

JEPAL

Journal of English Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics

<https://jurnal.masoemuniversity.ac.id/index.php/englishpedagogy>

Submitted: 13 December 2021 Accepted: 27 February 2022 Available Online: 28 February 2022

POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN SUNDANESE CONTEXT

Ayang Winda Sri Widianingsih

Masoem University

ayangwinda27@gmail.com

Abstract : This research aims on the refusal and acceptance strategies, as well as their politeness, in the context of a sundanese community in Kuningan. The study was formulated to answer research questions (1) what are the types of refusal and acceptance strategies used in Sundanese context?. (2) how is the politeness strategies happen in sundanese context?. This study employed the qualitative method as research design. A Discourse Completion Task (DCT) is employed to collect data from 20 respondents. Because the respondents are Sundanese, the questionnaire is written in Bahasa Sunda, making it easier to evaluate. The results show that there are 240 utterances, 150 of which are refusing and 90 of which are accepting. The refusal strategies are made up of 12 techniques, whereas the acceptance strategies are made up of 6 techniques. Most Sundanese respondents are courteous, as seen by their responses when requesting to follow their professor or when refusing to speak to a person of great power. So they know where they should be courteous and who they should talk to.

Keywords : acceptance, politeness, refusal, strategy, sundanese culture

INTRODUCTION

Language is crucial in communicating. To ensure that the conversation runs well, one must know how to deliver his remarks effectively. It is not simple to accomplish this, however there is a language approach that may be used to accomplish the goals, called the politeness method. Humans, being social beings, communicate with one another because they require one another. To accomplish so, they must use a specific language as a means of communication in their culture. Language may be defined as a collection of elements such as sounds, words, grammatical structure, and so on. People use this language to strive to live together by employing notions like as identity, power, class, status, solidarity, accommodation, face, gender, and politeness (Wardaugh & Fuller, 2015). Politeness was not only for one set of individuals in society, but it was also for everyone in all circumstances to utilize language as a tool in daily discussion in order to have a healthy social contact with other people in their lives (Togatorop, 2019).

According to (Thomas, 1995), politeness was a true objective that may be regarded as a genuine wish to be nice to others or as the underlying purpose for an individual's

language conduct. Using civility enabled listeners to provide an appropriate response to the speaker's query or request. The truth revealed that some people were unaware of their views when they did or said anything. When someone spoke to his/her friends, family, or others, he/she did not consider the words he/she would use.

Speakers use a variety of speech acts to achieve their communicative goals, (Sattar et al., 2011), including those of (Searle, 1969) broad seminal categories –commissives, declarations, directives, expressives, and representatives – as well as more specific acts such as apologies, requests, complaints, and refusals. A denial is an unfavorable reaction to an offer, request, invitation, or recommendation (Jalilifar, 2009). Refusals are significant because they play a vital role in everyday communication. It is frequently tough to refuse requests. Rejecting requests correctly involves not just verbal but also pragmatic expertise. It is much more difficult to reject them in a foreign language, because one runs the danger of insulting the interlocutor. One of Indonesian culture that shown through the use of language is refusing and accepting. It is happen everywhere including in Sundanese.

As the Sundanese people, learning Sundanese language is more difficult that learning English or using Indonesia language. There are many rules in Sundanese that should be obeyed if we want to speak Sundanese. It is a proof that there are cultural differences between sundanese and other. According to (Oatey, 2000), culture can be characterized as a system of cultural representations. A cultural representation is a particular type of metarepresentation (i.e. representation of a representation).

This study is focused on refusal and acceptance also the politeness in Sundanese context Kuningan. This research investigates the refusal and acceptance strategies in Sundanese context in Kuningan. Besides, politeness also topics that will be investigated. When we will refuse somebody request, we can not be direct to refuse it because the Sundanese will more focus on the politeness. They will refuse indirectly to save their face and also the speaker's face.

There are 746 languages in Indonesia such as Sundanese, Balinese, Javanese, etc. Sundanese becomes the main topic because we know that mostly Indonesian people used Sundanese as their habitual language. Besides, the background of the researcher is also Sundanese. To do this, the sundanese culture especially in language should be studied to give deeply understanding to the people.

To make clear about refusal and acceptance strategies in sundanese context, this study involved 20 respondents in Kuningan to get the answer of two research questions: (1) what are the types of refusal and acceptance strategies used in Sundanese context? and (2) how is the politeness happen in Sundanese context?.

LITERATURE REVIEW

All languages have distinct ways of rejecting and employ different techniques while refusing to make themselves and others feel more at ease. A refusal might be stated clearly or tacitly. An unambiguous denial in Indonesia is always denoted with negator *tidak* "no" or its (non-standard) forms such as *nggak*, *ndak*, *ogah*, and so on. (Aziz, 2000). An acceptance is a response offered by responders that demonstrates the speaker's desire to fulfill the request presented to him/her in the headact of the sequence of the answer or the illocutionary point. (Aziz, 2000).

Refusal and Acceptance Strategies

The refusal strategies consist of 12 strategies such as hesitation and lack of enthusiasm. When a person tries to deny something by manipulating their refusal, they utilize this method. Offer an alternative means that When the speaker considers the

interlocutor's request to be urgent, but he/she is already committed to sticking to his/her timetable, the speaker is more likely to suggest an option to his/her interlocutor (Aziz, 2000). Postponement means that the speakers do not instantly accept or deny the interlocutors' demands, but instead purposefully postpone their response. Speakers blame a third party or condition of affairs that prohibits them from meeting the interlocutors' wishes in order to shield themselves from either immediate or long-term consequences. (Aziz, 2000).

General acceptance of an offer with no details indicates indefiniteness and signifies the speaker's hesitancy to act on the request as well as the speaker's reluctance to openly decline the request (Aziz, 2000). General acceptance with explanation explains that the speaker appears to have accepted the interlocutor's request, but she/he later denied it in the ending sequence for whatever reason (Aziz, 2000). Although this method clearly conveys a refuse, it differs from the outright denial utilizing the negotiator *tidak* in that the speaker seems to be unclear in his/her refusal in some situations. Complaining and criticizing the way in which the terms are said would be viewed as a brusque refusal by the interlocutor.

While, the strategy of accepting consists of 6 strategies such as general yes or IFID that if the sequencing of the response or the illocutionary points suggests the speaker's readiness to fulfill the request given to him/her, the response will be classified as an acceptance (Aziz, 2000). A rhetorical response which refers to the strategy in which the speaker gives a rhetorical answer to his/her interlocutor as a response to the request addressed to him or her (Aziz, 2000: 78). Expression of solidarity means that there were times when the speaker felt that satisfying his or her interlocutor's request was just as vital as executing his or her arranged plans (Aziz, 2000).

Acceptance with reservations tell the respondent agreed to perform an act as requested by their interlocutors if particular conditions are met (Aziz, 2000). Non-committal responses, this category refers to a category of responses that the speaker does not give a specific answer. Comments without exemplification, this strategy can be acceptance and also refusals because the responses clearly indicated that the respondents would either accept or refuse the request uttered by their interlocutor (Aziz, 2000).

Politeness

When people study pragmatics may be related to the idea of politeness. According to (Yule, 1996), politeness may be defined as the tactics used to demonstrate awareness of another person's face. According to (Yule, 1996), civility may be achieved in settings of social distance or proximity. Meanwhile, (Leech, 1983) said that politeness is necessary asymmetrical, which is concerned with politeness with relation to the listener or speaker. The sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic components of pragmatics were recognized by these academics. Pragmalinguistics is the linguistic side of pragmatics, comprising "...the specific resources that a given language affords for communicating certain illocutions" (Leech, 1983).

Paltridge in (A. S. Winda, 2014) proposed three main rules of politeness. He followed the three major laws of politeness: 'don't intrude,' 'offer alternatives,' and 'make your listener feel good.' He used the example of someone apologizing for imposing by stating, "I'm extremely sorry for disturbing you, but..." Then, when the individual makes intricate requests, he makes it obvious by saying 'do you think you might possible...' to offer our hearer the option of refusing or making them feel good by answering something like 'you are more attractive at this time than me.'

(Brown & Levinson, S, 1987) claimed that there are three sociological factors are crucial in determining the level of politeness which the speaker (s) will use to an addressee (h): these are relative power (P) of hearer (h) over s (speaker), the social distance (D) between a speaker and a hearer, and the ranking (R) of impositions involve in doing the face-threatening act (FTA). Beside that, (Brown & Levinson, S, 1987) also stated: A social distance (D) of speaker (s) and hearer (h) (a symmetric relation); The relative power (P) of the speaker and the hearer (an asymmetric relation); The absolute ranking (R) of impositions in the particular culture.

(Brown & Levinson, S, 1987) stated that Ranking of imposition relates with “*the expenditure of goods and/or services by the H, the right of the S to perform the act, and the degree to which the H welcomes the imposition*”. They strongly believed that the three social factors can be seen to subsume most of the culturally specific social determinants of FTA expression. Then, (Yule, 1996) put in plain words that FTAs can be defined as a speaker’s utterance that represent a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self-image. Alternatively, given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat and it can be called as face saving act (Reiter, 2000).

METHOD

In this research, qualitative research is used as research design. (A. S. Winda, 2014) described design in qualitative research is an interactive process that involves “tacking” back and forth between the different components of the design, assessing the implications of purposes, theory, research question, methods and validity threats for one another.

The object of this research need 20 sundanese people in Kuningan. Data source of this research were chosen by using purposive sampling. (A. S. W. Winda, 2021) defines purposive sampling is a technique of determining a sample with certain consideration. The participants chosen because of some consideration such as : Even they are pointed out from different background, but they should be sundanese which come from every district in Kuningan. The different background indicates the variety of using sundanese language. Besides different background, they are also pointed out from every major of study, they should have quality in speaking and writing because this requesting strategy are shown both in speaking and writing.

DCT (Discourse Completion Task) is used to collect data. DCT data can, therefore, be regarded as indirectly representing “a participant’s accumulated experience within a given setting” (A. S. Winda, 2014). Responses to written questionnaires have been shown to “reflect the values of the native culture” (A. S. W. Winda, 2021) and defined as metapragmatic on the grounds that they represent culture-specific beliefs about what constitutes appropriate behaviour (Golato 2003) in (Ogiermann, 2012).

The data will be analyzed using politeness based on power, distance and ranking of imposition. The method of this study is categorized as a descriptive-qualitative. The technique of study is conducted as follows : Firstly, the researcher choosing the participants. The researcher looks for the students with high GPA. Secondly, the researcher prepares the situation for the questionnaire. Thirdly, when situations complete and the respondents are pointed out, the researcher doing a research. They are given the situations which should be responded. They should respond that situations as in normal conversation. Then, the writer analyzes the types of refusal and acceptance strategies of Sundanese context also their politeness based on their power, distance and ranking of imposition. Then, the writer classifies their answer.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSIONS

Based on the data, from eight situations spread out to 20 respondents, there are 240 utterances that also consist of 150 utterances of refusing and 90 utterances of accepting.

Refusal Strategies

The refusal strategies consist of 12 strategies such as hesitation and lack of enthusiasm, offer an alternative, postponement, put the blame on a third party, general acceptance of an offer but giving no details, general acceptance with excuse, giving reason and explanation, complaining and criticizing, conditional yes, questioning the justification of a request, threatening and comments without exemplification. While, the strategy of accepting consists of 6 strategies such as general yes or IFID, a rhetorical response, expression of solidarity, acceptance with reservations, non-committal responses and comments without exemplification. The detail description of refusing and accepting strategies are shown in the table below:

Table 1. The description frequency of refusal strategies

No	Strategies	Frequency
1.	Hesitation and lack of enthusiasm	32
2.	Offer an alternative	19
3.	Postponement	10
4.	Put the blame on a third party	4
5.	general acceptance of an offer but giving no detail	3
6.	General acceptance with excuse	26
7.	Giving reason and explanation	34
8.	Complaining and criticizing	1
9.	Conditional yes	3
10.	Questioning the justification of a request	5
11.	Threatening	4
12.	Comments without exemplification	8
Frequency		150

Table 2. The description frequency of acceptance strategies

No	Strategies	Frequency
1.	IFID	10
2.	Expression of solidarity	9
3.	A rhetorical response	21
4.	Acceptance with reservation	12
5.	Non-committal responses	33
6.	Comments without exemplification	5
Frequency		90

Hesitation and Lack of Enthusiasm

When a person tries to deny something by manipulating their refusal, they utilize this method. By employing the negator "*tidak*" instead of the negator "*tidak*", the individual feels more rude. The following sample are taken from the respondents :

Excerpt 1

Hapunten sateuacana, manawi abdi kirang sae dina nyandakeun acara anu sakral ieu (R3,S1).
(sorry maybe I was not very good in bringing an event).

Excerpt 2

Aduh punten, keenjing na abdi bade UAS upami nonton piala dunia teh bilih ke enjing nundutan.(R8,S7).
(oh sorry i will get final exam tomorrow if I watch the world cup, I fear that I will be so sleepy tomorrow).

The examples above clearly clarify their reactions, informing the interlocutors of their implicit response. They sent signals such as "*manawi abdi kirang sae*" and "*ke enjingna abdi bade uas,*" both of which indicated that the interlocuter's request was unacceptable.

Offer an alternative

When the speaker considers the interlocutor's request to be urgent, but he/she is already committed to sticking to his/her timetable, the speaker is more likely to suggest an option to his/her interlocutor (Aziz, 2000). These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered the offer an alternative situation.

Excerpt 3

Haduh, hapunten anu dipikasuhun, manawi abdi teh bade aya kagiatan di kampus janten teu tiasa nurutkeun kahoyong baraya. Kumaha lamun si udin bae pan si eta mah tos sering (R28, S1).
(oh sorry, I have events in my campus so I can not follow your wishes. what if udin because he's smart in bringing an event).

Excerpt 4

Hapunten, abdi teu wantun kangge mawakeun acara lantaran abdi tara biasa. Ke wae abdi miwarang pun raka anu tos biasa (R19,S2).
(sorry I can not be a host because I have not been accustomed to. let me ask my brother because he is experienced in bringing the show).

According to the three data points above, respondents expressed their remorse by expressing '*punten kang.*' They are disappointed since they are unable to provide what the interlocutor requested. As a result, the speaker offers an option that saves both the speaker's and the hearer's face. When the speaker wishes to decline the interlocutor who invited them to be a host, they may say something like "*ke wae abdi miwarang pun raka anu tos biasa*" or "*kumaha lamun si udin wae pan si eta mah tos sering.*"

Postponement

The speakers do not immediately accept or refuse the interlocutors' requests, but they deliberately delay their answer (Aziz, 2000). These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered the postponement situation.

Excerpt 5

Bade aya pamengan abdi teh, kedah dongkap ka bumi mamah ongkoh (R15, S6).
(I will have an activity, then I should go to my mother's house).

Excerpt 6

Abdi teh teu acan ngerjakeun tugas teras dipiwarang ngajajap mamah (R15, S3).
(I haven't finished my task yet then my mom asked me to accompany her).

According to the statistics shown above, the speakers do not accept and do not decline the interlocutors' requests. Data 6 revealed that the speaker delayed the answer by speaking in a long-winded manner. When they were asked whether they may eat supper with their new neighbor, they stated that they would have an activity first and then go to their mother's place.

Put the blame on a third party

This technique requires less input from the responder. This approach is used in only four utterances. Speakers blame a third party or a situation of things that prohibits them from meeting the interlocutors' wishes in order to shield themselves from either immediate or long-term consequences. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered put the blame on a third party situation.

Excerpt 7

Hapunten pa, kaleresan abdi aya peryogi ka bumi sepuh. Janten teu tiasa sumping (R1, S6).
(Sorry sir, inadvertent I have an event in my parent's house. So I can't come).

Excerpt 8

Punten poe eta teh abdi bade aya tamu ka rompok (R10, S1).
(Sorry, that day I will have a guest).

General acceptance of an offer but giving no detail

This tactic is used simply because such ambiguity reflects the speaker's unwillingness to act on the request and the speaker's reluctance to openly decline the request (Aziz, 2000). This means that the speaker suggests acceptance but does not accept it entirely. The following instances are drawn from respondents who responded with general acceptance of an offer but provided no details about the circumstance.

Excerpt 9

Kaleresan abdi teh tos tuang di rompok, muhun atuh sakedik wae hun (R8, S5).
(I happened to have eaten at home. let me eat a little).

Excerpt 10

Hapunten ibu abdi teu tiasa dongkap ka bumi ibu lantaran aya acara husus. Tapi insaallah ke ku abdi diusahakeun dongkap sakedap (R15, S6).
(sorry mom, I can not come to your home because I had a special event. But insha Allah I'll try to come up briefly).

The data told that the speaker accept the interlocuter's request but they did not promise to make it happen fully. They did not ensure their answer wheather refuse or accept it clearly.

General acceptance with excuse

The speaker appears to have accepted the interlocutor's request in the initial sequence of his/her speech, but she/he finally rejected it in the ending sequence for some reason (Aziz, 2000). It may be inferred that this method causes the speaker to want to accept but ultimately refuses. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered general acceptance with excuse situation.

Excerpt 11

Nampi pisan undangan tuangna, mung pun ibu kaleresan nuju ngayakeun acara kulawargi (R7, S6).
(I accept it but my mother is held the family event).

Excerpt 12

Abdi saleresna hoyong dongkap ka acara ibu mung abdi ke wengi kedah ka bumi pun biang (R9, S6).
(exactly, I want to come to your event but I should come to my wife's house tonight).

Giving reason and explanation

Although this method clearly expresses a refuse, it differs from the outright denial employing the negotator *tidak* in that the speaker seems to be unclear in his/her refusal in some circumstances (Aziz, 2000). The speaker explains why they are unable to accept the interlocutor's request indirectly. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered giving reason and explanation situation.

Excerpt 13

Hatur nuhun sateuacana tos nawisan ka abdi kaleresan sim kuring parantos tuang nembe pisan dirompok (R10, S5).

(Thanks already offered me, but I have already eaten in my house).

Excerpt 14

Hapunten pisan abdi teu tiasa kumargi aya tugas kangge ke enjing (R17, S3).

(I'm really sorry, I can't because I have task for tommorrow)

Complaining and criticizing

The speakers avoided using the negator *tidak* or its derivatives, but they did convey their off-the-record refusals in various ways. This approach was utilized in only one speech. That utterance is in the situation 3 used by the last respondent.

Excerpt 15

Nuhun mih da atos emam tuda wareg (R5, S3).

(Thanks mom, I have eaten, still full).

Conditional yes

If certain circumstances are met, the speaker is prepared to carry out the request made by his/her interlocutor. However, in the opinion of the interlocutor, such a condition may be considered unjustly presented. They can accept something for a specific reason, which is that the speaker is unable to do it. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered conditional yes situation.

Excerpt 16

Padahal abdi teh gaduh padamelan nu sanes tapi teu nanaon tiasa ke wengi ngadamelanna (R11, S3).

(Exactly, I have another task but it's never mind. I can do it tonight).

Excerpt 17

Nuhun pa tapi panginten abdi mung sakedap wae dongkapna kumargi aya kaperyogian (R9, S6).

(Thanks sir, but only for a while I came because I have an event).

Questioning the justification of a request

As an indirect denial that includes rhetorical questions, the goal of this tactic is to persuade the interlocutor that his/her request is undesirable. The speaker does not accept the request of the interlocutor. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered questioning the justification of a request situation.

Excerpt 18

Kabener? Geuning urang sih? (R17, S1).

(Really? Why should I?).

Excerpt 19

Sugan ke peuting piala dunia? Kabener? (R11, S7).

(Is the world cup tonight? Really?).

Treatening

The speaker does not accept and refuse the interlocutor's request directly, but she is instead threatens the interlocutors not to request something to her. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered threatening situation.

Excerpt 20

Duh kumaha nya! Teu tiasa heh upami dipaksakeun bilih ngarusak acara (R10, S1).

(Ouch, sorry I can't. If I am forced, I'm afraid that I will destroy the event).

The speaker threatens the interlocutor that if he is compelled to do what the speaker wants, the speaker will damage the event.

Comments without exemplification

The replies clearly suggested that the respondents would either accept or decline their interlocutor's request. The following instances are drawn from responders who responded to remarks without elaborating on the circumstance.

Excerpt 20

Hapunten pa nuju aya peryogi nu sanes, kedah ngumpulkeun tugas kangge ke enjing (R4, S3).

(I'm sorry sir, I have another task, I should collect my task for tomorrow).

Excerpt 21

Hapunten pa, margi abdi teu tiasa ngarencangan bapa rapat kumargi abdi teh nuju seueur tugas sareng waktosna tos meped (R17, S3).

(Sorry sir, I can't accompany you meeting because I have alot of task and I have no time).

Acceptance strategies

IFID

A respondent's response will be classified as an acceptance if the sequence of the response or the illocutionary points suggests the speaker's readiness to fulfill the request given to him/her. It is well known that this method requires the speaker to expressly accept the interlocutor's request. The following examples are drawn from respondents who responded to the IFID scenario.:

Excerpt 22

Mangga (R6, S2).

(Okay).

Excerpt 23

Abdi nampi pisan pa (R7, S8).

(I really accept it sir).

Expression of solidarity

On other situations, the speaker discovered that fulfilling his or her interlocutor's request was just as vital as fulfilling his or her arranged plans. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered expressin of solidarity situation.

Excerpt 24

Teh saleresna mah abdi teh sibuk, tapi tos teu nanaon. Insya allah, abdi teu enak ka teteh. Mung ka teteh bae abdi kersa (R9, S2).

(Actually I'm busy but it's ok. Insya Allah I will).

Excerpt 25

Abdi isin mang, tapi pami nolak abdi henteu enak ka mamang (R2, S4).

(Uncle, I'm shy. But I will not refuse because of you).

A Rhetorical Response

This approach refers to the strategy in which the speaker responds to the request given to him or her with a rhetorical response. The speaker adopted this method since offering a rhetorical response implies that they accept the interlocutor's request implicitly. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered a rhetorical answer situation.

Excerpt 26

Kaleresan abdina nuju rineh. Dikawitan dinten iraha? (R16, S2).

(I am free exactly. When it will be held?).

Excerpt 27

Bade dinten naon ngawitana? (R18, S2).

(When it will be started?).

Excerpt 28

Dianggo henteu ku mamang laptopna? (R8, S4).
(Do you use your computer?).

Acceptance with Reservation

If certain requirements are met, the respondent consented to undertake an act as asked by their interlocutors. This method should be viewed as an acceptance strategy rather than a declination strategy. The following examples are drawn from the responses of those who indicated acceptance with a reservation scenario.

Excerpt 29

Nya pami teu aya nu keursaeun, abdi oge teu nanaon nu ngajar mah asalkeun budakna nurut (R20, S2).
(Well, if your sister is willing I also do not mind as long as he keeps me).

Excerpt 30

Mangga tapi hapunten pisan pami abdi nuhunkeun artos bayarana dipayun kumargi abdi butuh pisan (R13, S2).
(Of course, but what if I asked for payment at the beginning because I really need it).

Non-committal Responses

This category relates to answers to which the speaker does not provide a specific answer. The speaker purposefully left his/her comments open-ended, allowing the interlocutor to make the final judgment. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered non-committal responses situation.

Excerpt 31

Aruh punten tos ngarerepot (R12, S4).
(oh sorry, I've made a difficulties for you).

Excerpt 32

Hatur nuhun pa sateuacana, abdi ngaraos henteu enak panginten atos bantosanana. (R14, S8).
(Thanks before sir, I am shy for your help).

They provide the response but do not specify whether they accept or reject it. They believe that if the speaker does not respond directly, the interlocutors will interpret their response.

Comments without Exemplification

Because the replies clearly stated that the respondents would either accept or decline the request made by their interlocutor, this method can be acceptance as well as denial. These are the following examples are taken from the respondents which answered comments without exemplification situation.

Excerpt 33

Abdi narima. Da abdi butuh teras abdi oge dicarekan ku bapa pami nolak maksad sae mamang, pan lamun teu nurut ka kolot matak dosa (R13, S4).
(I accept because I need it, then my father will be angry to me if I refuse your kind purpose. It will be sin if I don't obey my father).

Excerpt 34

Abdi narima mang nu tos nambutkeun leptop ka abdi jadi abdi tiasa nyusun skripsi tur enggal – enggal (R15, S4).
(I accept that you had borrowed your computer so I can do my thesis as soon as possible).

Most of the respondents which are Sundanese are polite because it can be seen from their respond when they are asking for accompanying their lecturer or when they refused to the person with high power, they choose the polite words. They always say *punten*, *hapunten sateuacana* or it can be called 'sorry'. The term sorry shows that they have a polite when talking with the higher power and distance. But they used different talking when they talk to their

friend which has same power. So they can place where they should be polite and to whom they talk.

CONCLUSION

Based on findings above we can see that the refusal strategies consist of 12 strategies such as hesitation and lack of enthusiasm, offer an alternative, postponement, put the blame on a third party, general acceptance of an offer but giving no details, general acceptance with excuse, giving reason and explanation, conditional yes, questioning the justification of a request, threatening and comments without exemplification. While, the strategy of accepting consists of 6 strategies such as general yes or IFID, a rhetorical response, expression of solidarity, acceptance with reservations, non-committal responses and comments without exemplification.

Most Sundanese respondents are courteous, as seen by their responses when requesting to follow their professor or when refusing to speak to a person of great power. *Punten, hapunten sateuacanaor'sorry'* is what they always say. When speaking with increased authority and distance, the phrase sorry demonstrates that they have a courteous manner. But when they talked to their friend who had the same power, they used different words. So they know where they should be courteous and who they should talk to.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universal in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jalilifar, A. (2009). Request Strategies: Cross-Sectional Study of Iranian EFL Learners and Australian Native Speakers. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n1p46>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics* (p. 134). Longman Group Inc.
- Oatey, H.-S. (2000). *Culturally Speaking: culture, communication and politeness theory*. continuum.
- Ogiermann, E. (2012). On Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures. by Eva Ogiermann. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16(1), 124-127. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00529_6.x
- Reiter, R. M. (2000). Politeness in Britain and Study of Requests. *Library*.
- 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), 69-81.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts An Essay in the Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatic*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Togatorop, F. (2019). *Politeness Strategies Used in the Conversation between the Students of Finance and Banking Department in Murni Sadar Polytechnic Pematangsiantar*. 5(1), 37-48.
- Wardaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics: Seventh edition*. wiley blackwell.
- Winda, A. S. (2014). Apologizing Strategies Realization of Indonesian: a Case Study of the University of Kuningan Students. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 1-9.

Widianingsih, A. W. S. Politeness Strategies in Sundanese Context.

Winda, A. S. W. (2021). *The candidates' beliefs in 2016 U.S. presidential election debate through presupposition: A pragmatic discourse studies*. 7(1).

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.