impositions in a particular culture.

Brown and Levinson, (1987) categorized politeness strategies into five strategies: 1) *Bald on Record Strategies* (direct strategy without redressive action) are used by the speaker when there is a little risk of losing face. *2) Positive Politeness Strategies* are used to satisfy the hearer's desire to be liked and supported, where the speakers give a positive self-image to the hearers. *3) Negative Politeness Strategies,* in contrast, these strategies are meant to satisfy the hearer's desire to be respected (not imposed on). *4) Off Record Strategy,* is a strategy to do FTA indirectly where the speaker is vague, ambiguous, incomplete, being ironic, using metaphors and by letting the addressee to decide how to interpret the speaker's utterances. *5) Don't do the FTA* is the strategy whereby the speaker chooses to say nothing.

2.3 Politeness System

According to Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995) in Azwan, (2018) there are three possible social relationship which is correspond to three kinds of politeness systems which based on the values interlocutors assign to two contextual variables: *Power* (P) and *Distance* (D). The first two politeness systems are symmetrical, whereas the third is asymmetrical.

Based on three politeness systems presented by Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995); *Deference, Solidarity,* and *Hierarchy,* Yassi (2012) then developed Scollon and Scollon's three politeness systems become six politeness systems by three contextual variables: *Power (P), Distance (D)*, and *Kinship (K)*. First; *Deference politeness strategy in non-kin context* labeled as (-P,+D,-K), such as an interaction between two strangers. Second; *Deference politeness strategy in kin context* labeled as (-P,+D,+K), i.e. an interaction between two distant families. Third; *Solidarity politeness strategy in non-kin context* labeled as (-P,-D,-K) i.e. an interaction between two colleagues. Forth; *Solidarity*

politeness strategy in kin context labeled as (-P,-D,+K), i.e. an interaction between two siblings. Fifth; *Hierarchical politeness strategy in non-kin context* labeled as (+P,+D,-K), i.e. an interaction between a boss and an employee. Sixth; *Hierarchical politeness strategy in kin context* labeled as (+P,-D,+K), i.e. an interaction between parents and children (Yassi, 2012 in Azwan, 2021). According to Yassi (2012), the tree social variables; Power, Distance, and Kinship have positive contributions on politeness strategies used by the speakers to communicate with the hearers.

3.   METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the descriptive qualitative method in this study. Creswell (2009) revealed that the qualitative research is the methods to explore and understand the meaning of social or humanity issues by individuals or groups of people.

There are some procedures that used by the researcher in collecting data. Firstly, for Ambon's data, the researcher used direct observation by recording the conversation in any situation and taking note to remember every little thing that would be happened and including the relationship between the interlocutors. Secondly, For American's data, the researcher collected all the videos of conversation which deal with refusals used by the American through *www.youtube.com*.

The data analysis techniques used in this study were carried out in two stages: during data collection and after data collection. The first procedure was executed using these steps: Reducing data by identifying refusals while observing for Ambonese data and video clips for American data, selecting data relevant to the study's topic, and transcribing data from recordings and video clips into transcription. The second procedure was carried out by examining the transcriptions and categorizing the refusals whether in responding to requests or describing the social relationship between the interlocutors such as intimacy, stranger, and hierarchy based on six models of politeness system by Yassi (2012) approaches.

4.   FINDINGS

Here are the politeness strategies of refusals used by the speakers of Ambonese and Americans in refusing requests. Commonly, the findings are showed baldly in interaction between the interlocutors in different social relations.

4.1   Politeness Strategies Used by the Ambonese in refusing requests

(1) A conversation between a fundraiser and a visitor as strangers in a public centre.
The social relation = Deference politeness system in non-kin context (-P,+D,-K)
(A= fundraiser, B=visitor)
A: *permisi abang, caca tolong bali katong pung kue dolo, katong ada mo cari dana.*
(Excuse me. Would you like to buy our cake, please? We are doing on fundraise)
B: ***o seng seng ade, maaf e.***
(No, I am sorry)
The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A fundraiser requests that a visitor buy her cake in order for her to fundraise: *"Permisi abang, caca,*

bali katong pung kue dolo, katong ada mo cari dana". The request is then refused by a visitor using direct refusal. *"seng seng"* which is followed by give deference *"ade"*, and ended by apology *"maaf e"*. The refusal sequences here are **head act** (*seng seng ade*), and **post-refusal** (*maaf e*).

In deference politeness system, the preceding interactions show that B, as the speaker, generally begins refusal with direct refusal. *"seng"* which is apparently in less polite form in refusing request, but it is often combined by using give deference *"ade"* as in interaction (1). Speakers use these strategies to soften the refusal form, which is preceded by a direct refusal, and to try to respect the addressee even if they do not know each other. To make the refusal appear more polite, the speakers end the refusal with an apology, as in interaction (1) to indicate a speaker's repentance because she can not accept the addressee's request, and sometimes reason to explain the intent of refusal to addressee's request.

(2) An interaction between two cousins at home.
    The social relation= Deference politeness system in kin context (-P,+D,+K)
    (A=a bit younger, B=a bit older)
    A: Abang Wan, minta pulsa do, isi barang spulu jua ka..!!
    (I need some pulse, could you give me ten, please..!!)
    *B: **Sio.. ade tuang jantong hati e.. ka Wan pung pulsa lai ini to, tinggal nol rupia so satu minggu ini nanti jua e.***
    (Oh my pitiful sister, I have been no pulse for one week, maybe later)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request of favor. A who is a bit younger asks B as her couisin who is a bit older to buy her some pulse *"Abang Wan, minta pulsa do, isi barang spulu jua ka"*. B then refuses a request of A by using joke *"sio ade tuang jantong hati e"*, reason *"ka Wan pung pulsa lai to tinggal nol rupia so satu minggu ni"*, and followed by a promise *"nanti jua e"*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*sio ade tuang jantong hati e*), **head act** (*ka Wan pung pulsa lai ini to tinggal nol rupia so satu minggu ni*), and **post-refusal** (*nanti jua e*).

The interactions between the distant families in refusing request above show that B tend to start the refusal by using joke. This strategy is used by the speakers to keep a relation more abreast and looks unawkward between the interlocutors. In addition, the speaker also combines reason to explain the intent of refusal to addressee's request and promise as in interaction (2) to avoid the addressee feels disappointed.

(3) An interaction between two friends in deferent age in a preparation of wedding party.
    The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in non-kin context (-P,-D,-K)
    (A=older, B=younger)
    A: kamong sabantar pi angka kayo do par orang bamasa e
    (could you take some firewood for the cooks later, please?)
    *B: **ee maaf abang e, tadi bapa Ali lai so pangge katong par angka bambu biking sabua. Hii katong pung tulang-tulang mo pata.***
    (Oh, I am really sorry, just now Mr. Ali asked us to take some bamboos for the tent. Huh, we are very tired)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A asks B to take some firewood for the cooks in wedding party preparation *"kamong sabantar pi angka kayo dolo e par orang bamasa"*. B refuses the request by using apology which is followed

by give deference "*ee maaf abang e*", reason "*tadi bapa Ali lai so pangge katong par angka bambu biking sabua*", and joke "*hii.. katong pung tulang-tulang mo pata*". The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*ee maaf abang e*), **post-refusal** (*tadi bapa Ali so pangge katong par angka bambu biking sabua*), and **post-refusal** (*hii katong pung tulang-tulang mo pata*).

The interactions between two friends in different age which occurs above shows that B who is younger than A tends to start the refusal by using apology which is combined by give deference. It indicates that the junior should respect the senior in interaction. But commonly this strategy looks decrease the solidarity of interlocutors. Then it is often followed by another strategy such as giving reason as another factor to refuse the request indirectly or joke to comfort the addressee.

(4) An interaction between two close friends in the same age about sending massage for their lecturer.
The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in non-kin context (-P,-D,-K)
(A= adult male, B= adult male)
A: Ale tolong SMS antua jua e? beta blong isi pulsa ni..
(Could you send him massage, please?, I have not bought any count yet)
*B: **ado.. jang ale suruh beta kawan e.. beta tartau ator kata-kata.***
(Oh,, please, don't ask me, I cannot arrange the words)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A asks B to send their lecturer a massage "*Ale tolong SMS antua jua* e". B then refuses the request by using a direct refusal "*Ado jang Ale suru beta*" which is combined by addressed form "*kawan e*", and reason "*Beta tar tau ator kata-kata*". The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*Ado jang Ale suru beta*), **post-refusal** (*kawan e*), and **post-refusal** (*Beta tar tau ator kata-kata*).

The interactions between close friends in the same age above show that B tends to start the refusal using joke or a direct refusal which is always combined by addressed form. The strategies were used by the speaker to indicate the intimate relation between the interlocutors. Besides that the speakers also combines another strategy such as promise as the expectancy to avoid hurting addressee's feeling and reason as another factor to refuse the hearer's request.

(5) An interaction between two close families about taking the stuff in the rent house.
The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in kin context (-P,-D,+K)
(A=elder brother, B=younger brother)
A: Ba, nanti sadiki lai bisa pi angka barang-barang di kos do, barang beso lai so tarbisa itu.
(Would you like to take the things in the rent room, please. Because tomorrow is the deadline.)
*B: **Abang e, beta ada mo ka kapala skola par mo biking data siswa ni.   nanti beso pagi-pagi jua abang e?, pasti beta pi angka.***
(oh gosh brother, I should be in head master's house now, maybe tomorrow morning brother, may I? I certainly will)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. An elder brother asks his younger brother to take the things in the rent house "*Ba, nanti sadiki lai bisa pi angka barang-barang di kos do, barang   beso lai so tarbisa itu.* A younger brother then refuses his elder brother's request by using give deference *"Abang e*", reason "*beta ada*

mo ka kapala skola par mo biking data skola ni", and promise "*nanti beso pagi-pagi jua abang e, pasti beta pi angka*". The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*Abang e*), **pre-refusal** (*beta ada mo ka kapala skola par mo biking data skola ni*) **head act** (*nanti beso pagi-pagi jua abang e, pasti beta pi angka*).

The interactions between close families in refusing the request above show that B prefers to use give deference as a command strategy to indicate a different status between the interlocutors in kin context. Where B as a younger brother or sister should respect their elder brothers. While another combination strategy such as reason and promise are also used by the speakers which attemt to miinimize the addressee's face.

(6) An interaction between a headmaster and a staff about the list of students at school.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in non-kin context (+P,+D,-K)
(A=headmaster, B=staff)

A: *pa Anto, tolong kase pa deng ana-ana pung   nama dolo skarang.*
(Mr. Anto, could you give me the list of students now, please?

B: **mohon maaf pa, beta balong selesai akang, nanti beta antar di   ruangan jua pa kalo so selesai.**
(I am really sorry sir, I have not finished it, I will bring it to your room if it has been done sir)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A headmaster asks his staff to give him the lists of students' name "*Pa Anto, tolong kase pa deng ana-ana pung nama dolo skarang.* The staff then refuses the request by using apology *"mohon maaf"* which is combined by give deference *"pa"*, then followed by a reason *"beta balong selesai akang"*, and promise *"nanti beta antar di ruangan jua pa kalo so selesai"*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*mohon maaf pa*) **pre-refusal** (*beta balong selesai akang*) **head act** (*nanti beta antar di ruangan jua pa kalo so selesai*).

The interaction above show that B as an inferior person tends to refuse a request of A as a superior person by using apology which is followed by give deference. This strategies are used by the speaker to indicate a respect of an inferrior to a superior person. Additionally, the speaker also uses another strategies such as reason as head act of refusal and promise in order to make the refusal is accepted by the hearer.

(7) An interaction between husband and wife about making lunch.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in kin context (+P,-D,+K)
(A=Husband, B=wife)

A: *kamong biking makanang apa ma e?*
(What lunch do you make Mom?)

B: *katong balong bamasa e.*
(We have not cooked yet)

A: *kalo bagitu biking mi deng talor jua capat-capat e?*
(so, could you make noodles and eggs soon, please?)

B: **nanti jua biking makanang satu kali abang e, tapi sadiki lai beta lala.**
(may I make it all in once later, but a little longer because I am really tired)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A husband asks his wife to make him some noodles and eggs "*kalo bagitu biking mi deng talor jua capat-capat e*". His wife then refuses the request by using offer new solution "*nanti jua biking makanan satu kali*" which followed by give deference *"abang e"*, a promise *"tapi sadiki*

lai", and reason *"beta lala"*. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*nanti jua biking makanan satu kali*), **post-refusal** (*abang e*), **post-refusal** (*tapi sadiki lai*) **post-refusal** (*beta lala*).

(8) An interaction between uncle and niece about making a glass of tea.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in kin context (+P,-D,+K)

(A=Uncle, B=Niece)

A: Uni, biking bapa tenga deng te dolo.

(Uni, could you make me a glass of tea, please?)

B: **tenga e, beta mo pi mangaji tenga, suru ida jua e?)**

(Oh, I am getting ready to go for learning the Qur'an, could you ask Ida, please)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. An uncle asks his niece to make him a glass of tea *"Uni, biking bapa tenga deng te dolo"*. She then refuses the request by using give deference *"tenga e"*, a reason *"beta mo pi mangaji tenga"*, and offer new solution *"suru ida jua e"*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*tenga e*), **pre-refusal** (*beta mo pi mangaji tenga*) **head act** (*suru Ida jua e*).

The interactions in kinship above show the assymetrical relation. Where B as inferior person should attempt to respect A as superior person. Give deference is the mostly used by B. It is often combined by another strategies such as reason, offer new solution, and be conventionally indirect.

4.2 Politeness strategies used by American in refusing requests

(9) An interaction between two persons who have just known each other about taking a penny.

The social relation= Deference politeness system in non-kin context (-P,+D, K)

Speaker 1 : *Hey, there is a penny right there. Why don't you pick it up? It's good luck.*

Speaker 2 : **Only if it's heads** (*while inverting the penny*). *Now somebody else can have good luck. Bye.*

Speaker 1 : *Bye.*

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for advice. Speaker 1 askes speaker 2 to have a lucky penny (*penny* is indicated from British. The writer justificates this data to describe the whole of western culture) *"Hey, there is a penny right there. Why don't you pick it up? It's good luck"* but speaker 2 doesn't want to pick it up. Then she refuses the request by giving hints *"only if it's heads"*. This strategy is used by the speaker 2 to avoid treating hearer's face tactfully because they have just known each other once when snatching a cab away. The refusal sequence here is **head act** (*only if it's heads*).

(10) An interaction between two strangers about getting a ride for the downtown.

The social relation= Deference politeness system in non-kin context (-P,+D,-K)

Speaker 1 : *Hey, Could you drive me to the downtown, please?*

Speaker 2 : **Sorry, I can't.**

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. Speaker 1 asks speaker 2 to get a ride for downtown *"Hey, Could you drive me to the downtown, please?"*. Speaker 2 then refuses the request by using apology *"sorry"*, and a direct refusal *"I can't"*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*sorry*), **head act** (*I can't*).

ELLITE
Journal of Education, Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching

(11) An interaction between two cousins about calling Hunter.
The social relation= Deference politeness system in kin context (-P,+D,+K)
Speaker 1   : *John, can you call Hunter?*
Speaker 2   : ***Oh no, you may ask Laura..***

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. Speaker 1 asks speaker 2 to call Hunter "*John, can you call Hunter?*". Speaker 2 then refuses the request by using Direct refusal "*oh no*", and offer new solution "*you may ask Laura*. These strategies are used by the speaker 2 because he does not want to be distrubed in accomplishing his work. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*Oh no*), **post-refusal** (*you may ask Laura*).

(12) An interaction between two close friends about to return Mrs. Halena's recorder.
The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in non-kin context (-P,-D,-K)
Speaker 1   : *will you return Mrs. Helena's recorder?*
Speaker 2   : *is that the recorder which wasn't working?*
Speaker 1   : *Yup.*
Speaker 2   : ***I think it'll be better if you return it yourself.***

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. Speaker 1 asks speaker 2 to return Mrs. Helena's recorder "*will you return Mrs. Helena's recorder?*". Speaker 2 then refuses the request by using hedge "*I think it'll be better you return it by yourself*". This strategy is used by the speaker 2 because she does not want to be responsible on Mrs. Halena's recorder which was borrowed by a speaker 1.The refusal sequence here is **head act** (*I think it'll be better you return it by yourself*).

(13) An interaction between two best friends about to walk a tiger.
The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in non-kin context (-P,-D,-K)
Samuel   : *Rouf, what you doing?*
Rouf   : *Nothing, just listening to my mp3.*
Samuel   : *will you please walk Tiger for some time today?*
Rouf   : ***Samuel, you know I don't like pets.***

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. Samuel asks Rouf to walk his Tiger for some time "*will you please walk Tiger for some time today?*". Rouf refuses the request by giving hints "*Samuel, you know I don't like pets*". The strategy is used by Rouf because he wants to assert that he has a traumatic experience about animals. The refusal sequence here is **head act** (*Samuel, you know I don't like pets*).

(14) An interaction between two siblings about to show the painting.
The social relation= Solidarity politeness system in kin context (-P,-D,+K)
(Hunter=elder brother, Faith=younger sister)
Hunter   : *Faith, can you show me your painting?*
Faith   : ***No, no.. It's not like what you imagine.***

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for action. Hunter asks Faith to show him her painting "*Faith, can you show me your painting?*". Faith refuses the request by using Direct refusal "*No*" and be pessimistic "*It's not like what you imagine*". It is because Faith feels uncovertable to show her created picture for Hunter. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*No, no*) and **post-refusal** (*It's not like what you imagine*).

(15) An interaction between an employer and an employee about to take full-time in the office.
The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in non-kin context (+P,+D,-K)

(Rhonda= employer, Beth= employee)

Rhonda : *Juli's not coming back after she has the baby. We'd really like to have you back full-time.*

Beth : **I can't right now, Rhonda. I'm sorry.**

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. Rhonda as an employer asks Beth as an employee to have her back full-time in the office "*Juli's not coming back after she has the baby. We'd really like to have you back full-time*". Beth refuses the request by using a direct refusal "*I can't right now, Rhonda*" and apology "*I'm sorry*". In this case, Beth refuses Ronda's request because she has another work to do for several days at home. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*I can't right now, Rhonda*) and **post-refusal** (*I'm sorry*).

(16) An interaction between uncle and nephew about discussing a power of attorney.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in kin context (+P,-D,+K)

Uncle Peter : *Robert, we need to talk about a power of attorney. I know this is hard, but it's imperative*

Robert : **Not now, Uncle Peter.**

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for action. Uncle Peter asks Robert as his nephew to talk about a lawyer for his father who has just passed away "*Robert, we need to talk about a power of attorney. I know this is hard, but it's imperative*". Robert refuses the request by using direct refusal "*not now*", and addressed form "*Uncle Peter*". The refusal sequence here is **head act** (*not now*), and pos-refusal (*Uncle Peter*).

(17) An interaction between father and child about to turn the television off.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in kin context (+P,-D,+K)

Father : *Buddy, could you turn it off, please?*

Child : **No, It's almost over**

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for action. A father asks his son to turn the television off because it has been already midnight "*Buddy, could you turn it off, please?*". But then his son refuses his request by using direct refusal "*No*" and giving reason "*It's almost over*". The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*No*) and **post-refusal** (*It's almost over*).

(18) An interaction between a grandfather and a granddaughter about making sandwich.

The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in kin context (+P,-D,+K)

Grandfather : *would you like to do this yourself?*

Granddaughter : **only if you do it wrong.**

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for action. A grandfather asks his granddaughter to help him make her sandwich herself "*would you like to do this yourself?*" but then his granddaughter refuses his request by giving hints "*only if you do it wrong*". In Ambonese culture, a granddaughter's respond above is indicated impolite. But it is normal to use by the American. The refusal sequence here is **head act** (*only if you do it wrong*).

5. DISCUSSION

Based on the explanations above, the result of this research show that there are some different way and the similarity of choosing Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies

which used by the Ambonese and the American in refusing requests.

Some findings exposed that the politeness strategies of refusals are used by the speakers as the strategy in persuading or expressing their culture. It covers how Ambonese tended to interject giving deference "*abang*", "*ade"* and addressed form "*sodara*" when the relation between speakers and hearers are strangers or who have just known each other. These strategies are used by the speaker is not only to attempt respecting the addressee, but also to keep a relation more abreast and looks unawkward between the speaker and the hearer. Culturally, it reflects a motto of Ambonese people which is well known "*Pela gandong"* as adhesives relation of brotherhood. They believe that their originally come from the same culture despite their religion is different. Because it's a cultural bond, the *pela gandong* can be interpreted as "a calling of soul" of brotherhood. *Pela gandong* in Ambonese can be termed as a cultural local wisdom which institutionalized in every heart, mind, and behavior of Ambonese. Temporary, American's cultures usually express their feeling when refusing requests by expressing direct refusal or apology is enough to use politely.

In sum up, every culture have unique strategies in refusing requests. It depends on with whom they speak, where they speak, and how the condition is.

6. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussions above, the researcher comes up with some conclusions on the politeness strategies of refusals used by the Ambonese and American.

In refusing requests, Ambonese mostly used a long refusal sequences which consists of some strategies, while American speakers use short refusals sequences. Ambonese speakers tend to use bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy and negative politeness strategies such direct expressing of refusal, give deference, expressing apology, be conventionally indirect, using addressed form, reason, promise, offer new solution and joke to minimize the hearer's face. While American speakers tend to use bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategies, and off record strategies such as direct expression of refusal, expressing apology, hedge, reason, offer new solution, give hints and be ambiguous.

In the interaction between the strangers, Ambonese speakers tend to use bald on record strategy such as direct refusal as a head act of refusals sequence, then it is often combined by negative politeness strategy to avoid the refusals directly in refusing requests. American speakers tend to use negative politeness strategy as expressing apology then combined by direct expression of refusal or using off record strategy such as giving hints in refusing request.

In the interaction between friends in the same age, Ambonese speakers tend to use positive politeness strategies such as using addressed form, joke, reason and promise. While American speakers tend to give hints and hedge as sub strategies of off record strategy and negative politeness strategies. Whereas in the interaction between friends in deferent age, Ambonese speakers tend to combine positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies such as giving deference, reason and promise.

In the interaction between inferior and superior, Ambonese speakers tend to use negative politeness strategies such as give deference and expressing apology by an inferior to a superior person, while American speakers tend to use negative politeness strategies or off record strategies.

Culturally, Ambonese were influenced by local wisdom to maintain solidarity in responding and addressing, whereas Americans were influenced by the freedom to express themselves.

REFERENCES

Azwan, A. (2018). Politeness strategies of refusals to requests by Ambonese community. *LINGUA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, *15*(1), 1–6.

Azwan, A. (2021). THE STRATEGIES OF POLITENESS USED BY THE AMBONESE IN REFUSING INVITATIONS. *JURNAL BASIS*, *8*(1), 127–140.

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Mapping the field of mixed methods research*. SAGE publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Ebsworth, M. E., & Kodama, N. (2011). *The pragmatics of refusals in English and Japanese: Alternative approaches to negotiation*.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Nadar, F. X. (2005). Penolakan dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia (Kajian Pragmatik tentang Realisasi Strategi Kesopanan Berbahasa). *Disertasi. Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Gadjah Mada*.

Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Batal, M. Al, & Bakary, W. El. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2), 163–189.

Sattar, H. Q. A., Lah, S. C., & Suleiman, R. R. R. (2011). Refusal strategies in English by Malay university students. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *11*(3).

Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). Speech acts and illocutionary logic. In *Logic, thought and action* (pp. 109–132). Springer.

Tanck, S. (2003). Speech act sets of refusal and complaint: A comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *13*(1), 65–81.

Wang, A. (2001). Refusal realization patterns in English and Chinese. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(004).

Yassi, A. H. (2012). Negating and Affirming a proposition in Makassarese: Universality of Brown and Levinson Politeness Theory in F. *Kebahasaan, Sastra Dan Pendidikan. International Seminar Proceeding. FIB, Hasanuddin University, Makassar*.