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***Abstract***

The aims of this research is to ascertain the Ambonese's politeness strategies, and to ascertain the effects of social relationships on the Ambonese's politeness strategies in refusing invitations, The researcher used descriptive qualitative approach. The data were taken from 25 respondents of Ambonese. The data were collected by recording the conversations in any situation between the interlocutors. The data were analyzed based on Yassi’s six models of politeness system, and classifies the strategies of politeness which are formulated by Brown and Levinson, The results showed that Ambonese speakers mostly use long refusal sequences, In interaction between the strangers, Ambonese speakers tend to use bald on record strategy such as direct refusal as a head act of refusals sequence, In intimate relationship, Ambonese speakers tend to combine addressed form, reason, promise, joke or offer new solution as positive politeness strategy. In hierarchal relationship, Ambonese speakers tend to use negative politeness strategies such as give deference and expressing apology by an inferior to a superior person, Culturally, Ambonese people tend to be influenced by Pela gandong to maintain the solidarity in responding and addressing.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Success in communication depends on the ability to interpret speakers' communicative purposes and pragmatic context in speaking or writing to communicate from the speakers to the hearers, there is a mixture of cooperation and comprehension in human communication or interaction. However, each person has their own unique way of communicating the intent or meaning, which is based on a variety of factors.

In announce a speech, a person has a certain purpose, so it is called speech act. As noted by Tanck in Sattar *et al* (2011: 69) that in order to achieve a goal of communication, speakers use various speech acts Include Searle's categories of speech act such as; 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 and Rose, 2001 in Sattar et al, 2011: 69). One type of speech act that is very vulnerable to the occurrence of gaps and misunderstandings between individuals is refusal speech act. 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.

In speech acts, refusal is referred to as a face-threatening act. It is a delicate situation in the communication process that may have a positive or negative impact on the communication (Nelson *et al*., 2002). According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 61), everyone has a Face that needs to be cared for, because refusing is an action that can threaten a listener's face, known as a 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 is important in protecting "face" during the performance of a speech act such as refusal, because refusal is a negative response to an offer, request, invitation, or suggestions.. As defined by Searle and Vandervken (1985) in Sattar et al (2011) that rejections and refusals are the negative counterparts to acceptances and consentings. Offers, applications, and invitations can all be accepted, but they can also be refused or rejected.

Studies about refusal have been carried out by some researchers, including Nadar, *et al* (2006), Al-Kahtani (2005), Tanck (2003), Robinson (1991), Tickle (1991), Turnbull and Saxton (1996 in Nadar et al, 2006), Takahashi and Beebe (1987), etc. Nadar *et al* (2006) in their study about *“Penolakan Dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia”* stated that refusal in English is already polite to refuse someone’s request with short combination of speech acts, while the refusal in Indonesian language is used more combinations of speech acts that will be more polite to refuse someone’s request.

Refusal strategies differ from one country to the next, and from one culture to the next. Not all languages or cultures reject or refuse an offer, request, invitation, or suggestion in the same way. Finally, in cross-cultural communication, there is sometimes misunderstanding between native speakers and non-native speakers who use the same language but cannot communicate the same purpose. (Yamagashira, 2001 in Anggreni, 2008).

Concerning to the differences in language and culture, Indonesia is a country that has various ethnic groups with different languages ​​and local cultural backgrounds such as; Javanese, Malay, Madurese, Banjarese, Buginese, Makassarese, Butonese, Ambonese, and etc. It is very important to know the strategies of refusal used by people who have different cultural backgrounds. As a result, the researcher is interested in conducting research on the Ambonese's politeness strategies for refusing invitations..

.

1. **LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1** **Refusal**

Refusals are face-threatening acts (Brown and Levinson, 1987) that fall under the category of commissives because they bind the refuser to perform an action (Searle, 1977 in Fèlix-Brasdefer, 2008: 42). Refusals serve as a response to an initiating act, and in the case of a speech act, a speaker "*[fails]* to engage in an action proposed by the interlocutor" (Chen et al., 1995, p.121). Refusals are significant from a sociolinguistic standpoint because they are sensitive to social variables such as gender, age, level of education, power, and social distance (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Smith, 1998).

Because failing to refuse appropriately can jeopardize the speakers' interpersonal relationships, refusals usually include a variety of strategies to avoid offending one's interlocutors. Overall, refusals are complex speech acts that necessitate not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements, but also *"face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the act's noncompliant nature."* (Gass & Houck, 1999: 2).

**2.2 Face Threatening Act (FTA)**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 65-68), in their concept of 'face,' there is a variety of speech that tends to an undesirable action, which is referred to as 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: 74-77). The explanation of three social factors as follows:

- Power:It refers to the disparity in power or dominance between the speaker and the hearer. The ability to recognize each other's social position plays a role in the role of social status in communication (Leech 1983; Brown and Levinson 1987; Holmes 1995). According to Holmes (1995), people with high social status are more likely to receive deferential behavior, such as linguistic deference and negative politeness. As a result, those with lower social status are more likely to avoid offending those with higher social status and to show them more respect.

- Distance: the social distance is a measure of social contact between speakers and hearer knowing each other, and how their relationship in context (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 76-77). It is one of the factors that influence politeness (Leech 1983; Brown and Levinson 1987). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness increases with social distance. Otherwise, According to Wolfson (1988), there is very little solidarity establishing speech behavior among strangers and intimates due to the relative familiarity of their relationship, whereas relationship negotiation is more likely to occur among friends..

- Imposition: rank of imposition refers to the importance or degree of difficulty in the situation that considered less threatening face (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 77).

Brown and Levinson (1987: 60) classified politeness strategies into five types: bald on record (direct strategies without redressive action), positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, off record strategy, and don't do the FTA (silent). Brown and Levinson's choice of strategy is determined by the circumstances shown below.:

*-* ***Strategy 1****:* Bald on Record Strategies(direct strategy without redressive action)are used by the speaker when there is a little risk of losing face. Brown and Levinson (1987: 69-70) define direct strategy without redressive action as a strategy for doing FTA to state the obvious. The main reason for choosing this strategy is that the speaker wants to complete the FTA as efficiently as possible (Brown and Levinson 1987: 95). There are two sub-strategies of bald on record usage in different circumstances, because the speaker may have different motivations for wanting to do the FTA as efficiently as possible.:First, Cases of non-minimization of the face threat, where maximum efficiency is very important, and this is mutually known to both Hearer and Speaker, no face redress necessary. Second, Cases of FTA-oriented bald on record usage, where he use of this strategy is oriented to face. In other words, it is used where face involves mutual orientation, so that each participant attempts to foresee what the other participant is attempting to foresee. For in certain circumstances it is reasonable for speaker to assume that hearer will be especially worried with hearer’s potential violation or speaker’s maintaining. There are three functional categories or areas where we expect the pre-emptive invitations to occur in all languages (which are potential to FTA): Welcoming, Farewell, and Offers.

*-* ***Strategy 2****:* Positive Politeness Strategies are used to satisfy the hearer's desire to be liked and supported, where the speakers provide the hearers with a positive self-image The speakers emphasized the establishment of solidarity and intimacy, as well as expressions centered on the listener's interests, wants, needs, and possessions. For example; exaggerated expressions of interest, approval, sympathy, and interest, asserting knowledge of the hearer's wants, offering, and promising (Brown and Levinson 1987:101-103).

*-* ***Strategy 3****:* Negative Politeness Strategies*,* These strategies, on the other hand, are intended to satisfy the listener's desire to be respected (not imposed on). According to Brown and Levinson (1987:129), *"Negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the Addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded."*

***- Strategy 4****:* Off Record Strategy*,* is an indirect FTA strategy in which the speaker is vague, ambiguous, incomplete, ironic, uses metaphors, and allows the addressee to decide how to interpret the speaker's utterances (Brown and Levinson 1987: 211).

***- Strategy 5****:* Don’t do the FTA is the strategy whereby the speaker chooses to say nothing

**2.3 Politeness System of Social Relationship**

According to Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995), there are three types of social relationships that correspond to three types of politeness systems that are based on the values that interlocutors assign to two contextual variables: Power (P) and Distance (D). The first two etiquette systems are symmetrical, while the third is asymmetrical.

The First, the absence of a difference in relative power between interlocutors determines the existence of the two symmetrical politeness systems. On the one hand, people may share a Deference Politeness System in which they are aware of a social distance between them: *“…participants are considered to be equals or near equals but treat each other at a distance”* (Scollon and Scollon 1995: 44). The low value of the variable P and the high value of the variable D determine this politeness system, which can be represented by the formula (-P,+D). A clear example of this system is the case of two colleagues with the same professional status who are unfamiliar with each other. The immediate result of this politeness system's perception will be the mitigation of FTAs through negative-politeness or off-the-record strategies. The second type of symmetrical system, on the other hand, is a Solidarity Politeness System, in which interlocutors do not perceive any social distance between themselves. D has a low level in this system, so it can be reflected in the formula (-P, -D). An example of this system would be two close friends who have known each other for a long time and are on good terms. According to Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995), the existence of this system enables individuals to carry out FTAs openly or using positive-politeness strategies.

The Second, The asymmetrical politeness system is determined by a difference between interlocutors in terms of P. Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995) call it Hierarchical Politeness System, and individuals who share it are seen as having clearly different social statuses, as in the relationship between an employer and an employee. Because the value assigned to D can be either high or low, the formula displaying this system is [+P, +/-D]. On the one hand, this results in the individual of higher status performing FTAs without redress or with positive-politeness strategies, and on the other hand, the individual of lower status feels compelled to avoid FTAs, to perform them off record or to compensate them by means of *negative-politeness strategies*. Despite this, Scollon and Scollon (1983: 169) warn that “any strategy might be used by a speaker in any particular case, of course, because of individual differences, differences in the imposition being advanced, or differences in the context.” As a result, it is important to understand that the types of politeness strategies to be expected in each system are only predictions that may or may not be confirmed during conversational exchanges.

Based on the three politeness systems presented by Scollon and Scollon (1983, 1995); *Deference, Solidarity,* and *Hierarchy.* Yassi (1996, 2012) then developed Scollon and Scollon’s three politeness systems become six politeness systems based on three contextual variables: *Power* *(P),* *Distance* *(D)*, and *Kinship (K).* First; *Deference politeness strategy in non-kin context* labeled as (-P,+D,-K), i.e. 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. According to Yassi (1996, 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. RESEARCH METHOD**

The researcher employed the descriptive qualitative method in this study. Data were collected from 25 Ambonese respondents in Namlea sub-district, Buru Regency, Maluku Province. The researcher used direct observation to remember everything that happened between the interlocutors by recording the conversations in any situation and taking notes as the instruments. In this study, data was analyzed in two stages: during data collection and after data collection.

The first procedure was execueted using these steps:

1. Data reduction by identifying refusals while observing for Ambonese data.
2. Choosing data relevant to the study's topic, which in this case is refusal.
3. Converting data from recording into transcription.

the following steps were used to carry out the second procedure:

1. Examining transcriptions and categorizing refusals in response to invitations.
2. Describing the social relationship between the interlocutors such as intimacy, stranger, and hierarchy based on six models of politeness system by Yassi (2012) approaches.
3. Describing the Initiating Act, refusal sequences, and refusal strategies in the table

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The following are some data that show politeness strategies used by Ambonese in refusing invitations in verious conditions and situations with different social relationships.

1. An interaction between a teacher and a civil officer about to stop in a teacher’s house for a while.

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

(A= a teacher, B= a civil officer)

*A: mari katong ka ruma dolo, sambil katong bicara-bicara akang to.*

(let’s come to my house while talking about it)

*B:* ***ado tarima kasi banya-banya lai pa, beta capat-capat saja barang mo bale lai ka kantor ini.***

(Oh, Thank you very much sir, I am in a hurry, because I should come back to the office now)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a ritual invitation. A teacher invites a civil officer who has brought him a letter from the office to his house “*mari katong ka ruma dolo sambil katong bicara-bicara akang to*”. But a civil officer refuses the invitation by using gratitude *“ado tarima kasi banya-banya lai*” which is followed by Give deference *“Pa”*, and ended by giving reason *“beta capat-capat saja barang mo bale lai ka kantor ini”*. These strategies are using by a civil officer to appreciate a teacher who has a good intend to invite him. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*ado tarima kasi banya-banya lai Pa*), and **head act** (*beta capat-capat saja barang mo bale lai ka kantor ini*).

1. An interaction between a citizen and a newcomer about visiting the citizen’s house.

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

(A= a citizen, B= a newcomer)

*A: e.. datang ka ruma ka.*

(please come to my house)

*B:* ***tarima kasih lai sodara, laeng kali jua kaapa e.***

(Thank you, maybe another time)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a ritual invitation. A citizen invites a newcomer to come to his house *“e.. datang ka ruma ka”*. A newcomer then refuses a citizen’s invitation by using gratitude “*tarima kasi lai*” which is followed by addressed form“*sodara”*, and ended by a promise *“laeng kali jua kaapa e”*. These strategies are used by the speaker to keep making close relation as family even they have just known each other, and making promise as an attitude to respond a kindness of addresse. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*Tarima kasi lai sodara*), and **head act** (*laeng kali jua kaapa e*).

1. An interaction between two distant families (cousins) at home.

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

(A=older, B=younger)

*A: Ona, sabantar datang ka rumah e..!!*

 (Ona, could you come to my house this evening..!!)

*B:* ***Ado abang e, kayanya beta pulang bajual lat ni.***

 (I cannot come, probably I will come late after selling)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A invites B to come to his house for discussing something “*Ona, sabantar datang ka ruma e*”. B who is younger than A refuses the invitation by giving deference “*Ado.. abang* e”, and reason “*kayanya beta pulang bajual lat ni*”.The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*Ado abang e*) and **head act** (*kayanya beta pulang bajual lat ni*).

1. An interaction between distant families about an invitation for having lunch

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

(A=younger female, B=older female)

*A: caca, pi mana tu.. mari singga dolo la katong makang sadiki.*

(hey, where are you going,.. please hang on for a while and let’s have lunch)

*B:* ***iyo makasi ibi, nanti jua e, caca ada buru-buru e.***

(sure, thank you, but maybe another time, I am in a hurry)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a ritual invitation. A invites B for having lunch “*caca, pi mana tu..!! mari singga dolo la katong making sadiki”*. B refuses a request of A by using gratitude “*iyo makasi ibi*”*,* promise “*nanti jua e”,* andreason “*caca ada buru-buru e*”. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*iyo makasi ibi*), **head act** (*nanti jua e*), and **post-refusal** (*caca ada buru-buru e*).

1. An interaction between two friends in deferent age about coming to the farewell party.

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

(A= older male, B= younger male)

*A: tamang e, adawaktu ka seng sabantar sore? iko beta pi di katong pung acara perpisahan mari?*

(Hey, do you have free time this evening? come with me to our farewell party)

*B:* ***eee.. beta malu hati abang e. beta seng bisa pi kaapa..***

 (Ouch, I am really shy. probably I can not come)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A invites B to the farewell party “*tamang e, ada waktu ka seng sabantar sore? iko beta di katong pung acara perpisahan mari*”. B then refuses the invitation by using a reason “*e, beta malu hati*” which is combined by Give deference“*abang e*”, and ended by direct refusal “*beta seng bisa pi kaapa*”. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*e, beta malu hati* *abang e*), and **head act** (*beta seng bisa pi kaapa*).

1. An interaction between two colleagues in deferent age about an invitation for having lunch.

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

(A=younger, B=older)

*A: pa, katong makan sadiki dolo baru pulang, maitua so taru dulang ni.*

 (sir, let’s have lunch before leaving, my wife has prepared the lunch)

*B: sio ade tuang, bilang maitua jang repot-repot lai, laeng kali jua kaapa, pa ada mau buru-buru ni.*

(Oh my dear brother, please tell your wife do not trouble herself, maybe another time, I am in a hurry)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a ritual invitation. A invites B to have lunch together before leaving “*pa, katong makang sadiki dolo baru pulang, maitua so taru dulang ni*”. B then refuses the invitation because he is in a hurry by using addressed form *“sio ade tuang*”, offer new solution“*bilang maitua jang repot-repot lai, laeng kali jua ka apa”*, and give reason *“pa ada mo buru-buru ni*”. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*Sio Ade tuang*),**head act**(*bilang maitua jang repot-repot lai* *laeng kali jua ka apa*), and **post-refusal** (*pa ada mo buru-buru ni*).

1. An interaction between two close friends about going to a traditional market.

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

(A=adult female, B= adult female)

*A: Ti, katong pi ka pasar mari, hari minggu ni..*

(Ti, let’s go to the market, it is Sunday..)

*B:* ***Ado mi e.., pakeang kotor satu kontener ada tunggu beta di balakang ni, siang-siang bole kaapa lapas bacuci.***

(Oh Mi, I have many laundries to wash, maybe at noon after washing the laundries)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A invites B to go to the market together for buying something “*Ti, katong pi kapasar mari, hari minggu ni*”. B then refuses the invitation by using a reason *“ado Mi e.. pakeang kotor satu kontener ada tunggu beta di balakang ni*”, and offer new solution “*siang-siang bole kaapa lapas bacuci”*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*ado Mi e.. pakeang kotor satu kontener ada tunggu beta di balakang ni*), and **head act** (*siang-siang bole ka apa lapas bacuci*).

1. An interaction between two close friends about going to see a show.

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

(A= adult female, B= adult female)

*A: hee oda, ada acara di lapangan bawa, se seng pi? katong pi mari*

 (Hey Oda, there is a show in the field, do you interest to come? Let’s go.)

*B:* ***hado.. kamong pi jua, beta manganto tombak e.***

(oh, you can go by yourselves, I am very sleepy)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A invites B to watch an interested show with her on football field “*hee Oda, ada acara dilapangan bawa. se seng pi? Katong pi mari*”. B then refuses the invitation by using a conventionally indirect *“hado.. kamong pi jua*”, and reason “*beta manganto tombak e”*. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*hado.. kamong pi jua*), and **post-refusal** (*beta manganto tombak e*).

1. An interaction between two siblings about going to the work placement.

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

(A=eldest sister, B=younger sister)

*A: Antimo.*

 (Antimo)

*B: ya Aca.*

 (Yes sister)

*A: sabantar sore katong dua pi di orang karja e?*

 (Would you come with me to the working place this evening?)

*B:* ***jang lai Aca o, malu hati e.***

 (please, don’t go. I am really shy.)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A as an elder sister invites B as her younger sister to come to a work-place of wedding preparation “*sabantar sore katong dua pi di orang karja e*”. B then refuses the invitation by using be conventionally indirect *“jang lai Aca*”, and reason *“malu hati* e”. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*jang lai Aca o*), and **post-refusal** (*malu hati* e).

1. An interaction between a boss and an employee about an invitation for having lunch.
2. The social relation= Hierarchical politeness system in non-kin context (+P,+D,-K)

(A=Boss, B=employee)

*A: eh.. so makang ka balong? Mari katong ka balakang isi poro dolo sadiki.*

(Have you had lunch? Let’s have lunch)

*B:* ***Bismillah pa bismilah, pa dong lanjut jua, beta so isi sadiki di ruma tadi.***

(Go head sir, I have had little lunch at home just now.)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a ritual invitation. A boss invites his employee to have lunch “*eh, so makang ka balong, mari katong ka balakang isi poro dolo sadiki*”. The employee then refuses the invitation by using a conventionally indirect *“bismillah pa bismilah* *pa dong lanjut jua*”, and reason *“beta so isi sadiki di ruma tadi*”. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*bismillah pa bismilah pa dong lanjut jua*), and **post-refusal** (*beta so isi sadiki di ruma tadi*).

1. An interaction between husband and wife about going to the beach.

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

(A=husband, B=wife)

*A: ma e, nanti iko beta ka pante e?*

(Could you come with me to the beach, please?)

*B:* ***Nanti beta bilang Ba jua la dia pi e, beta ada mo pi Baku bantu di bawa.***

(I will ask Ba to come, I am going to help the cooks there)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a request for favor. A as a husband asks B as his wife to follow him to the beach and take some tools for fishing “*ma e, nanti iko beta ka pante e*”*.* B then refuses the request by using offer new solution *“nanti beta bilang Ba jua la dia pi e”* and give reason *“beta ada mo pi baku bantu di bawa”*. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*nanti beta bilang Ba jua la dia pi e*), **post-refusal** (*beta ada mo pi baku bantu di bawa*).

1. An invitation between father and his son about visiting to a grandma’s house.

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

(A= a father, B= a son)

*A: Ida, mau ka seng katong pi ka nene dong? Dong so pangge ini*

(Ida, won’t you go to grandma’s house, they have just called us.)

*B:* ***katong ada mo bale lai ka skola. Bapa pi jua e, nanti malang jua baru beta kasana***

(Dad, I have just come home from school, then I have to come back to school. Could you go alone? I will be there this evening.)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A father invites his son to come to the granma’s house “*Ida, mau ka seng katong pi ka nene dong? dong so pangge* ni”. His son then refuses the invitation by using give reason *“Katong ada mo bale lai ka skola”*, be conventionally indirect *“Bapa pi jua e*” and a promise *“nanti malang jua baru beta kasana”*. The refusals sequences here are **pre-refusal** (*Katong ada mo bale lai ka skola*), **head act** (*Bapa pi jua e*) and **post-refusal** (*nanti malang jua baru beta kasana*).

1. An interaction between an aunt and a niece about visiting a grandma’s house.

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

(A=Aunt, B=Niece)

*A: Ona, baganti suda la katong pi di nene dong mari.*

(Ona, change your clothes and let’s come to grandmother’ house)

*B:* ***beta seng pi Tua, barang seng ada yang jaga ruma.***

(I will not come, because no one is staying at home)

The initiating act of the interaction above is a real invitation. A as an aunt invites B as her niece to come to the grandma’s house “*Ona, baganti suda la katong pi ka nene dong mari*”. B then refuses the invitation by using Direct refusal *“Beta seng pi Tua”*, and give a reason *“barang seng ada yang jaga ruma”*. The refusals sequences here are **head act** (*Beta seng pi Tua*) and **post-refusal** (*barang seng ada yang jaga ruma*).

Based on the findings above, the result of this research shows that there are some different way and the similarity of choosing Brown and Levinson’s politeness strategies used by the Ambonese in refusing invitations. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) introduced five super strategies of politeness in relation to FTAs (Face Threatening Acts) such as bald on record strategy which entail a little risk of losing face, positive politeness strategy which is addressed to the hearers’ positive face, negative politeness strategies which is directed to the hearers’ negative face and free from imposition, then off record strategy which may be taken either as an imposition or not, and the last is don’t do the FTAs which the risk is too great.

However, other interesting things that have been researcher get on the outcome of this research; the result of this research is similar from the other research. But the different seem in the cultural influences. For instance, in the configuration of deference politeness system, such as interaction between the strangers in refusing invitation, Ambonese speakers tend to use positive politeness strategy to accentuate the closeness or relationship between participants such as expressing gratitude, use addressed form, give reason and offer new solutions which seen contrast to Scollon and Scollon (1995: 44), who stated that the immediate consequence of the perception of deference politeness system will be the mitigation of FTAs ​​by means of negative politeness strategy which is shown the social distance among the participants or off record strategies.

Other findings also show different interactions in solidarity politeness system. Brown and Levinson (1987) in Yassi (2012) stated that in solidarity politeness system, the participants tend to choose less polite form of politeness strategy. According to Scollon and Scollon (1995), the existence of solidarity politeness system allows individuals to perform their FTAs baldly on record or using positive politeness strategies. Commonly, Ambonese speakers tend to use positive politeness strategy in refusing invitations when the relation between the interlocutors is close friends. For instance, the speakers tend to use addressed form, overstate of reason, promise, or offer new solution to minimize the hearer’s positive face. But it seems deferent when the relation of the participants is friends in different age, where an inferior tend to use negative politeness strategies such as apology and give deference to a superior in refusing invitations. The same occurrence is also occurred in kin context where a young brother or sister tend to use more polite form to an elder brother or sister in responding or addressing when refusing invitation.

Whereas in hierarchical politeness system, Ambonese speakers tend to use negative politeness strategy as an inferior person to a superior person such as expressing apology, give deference and be conventionally indirect in refusing invitations. The using of these strategies are parallel with Scollon and Scollon in Azwan (2018), who stated that in hierarchical politeness system, in the need the individual of lower status feels to avoid FTAs, to perform them off record or to compensate them by means of negative politeness strategy.

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 people 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 friendship which institutionalized in every heart, mind, and behavior of Ambonese. Beside that, Ambonese speakers often the ritual invitation such as having lunch by using “*Bismillah*” as a conventionally indirect strategy to indicate that Ambonese people are very respect to the hearer’s invitation.

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

**5. CONCLUSION**

Based on the analysis above, the researcher comes up with some conclusions on the strategies of politeness used by the Ambonese in refusing invitations.

1. In refusing invitations, Ambonese speakers mostly use long refusal sequences which consists of some strategies. 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, and offer new solution to minimize the hearer’s face.
2. Social relation affacts the speakers to choose the politeness strategies in refusing invitations:
3. In the interaction between the strangers in refusing invitation, Ambonese speakers mostly use positive politeness strategies.
4. In the interaction between friends in the same age, Ambonese speakers tend to use positive politeness strategies such as using addressed form, reason and promise. 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.
5. 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.
6. Almost Ambonese people tend to be influenced by a slogan of *Pela gandong* to maintain the solidarity in responding and addressing

.
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