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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Islamic Boarding School (*Pondok pesantren/Pontren*) is one of the educational institutions that integrate the general and Islamic education. The life within such a school is heavily associated with the students (*santri*)—who most of them usually come from various regions of origin. The diversity of the students’ origin areas will reveal the diversity of speech act, particularly in relation with linguistic politeness and communication method.

The diversity of linguistic politeness is manifested in the strategies of rejection as the realization of refusal speech act (RSA). The strategies of refusing contain linguistic politeness, especially RSA. This study discusses RSA carried out among students, between students and staffs of boarding school, and between students and teachers. It is interesting to study the diverse realizations of RSA, in terms of the strategy and the level of politeness. Moreover, the circumstance of Islamic boarding school fosters the religiosity and the obedience to older people (*tawadhu*), hence RSA is presumed as an inappropriate thing. Generally, the refusal speech act is only used if the speech is intended for positive values. For this purpose, it is necessary to determine refusal speech act that is appropriate to the positive politeness of speech act.

Based on the background, this study emphasized on the strategies of refusal speech act (RSA) and their level of politeness. There is a possibility that the speech act performed by students in refusing orders, requests, and recommendations conveyed to the teachers or staffs of boarding school are entirely perceived as polite. The refusal speech acts may be realized in the words: “Wait a minute”, “No”, “Later”, “I’m tired”, “I am preoccupied”, and so on. These phenomena of RSA are performed by students to their teachers. Nevertheless, if those phenomena are not linked to the context [1], [2], 3]. They may be an act of linguistic politeness [4].

The study of politeness is very crucial as suggested [5], [6], that research of politeness basically examines language use in a particular language society. Nowadays, linguistic politeness is inclined to degrade from generation to generation in accordance with the ever-changing context and development of the industrial era [7]. Therefore, comprehensive studies are required, ranging from elementary to higher education. The aim is to improve the deterioration of politeness among students, adolescents, and adulthood in accordance with the genuine culture of Indonesian society.

In fact, RSA among students is basically scalable. The degrees of politeness in speech act are classified based on five types, namely: Cost-benefit scale, Optionality scale, Indirectness scale, Authority scale, Social Distance scale [8]. The results of this study are specifically explicated based on the pragmatic politeness scale developed by Leech [8].

1. **RESEARCH METHOD**

The main design of this study is qualitative research since it was conducted by describing the speech act in a respective Islamic boarding school context and by utilizing natural methods. Qualitative research was conducted by highlighting the depth comprehension of interaction among prevailing speech acts and investigated them inductively in the environment of Darul Islam Muhammadiyah Islamic Boarding School, Sragen.

The subjects of this study were the students (*santri*) and teachers (*asatidz*) of Darul Islam Muhammadiyah Islamic Boarding School (DIMS). The object of this research was the refusal speech act empirically realized among the students of the DIMS. It was attempted to attain the clarity of the data contained in the object of research (: *gegenstand*) [9], [10].

Data in this research were in the form of qualitative data, which were speeches of refusal speech act. Data were collected through content analysis, interview, and observation. Content analysis technique was included the spoken language, but also written language [9], [10]. Interview is used to relate a context to the individual, event, activity, organization, emotion, motivation, response or perception, degree and form of student involvement, and so on. The aim was to construct those aspects as part of the past, and to project those aspects with regard to expectations that may occur in the future.

The collected data was analyzed with a contextual-extralingual method which was reinforced by Leech’s degree of politeness. It is a method which determinant is outside, detached, and excluded from the corresponding language (*langue*). The contextual method used was the pragmatic contextual sub-type [11]. It was employed to analyze refusal speech act and the scale of politeness from students to teachers.

1. **RESULTS AND ANALYSIS (10 PT)**

The results of this study are described in three sections. The first section, the strategies of refusal speech act (RSA) of students toward teachers. Second section, the scale of politeness in students’ RSA. Third section, the internalization of RSA among students of Darul Islam Muhammadiyah Islamic Boarding School, Sragen who have Javanese background.

This study generally illustrates the strategies of RSA among students based on two contexts. *First*, the strategy of RSA based on academic context or learning activity. *Second*, the strategy of RSA based on the context of Islamic teaching or education. The results indicate the strategies of RSA among students are based on the academic context rather than based on the context of Islamic teaching or education. This finding demonstrates that in the context of Islamic teaching and education, there is a rigid, omnipresent and mandatory principle of what must and must not be done. Meanwhile, those related to academic and learning process are something that should be developed and studied continually. Therefore, the RSA realized by students in the Islamic boarding school neighborhood is mainly driven by and solely aimed for scientific advancement and human welfare. Essentially, this finding confirms the reports of Kedves [12] and Ali [14].

**3.1. The Strategies of Refusal Speech Acts**

The strategies of refusal speech act (RSA) in this study were divided into two types: direct and indirect. The data of these two types of strategies is illustrated in Fig. 1. Direct strategies (63%) are more dominant than indirect ones (37%), which is possibly due their association to academic, scientific, and learning development.

**Fig. 1. Diagram of RSA Strategies**

* + 1. **Strategy of Direct Refusal Speech Act**

Direct refusal speech act is performed by students for presenting various responses. In general, it is realized in response to instruction, advice, invitation, and prohibition propounded by teachers, as shown in the context of speech (1) as follows:

(1) A teacher commanded a student to come in front of the class because he spoke something disrespectful.

 Teacher : “Ikhlas, please come forward! What did you say?”

 Student : “***Emoh***, Sir!”

 Teacher : “Then you come with me to the counseling after the class!”

 Student : “***Emoh***, Sir. Someone provoked me!”

 Lingual Marker : The word “***emoh***” (Javanese) signifies a refusal.

Direct refusal speech act for command conveyed by a teacher is the response of a student. It occurred during the class when the teacher heard one of the students spoke disrespectfully. The teacher then asked the student to come in front of the class but the respective student refused it impolitely with lingual marker of “*emoh”,* which signifies an impolite response.

Various forms of direct refusal utterances used by the students are illustrated in Fig. 2. Principally, there is vigilance in such acts. Fig. 2 shows that most of students refuse any command or order, but relatively comply with advice and invitation. The results demonstrate the propensity of students in denying any discrete coercion. Advice and persuasion are the most appropriate methods to instruct the students to perform an action, especially in relation to the religious teaching.

**Fig. 2. Diagram of Direct Refusal Speech Act.**

* + 1. **Strategy of Indirect Refusal Speech Act**

Indirect refusal speech act was divided into five sub-types in various contexts. The speech act is used by the students in response to instruction/command, advice/recommendation, invitation, prohibition, and proposal. One of the excerpts of this speech act as shown in the speech (2) as follows:

(2) A teacher gave rewards for student who had provided assistance in the canteen located in SMA Trensains.

 Teacher : “Here for you if you want to buy something.”

 Student : “I’m **sorry**, Mam. I cannot accept it.”

 Marker : **Sorry**.

Indirect RSA as in (2) was uttered by female students to her female teacher. The speech occurred during rest time in canteen of SMA Trensains. At that time, the teacher was willing to give a reward in the form of money to the student who provided assistance. However, the students indirectly refused the reward by politely saying “sorry” as lingual marker. It indicates an indirect speech act because it was propounded politely and was not signified a refusal marker.

Fig. 3 shows the examples of indirect RSA that indicated the act tends to be used by students in response to instruction/command from teachers. Most of them perform indirect refusal speech act (54%) more frequently in response to the advice, invitation, prohibition, or offer from teacher.

**Fig. 3. Diagram of Indirect Refusal Speech Act**

**3.2. The Scales of Refusal Speech Act**

* + 1. **Indirectness Scale**

The principle of this scale is the more direct the RSA, the lower the degree of its politeness. RSA commonly realized by students is generally in the form of statements. It indicates that in expressing a disagreement, the students have a propensity to utter it indirectly, instead of directly. It is expressed both in class and outside the class as shown by a student who impolitely refused to come in front of the class because he said something rude.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (3) | Explicature of speech act | : | Teacher: “Please come forward! What did you say?”Teacher: “***Emoh****, Sir*!”Teacher: “Then you come with me to the counseling after the class!”Student: “***Emoh,*** *Sir. (I did it because) Someone provoked me*” |
|  | Lingual marker | : | *Emoh, (I did it because) someone provoked me*” |
|  | Implicature  | : | The student gave reason that he said something rude because his friend provoked him to.  |

* + 1. **Cost-benefit Scale**

This scale is based on the fact that the more obvious the impact of RSA, the lower the degree of RSA. The realization of RSA is speech act performed by a student to a teacher with the intention of refusing teacher’s instruction to collect the assignment in the form of print out and bound paper. In responding the instruction of Bahasa Indonesia teacher, the student gave an indirect speech act by uttering “Would you binding the paper?”. In accordance with the cost-benefit analysis, it is categorized as a form of speech that only benefits the speaker, in this case the student, but disadvantages the interlocutor or the teacher.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (4) | Explicature of speech act |  | Teacher : “For the assignment of scientific paper, you have to collect it tomorrow in the form of print out and bound paper!”Student : “**Would you binding the paper**, *Sir?*” |
|  | Lingual marker | : | ***Would you bind the paper?*** |
|  | Implicature  | : | When the Bahasa Indonesia teacher instructed the students to compose and collect the assignment of scientific paper in the form of print out and bound paper, the students responded it by indirectly declining the instruction to show their objection by asking the teacher to bind the paper. |

* + 1. **Optionality scale**

The principle of optionality scale is the more unpleasant the RSA, the more impolite the RSA. The realization of RSA in (5) describes strategy of student in refusing the teacher’s instruction to answer the questions in the book by making options. The RSA merely contains two options, namely “*right* *now*” and “*later”*, with the intention of indirectly refusing the teacher’s instruction. Such indirect RSA indicates the student attempted to refuse by giving options to the teacher.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (5) | Explicature of speech act | : | Teacher: “Fitriana, read and answer question number 30!”Student: “**Right now or later**, Mam?”Teacher: “Next year!” |
|  | Lingual marker | : | ***Right now or later*** |
|  | Implicature  | : | A teacher asked a student to read and then answer a question. The student applied a strategy of refusal speech act by giving a lingual marker “*Right* *now* or *later?”,* which indicated an indirect refusal by involving the interloctur. |

* + 1. **Authority Scale**

This type of scale is based on the principle of the higher the authority centered on the speaker, the lower the degree of RSA and vice versa. The RSA in (6) describes when a teacher commanded a student for a presentation, but the student indirectly refused it by uttering “Sorry Ustad Udik, but I have presented my paper”. The authority of approval over RSA realized by the student is not absolute. Thus, the RSA is still classified as polite.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (6) | Explicature of speech act | : | Teacher: “Next, Nur Aini comes forward!”Student: “I’m sorry Ustad Udik, but ***I have*** presented my paper.” |
|  | Lingual marker | : | ***I have***  |
|  | Implicature | : | Such an indirect RSA by uttering “I’m sorry, but I have presented my paper*”* is a statement which authority is back to the teacher as interloctur. |

* + 1. **Social Distance Scale**

Social distance scale emphasizes the use of RSA with wide social distance but the use of RSA will be narrower, thus reduces the degree of a RSA, and vice versa. The realization of RSA in (7) illustrates when a teacher wanted to give reward in the form of money for student who helped her in canteen cooperative service. However, the student indirectly refused the reward by stating “I’m sorry Mam, I cannot accept it”. In the context of the utterance, even though the teacher perceived the student as her own child, but the speech act performed by the student demonstrated the existence of social distance. Therefore, the realization of RSA is classified very polite.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (7) | Explicature of speech act | : | Teacher: “It is for you if you want to buy something.”Student: “I’m sorry Mam***, I cannot accept it***.” |
|  | Lingual marker | : | ***I cannot accept it*** |
|  | Implicature | : | The student situated the teacher as person who has higher social status. |

The realization of the diverse scales of RSA among the students of DIMS implies that the most dominant RSA is in the form of indirect strategies 56%. It indicates that in expressing their disagreement refusing, avoiding, or inhibiting, can be categorized in relatively polite acts. The strategies are performed merely for academic and learning activities, instead of refusing any command of Islamic teachings. The students perceive that the Islamic teachings are standard and in accordance with the provisions of Islamic law and therefore must be implemented. Meanwhile, the academic and learning activities are relative, thus there is open space to be responded by means of refusing, avoiding, or inhibiting if an instruction is not in accordance with the applicable academic and learning agreement. The realization of RSA is illustrated in Fig. 4.

**Fig. 4 Diagram of General Scale of RSA.**

**3.3. Internalization of the Students’ Character building**

Politeness is the most fundamental component to establish the identity and character of students in the boarding school environment is politeness. One form of politeness is linguistic politeness. One form of linguistic politeness is refusal speech act (RSA). Such an act can be realized through various strategies [14], [15] To establish and internalize the students’ character building, several measures can be done such as: (a) exemplary, (b) enculturation, (c) supervision, (d) suggestion, (e) admonition, and (f) sanctions. Exemplary, enculturation, and suggestion are central keys to build the character and identity of the students.

The realization of RSA by the students is mostly to respond the teacher’s instruction in which the context is academic and learning activities. The students’ indirectness scale in realizing RSA is higher if the teachers use the approach of suggestion and exemplary. Students perceive the form of suggestion is closer to social harmony in relation to the character building. This strategy is important for educators to avoid politeness paradox of pragmatism [16] a model for fostering students’ creativity in the learning process [17] ​​and inherent politeness in students [18], [19].

Important factors for the internalization process of the students’ character building, namely: (a) the role of teachers in the enculturation of politeness [20] in learning activities, (b) the polite-encouraged circumstance, (c) the character building through learning in the classroom. Meanwhile, the inhibiting factors in the internalization of the students’ character building are: (a) the understanding of politeness among the students is relatively low, (b) the diversity of students’ background, (c) the students’ habits in using common Javanese languages in the school environment, d) the less control from the students’ guardian. In this case, the students’ character is an important factor in the learning process [21], 22].

1. **CONCLUSION**

The results of this study underline several points. *First*, the refusal speech act realized by the students is mostly indirect strategies rather than direct ones. This finding indicates that the students have high respect to the teachers, particularly to those who are charismatic in the boarding school environment. *Second*, the refusal speech act realized by the students is mostly the responses to teacher’s instruction and command, instead of to advice or exemplary. It implies the advice/suggestion and exemplary are the most appropriate methods of indirect guidance in guiding the students’ learning and religious activities. *Third*, the concrete efforts can be carried out by boarding school to establish and internalize the students character building are through exemplary, enculturation, supervision, and suggestion. Meanwhile, admonition and sanctions are used as an intermediate effort in the students’ maturation process. The internalizing of the students’ character building is affected by: (a) the role of teachers in the enculturation of character building in learning activities, (b) the polite-encouraged circumstance, (c) the character building through learning in the classroom. Meanwhile, the inhibiting factors in the internalization of the students’ character building are: (a) the understanding of politeness among the students is relatively low, (b) the diversity of students’ background, (c) the students’ habits and the background of local languages, and d) the less control from the students’ guardian.
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