Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Javanese Cultural Community

Edy Jauhari, Faculty of Humanities,Airlangga University, Indonesia**,** edy-j@fib.unair.ac.id
Dwi Purnanto, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia, dwi.purnanto@yahoo.com

Abstract- This articles studies the politeness strategies that are used in negative response to criticism in the Javanese cultural community. The goal is to explain the cultural norms that regulate the way in which people in the Javanese cultural express a negative response to criticism, to discover thetype of contexts in which direct/ indirect strategies are used. The data collected by the DCT. The contexts of negative response were determined based on ±Power (±P), ± sosial Distance (±D), and ±Direct Criticicism (±DC). The results of the analysis show that if a context contains (+P), the use of a direct strategy is very low. On the contrary, if a context contains (-P), the choice of the negative response strategy tends to be influenced by the use of the criticism strategy (±DC). If the critic uses a direct strategy (+DC), the recipient also tends to use a direct strategy. If the critic uses an indirect strategy (-DC), the recipient also tends to use an indirect strategy. It can be concluded, therefore, that the type of negative response strategy used to respond to criticism in the Javanese cultural is determined by the parameter (±P).

Keywords: negative response to criticism, Javanesecultural community, direct strategy, indirect strategy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Criticisms and responses to criticisms are two types of linguistic acts that are interconnected with one another. A criticism requires a response and a response to a criticism is expressed to give a reaction to the criticism. From the point of view of a threat, a criticism is clearly a face threatening act. Why so? Because a criticism is expressed by means of presenting a negative evaluation ofthe behaviour or actions of the recipient (Mulac et.al, 2000; Nguyen, 2005; Hoang ThiXuangHoa, 2007; MIN Shang-chao, 2008).

However, in truth it is not only the face of the recipient (R) that is threatened. The face of the critic (C) may also be threatened because a criticism may also backfire and "lash back" at the face of the C, especially if the R proves to give a negative reaction or response to the criticism. Giving a negative response means that the R is rejecting the criticism. Rejecting a criticism means that the R does not value or respect the C. The criticism may be rejected in a way that is as harsh as the criticism itself. Therefore, the face of the C may also be threatened or damaged in the same was as that of the R.

Since it is not only R whose face is threatened (as a result of the criticism), but also C (as a result of the negative response), in an act of communication, it is not only C who is required to protect or save the face of R but R is also required to protect the face of C. Therefore, the response to the criticism must also be expressed carefully. R must be able to use an appropriate strategy of politeness in the (verbal) response. In addition, R must also use appropriate modifiers in order that the level of harshness of the (negative) response may be reduced by several degrees. If this element of politeness is ignored, the (negative) response to the criticism may be extremely painful and face-threatening. It is quitepossible to imagine what would happen if C and R each allow their faces to be threatened. This would probably lead to tension or even conflict between C and R.

The study of speech act of criticism has been done by a number of people from various countries. They are Tracy, et.al. (1987), Tracy & Eissenberg (1990), Wajnryb (1993), Gunarwan (1996), Toplak & Katz (2000), Nguyen (2005), Hoang Thi Xuang Hoa (2007), dan Farnia & Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar (2015). However, the study of speech acts of response to criticism has not been widely done by experts. Therefore, this study will focus on speech act of response to criticism, especially in the aspect of politeness.

Indeed, the response to criticism can be positive (accept criticism) or negative (rejecting criticism). A positive response certainly does not threaten the face, but the negative response is prone to threatening the face.In this article the response under study is a negative response. This negative response is more interesting to examine because the inappropriateness of the use of strategies is prone to conflict.The study is carried out based on a sociopragmatic approach (Leech, 1993; Leech, 2014). The community selected as the target of the study is the Javanese cultural community (one of the tribes in Indonesia). The study is carried out only in the office domain. The questions to be answered are: how is a negative response to criticism (a rejection of the criticism) expressed according to the norms of the Javanese Cultural

Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the
Javanese Cultural Community

Community (JCC), specifically in an office setting? In what kind of contexts are negative responses expressed using a direct strategy and in what kind of contexts are negative responses expressed using an indirect?

The study of the speech act of response to criticism in the JCC is an extremely interesting topic for discussion. The JCC is known to adhere strictly to the principles of harmony and respect (Suseno, 1985). These two principles strongly influence the day to day lives and interaction of the people. Any action or thing that is considered to have the potential to disturb the principle of harmony or the principle of respect tends to be avoided, whereas uttering a negative response to a criticism or rejecting a criticism clearly has the potential to disturb these principles of harmony and respect. For this reason, it is interesting to observe how the people in the JCC reject criticism but at the same time manage to preserve both the principle of harmony and the principle of respect.

So far, research that specifically examines the speech act of negative response to criticism (rejection of criticism) has never been done before. From the results of a library study, it was found that the experts who have studied the speech act of response to criticism are Higara&Turner (1996) and Nguyen (2005). but they do not specifically review the negative response (rejecting criticism), but also the positive response (accept criticism). However, the study of speech acts of refusal such as refusal of invitations, sugestion, offers, requests, etc. it has been done by a number of experts from various countries. They are Byon, A. S. (2003), Li Honglin (2007), Abdul Sattar, H. Q. et.al. (2011), Sadeghi, K., &Savojbolaghchilar, S. (2011), Sahragard, R., &Javanmardi, F. (2011)/ Hassani, R., et.al (2011), Hong, W. (2011), Allami, Hamid & Amin Naeimi. (2011), Farnia, Maryam &Xiaojuan Wu. (2012), Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M., &Yasin, M. S. M. (2012), Asmalı, M. (2013), Bonyadi, A., Ghazanfari, M., &Malekzadeh, S. (2013), J. César Félix-Brasdefer (2016), BabaiShishavan, Homa&FarzadSharifian (2016), Zhao Chunli&SitiNurbayaBintiMohd Nor (2016), Turgay Han &AssiyeBurgucu-Tazegül (2016). Most of their studies are comparative study or cross-cultural perspective.

II. METHOD

The data in this article was collected using a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). The contexts for negative response in this paper are determined based on the parameters proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), namely ±P (Power) and ±D (Distance). In addition to these two parameters, another parameter is also included that is deemed to be extremely important in the JCC, namely ±DC (Direct Criticism). These three parameters are considered to have a strong influence on the choice of negative response strategy. Parameter (+P) means that C has a higher power than R. Parameter (-P) means that C has a lower power than R. Parameter (+D) means that the relationship between C and R is not familiar / distance. Parameter (-D) means that C and R have a close relationship. Parameter (+DC) means that the strategy used by C when expressing the criticism to R is a direct criticism. Parameter (-DC) means that the strategy used by C when expressing the criticism to R is an indirect criticism. If all three parameters above interact with each other, these interactions will form a variety of different situational contexts, as follows: (+DC+P+D), (+DC+P-D), (+DC-P+D), (+DC -P-D), (-DC +P+D), (-DC +P-D), (-DC -P-D), (-DC-P+D). The analysis of politeness strategies in negative response to criticism in this article are based on these contexts.

Since this study is only carried out in the realm of offices, the DCT material is only related to office issues. This DCT contains criticism addressed to informants (R) in the contexts mentioned above. The task of the R is to reject or give a negative response to the criticism expressed by C in accordance with the context. The table 1 illustrates the material of criticism / strategy of criticism and the context that must be given a negative response (rejected) by the R in each context.

Table 1

The Material of criticism / Strategy of Criticism and Their Contextsin DCT

DCT Number	Types of Contexts	The Material of Criticism / Strategy of Criticism Expresed by C
DCT-1	The informant (employee) is criticized by the head office with a direct strategy. Their relationship is not close	"*Pak, njenengan ini gimana kok tidak bisa disiplin. Masak pekerjaan bertumpuk-tumpuk kok malah asyik main game*".'Sir, how come you are so undisciplined. How can you allow your work to pile up while you just enjoy yourself playing games'.

		(+DC+P+D)	
DCT-2	The informant (employee) is criticized by the head office with a direct strategy. Their relationship is close (+DC+P-D)	"*Pak, gimana njenengan ini tanggung jawabnya kok rendah. Masak pekerjaan sering molor dan tidak pernah beres*".'Sir, how can you showsuch a poor level of responsibility. Your work is often late and never up to date'	
DCT-3	The informant (head of office) is criticized by employee with a direct strategy. Their relationship is not familiar (+DC-P+D)	"*Sebelumnya saya mohon maaf. Kami selaku bawahan merasa senang apabila kita semua disiplin. Sayangnya, Bapak selaku kepala kantor tidak memberikan contoh disiplin yang baik kepada kami*".'I apologize beforehand, sir. As your subordinates, we are happy if we are all more disciplined. However, unfortunately you, sir, as the head of this office, do not set a good example of discipline for the rest of us'	
DCT-4	The informant (head of office) is criticized by employee with direct strategy. Their relationship is familiar (+DC-P-D)	"*Maaf Pak. Meskipun njenengan kepala kantor, tapi njenengan melanggar aturan karena telah menggunakan fasilitas kantor untuk kepentingan pribadi*".'Sorry sir. Even though you are the head of the office, you are still breaking the rules if you use office facilities for your own personal needs'	
DCT-5	The informant (employee) is criticized by the head office with an indirect strategy. Their relationship is not close(-DC+P+D)	"*MaafPak, apakahBapaktidakbisabekerjalebihbaiklagibiarpekerjaanBapakmemuaskan. KalauBapakmau, sayayakinBapakbisa*". 'Sorry sir, but can you not try to work a bit better so that the result of your work is more satisfactory. If you have the will to do it, I feel sure you are capable.'	
DCT-6	The informant (employee) is criticized by the head office with an indirect strategy. Their relationship is close (-DC+P-D)	"*Pak, njenenganbolehsajangurusibisnispribadi. Tidakdilarang. Tapisebaiknyapekerjaankantordikerjakandulu. Barungurusibisnispribadi*".Sir, you may take care of your own personal business. That is not forbidden. But it would be better if you finished your work in the office first. After that you may take care of your own business.'	
DCT-7	The informant (head of office) is criticized by an employee with an indirect strategy. Their relationship is not familiar.(-DC-P+D)	" *Sebelumnyasayamohonmaaf Pak. Sepertinyaakhir-akhirinibanyakpegawai yang disiplinnyarendah. Merekaseringkeluyuranpada jam kerja. Akibatnyapekerjaankantortidakterurus. Apahalinidibiarkansaja Pak"?* 'I apologize in advance, sir. It seems that recently many employees have shown a lack of discipline. They often wander around during office hours. As a result, their office work is not taken care of. Are we going to let this continue, sir?'	
DCT-8	The informant (head of office) is criticized by an employee with	"*Sebelumnyasayamohonmaaf. Kita semuamerasasenangbisnisnjenenganberkembangdenganpesat. Tapi kami mohondengansangat agar tugas-tugaskantorjugamendapatperhatian yang cukupsehinggatidaksalingmengganggu*".'I apologize in advance. We all feel	

	an indirect strategy. Their relationship is close(-DC-P-D)	that your business is growing quickly. But we strongly urge you to give sufficient attention to your office work too, so that the two jobs do not interfere with each other.'

The DCT was distributed to 40 informants. One informant filled DCT-1 to DCT-8. This means that the negative response obtained from each DCT also amounts to 40 utterances.These 40 utterances were then analyzed one by one to understand the use of their strategies, directly or indirectly. The determination of direct and indirect strategies in this article follows Searle (1996). Direct strategy only has one illocutionary act, while the indirect strategy has two illocutionary acts, namely the primary illocutionary act and secondary illocutionary act. Speakers put forward the primary illocutionary act through a secondary illocutionary act.Based on the analysis, the tendency to use the strategy is determined. After that, a parameter is sought that encourages the tendency to use the strategy.

III.   POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN NEGATIVE RESPONSE TO CRITICISM IN THE JCC.

As stated above, a criticism requires a response, and the response to a criticism is not always pleasant because in frequent cases, the response to a criticism is negative. Giving a negative response means that R is rejecting the criticism, and rejecting the criticism means that R does not respect C. On the other hand, when C criticizes R, this also means that C does not respect R. Hence, a criticism and a negative response to a criticism are both types of actions that are not respectful. Therefore, the threat that arises as a result of a negative response to a criticism is quite high because the action of not respecting is responded to likewise, with another action of not respecting. The high level the threat poses means that the potential for conflict between R and C is also quite high.

The condition of mutual disrespect described above strongly contradicts the principles of social interaction or communication that prevail in the JCC, namely the principle of respect and the principle of harmony. Therefore, the negative response to criticism in the JCC cannot be expressed at will or without certain considerations. In this instance, R must pay careful attention to the context to decide whether the negative response should be expressed using a direct or an indirect strategy. The wrong choice of strategy may lead to tension or even a quarrel between C and R. The following section will analyse in depth the types of contexts in which a negative response to criticism in the JCC tends to be expressed using a direct strategy and the types of contexts in which it tends to be expressed using an indirect strategy.

3.1 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (+DC+P+D)

Based on the data analysis, it is known that the strategy that tend to be used to express negative responses to criticism in context (+KL+P+D) is indirect. Of the 40 negative responses obtained from DCT-1, only 4 negative responses are expressed with direct strategy, while 36 are expressed by indirect . The data (1) below is one of example of negative response expressed with indirect strategy. R in data (1) does not use word *tidak* 'not' to express his negative response to C. R only says that he only plays games at rest. This means that it doesn't interfere with office work. This is different from the data (2). In the data (2) R clearly uses word *tidak* 'not' to express the negative response to C. The negative response expressed clearly.

(1) *Mohonmaaf Pak. Sayahanya main game padawaktuistirahatdantidakmengganggupekerjaansaya.*'Sorry, sir. I only play games during breaks and do not interfere with my work'.

(2) *Maaf Pak, apa yang Bapak katakan itu saya kira tidak benar. Sebabselamainisaya main game hanyapada jam istirahat sehingga tidak mengganggu pekerjaan.* 'Sorry, sir, what you said was not true. Because all the time I play games only during breaks so it doesn't interfere with work.'

The question is that why the most common negative response strategy used in the context (+DC+P+D) is indirect. Why not a direct? It should be stressed that the use of a negative response strategy in the context (+DC+P+D) above cannot possibly have occurred at random or by coincidence. There must be a certain parameter that influenced it. The question is, what is this parameter? Based on the analysis of the data, it was learned that the parameter with the greatest influence on the use of the negative response strategy in the context (+DC+P+D) is (+P). This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+P) is replaced with (-P), thus changing the context to (+DC-P+D), the tendency to use this strategy changes. In the context (+DC-P+D), the use of a direct negative response strategy is quite high. This is proven in the discussion in section 3.3 below. It would seem that a negative response such as appears in the data (2) is considered to be too harsh if it is uttered to R with a higher degree of power. Therefore, a negative response such as appears in the data (1) is ultimately preferred or more often chosen because it is felt to be less harsh.

Meanwhile, the parameters (+D) and (+DC) in the context (+DC+P+D) appear to have no significant influence on the choice of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+D) is replaced with (-D), thus changing the context to (+DC+P-D), the tendency remains the same, namely an indirect response strategy is more commonly used than a direct response strategy. This is examined in more detail in section 3.2. Similarly, if the parameter (+DC) in the context (+DC+P+D) is replaced with (-DC), thus changing the context to (-DC+P+D), it causes no change in the use of response strategy. The tendency remains the same, namely the more prevalent use of an indirect strategy. This is proven in the discussion in section 3.5 below. It can be concluded, therefore, that it is the parameter (+P) that is of the most important consideration for R when choosing to express a negative response using an indirect strategy.

3.2 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (+DC +P-D)
As in context (+DC+P+D), in context (+DC+P-D), the most common strategy used to express a negative response to criticism is an indirect. Data analysis shows that of the 40 negative responses obtained from DCT-2, only 3 negative responses are expressed with direct strategy, while 37 others are expressed in indirect strategy. The data (3) below is one of an example of negative response obtained from DCT-2 which is expressed by direct strategy. R in the data (3) blatantly says *tidak* 'no' to C. On the contrary, in data (4) R does not explicitly use the word *tidak* 'not' to express his negative response to C, but R only questions the validity of the content of criticism expressed by C. By questioning this, it means that R does not covertly accept or reject the criticism put forward by C.
(3) *Maaf Pak,tidakmungkinsayamemilki rasa tanggungjawab yang rendahsepertiitu. Masaksayasepertiitu. Sebaiknyasebelummelakukanpenilaian,*
tolongdicekdulukebenarannyasupayanjenengantidakterkesanasalmenilai. 'I'm sorry Sir, It is impossible that I have such a low level of responsibility. How could I be like that. Before making judgment, it is better that you check your facts first so that you do not give the impression of making random accusations.'
(4)*Mohonmaaf Pak,*
*apakahnjenengansudahmengeceksendiribahwapekerjaansayaseringmolordantidakberes?'*I'm sorry Sir,have you checked for yourself that my work is often late and never up to date?

The question is, why is the most common negative response strategy used in the context (+DC+P-D) indirect? Based on the analysis of the data, in this context it appears that parameter (+P) has the greatest influence in determining the use of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+P) in the context (+DC+P-D) is replaced with the parameter (-P), thus changing the context to (+DC-P-D), this makes a significant difference to the choice of response strategy. In the context (+DC+P-D), the most common response strategy used is an indirect strategy, while in the context (+DC-P-D), the most common response strategy chosen is a direct strategy. This is proven in the discussion in section 3.4 below.
Meanwhile, the parameter (-D) has no significant influence on the use of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (-D) is replaced with (+D), thus altering the context to (+DC+P+D), it does not change the choice of response strategy, and the use of an indirect response strategy remains higher than the use of a direct response strategy. This has already been proven in the discussion in section 3.1 above.
Similarly, the parameter (+DC) in the context above appears to have no significant influence on the choice of response strategy. This is proven in the discussion in section 3.6 below, which shows that in the context (-DC+P-D), the use of an indirect response strategy is higher than a direct response strategy. This means that changing (+DC) to (-DC) does not alter the use of response strategy.

3.3 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context
(+DC–P+D)
Based on the analysis conducted on 40 utterances obtained from DCT-3, it is known that negative response in context (+KL-P+D) generally tend to be put forward by direct strategy. However, the comparison with the negative response expressed by indirect strategy is not so high (25:15). The data (5) below is the example of negative response with direct strategy. R clearly uses the word *tidak* 'no' in expressing his negative response to C. Meanwhile, in the data (6) R does not use word *tidak* 'not' to express his negative response, but R only says that what was stated by C in his criticism does not make sense. This means that implicitly R does not accept the criticism put forward by C.
(5) *Selakukepalakantortidakmungkinsayatidakmemberikancontohdisiplin yang baikkepadabawahan. Apajadinyakantorinikalausayatidakmemberikancontohdisiplin yang baik. Jadi, kalauberbicarasebaiknyatidaksembarangan Pak.* 'As the head of the office, it is impossible that I would not

set a good example of discipline to my subordinates. What would happen to this office if I didn't set a good example of discipline. So it would be better if you did not speak in such an offhand manner'.
(6) *Maaf Pak, seandainyasayatidakdisiplin, manamungkinsayasetiapsaatmengajakparapegawai agar selalumenjagasikapdisiplin.* Sorry Sir, supposing I didn't have discipline, how could continue to keep asking my employees to maintain good discipline'.

The question is that why a negative response with a direct strategy in DCT-3 is preferred or more commonly used than a negative response with an indirect. Which parameter influences it? Based on an analysis of the data, it can be seen that the parameter with the greatest influence on the use or choice of response strategy in the context (+DC-P+D) is the parameter (-P). It appears that the parameter (-P) allows R the freedom to express a negative response using either a direct or indirect strategy. On the contrary, the parameter (+P) presents an obstacle for R to express a negative response using a direct strategy, as proven in section 3.1 above. In DCT-3 above, R could quite easily express the negative response using an indirect strategy. But why does he choose to use a direct strategy? It would appear that this is strongly influenced by the strategy of criticism used by C, namely a direct criticism. The use of a direct criticism by C appears to encourage R to express his negative response using a direct strategy.

Meanwhile, the parameter (+D) appears to have no significant influence on the use of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+D) is replaced with (-D), thus changing the context to (+DC-P-D), this does not alter the choice of response strategy, and the use of a direct response strategy remains higher than the use of an indirect response strategy. This is proven in the discussion in section 3.4.

3.4 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (+DC-P-D)
Based on the analysis, it is known that in the context (+DC-P-D) the negative response strategy that is more widely used is direct strategy. Of the 40 negative responses obtained from DCT-4, 27 of them were expressed with direct strategy, while the other 13 were expressed by indirect strategy. Data (7) is an example of a negative response with a direct strategy. R blatantly uses the word *tidak* 'no'. Meanwhile, R in the data (8) expresses the negative response by questioning the contents of the criticism conveyed by C. Therefore, the rejection was carried out in a non-explicit manner.
(7) *Pak, sayatahukalaufasilitaskantortidakbolehdigunakanuntukkepentinganpribadi. Karenaitu, tidakmungkinsayamelakukanitu Pak.*'Sir, I am aware that office facilities may not be used for personal needs. Therefore, it is not possible that I would do that'.
(8) *Pak, apanjenengantahusendirikalausayamenggunakanfasilitaskantor? Kalautidaktahusendiri, sebaiknyajanganmengatakansepertiitu Pak biartidakjadifitnah.* 'Sir, do you know yourself that I have been using the office facilities? If you don't know this yourself, you shouldn't say that, sir, so that it does not lead to slander'.

The question is, why is it more common for negative responses to be made using a direct strategy than an indirect strategy in the context (+DC-P-D)? Based on an analysis of the data, it was found that the parameter that has the greatest influence on the use or choice of response strategy in the context (+DC-P-D) is the parameter (-P). As explained above, the parameter (-P) allows R the freedom to express a negative response using either a direct or indirect strategy. However, because C in DCT-4 above uses a direct strategy in expressing his criticism, this encourages R to express the negative response also using a direct strategy.

Meanwhile, it appears that parameter (-D) does not have any significant influence on the choice of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (-D) is changed to (+D), thus making the context (+DC-P+D), this does not alter the use of response strategy, and the use of a direct response strategy remains higher than the use of an indirect response strategy. This has already been proven in the discussion in section 3.3 above.

3.5 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (-DC+P+D)
Based on the analysis, it is known that negative response in context (-KL+P+D) tend to be expressed by indirect strategy. Of the 40 negative responses obtained from DCT-5, only 5 negative responses were expressed with direct strategy, while 35 were expressed by indirect strategy. Data (9) is an example of a negative response with a direct strategy. R openly says *tidak* 'no' to C. However, R in data (10) is not like that. R expresses his negative response by questioning the content of the criticism that was presented by C.
(9) *Sebelumnyasayamohonmaaf Pak, seingatsayaselamainisayasudahberusahamengerjakantugas-tugaskantordengansebaik-baiknya. Jadi, kalauBapakmengatakanbahwapekerjaansayatidakmemuaskan,*

sayakiraitutidakbenar.'I apologize in advance, but as far as I remember I have tried to carry out my office duties to the best of my ability. So if you say that my work is not satisfactory, I don't think that is true'.
(10) *Mohonmaaf Pak, apakahbetulselamainipekerjaansayatidakmemuaskan? SayakiraBapakperlumengeceksekalilagibiartidaksalahmenilai.* 'I'm sorry,Sir, is it true that my work has not been satisfactory all this time? I think you should check one more time so that you do not make a wrong judgment'.

The question is, why are the negative responses using an indirect strategy much more common than negative responses using a direct strategy in DCT-5? Which parameter influences this tendency? Based on an analysis of the data, it was found that the parameter with the greatest influence on the use or choice of response strategy in context (-DC+P+D) in DCT-5 is the parameter (+P). As stated above, the parameter (+P) can present a strong obstacle for R to express a negative response using a direct strategy. Furthermore, in DCT-5 above, C expresses the criticism using an indirect strategy (-DC) which makes it even less likely that R would express a negative response using a direct strategy such as in dialogue (9) above.
Meanwhile, the parameter (+D) in the context (-DC+P+D) in DCT-5 appears to have no significant influence on the choice of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+D) is changed to (-D), thus making the context (-DC+P-D), it does not alter the use of response strategy, and the use of an indirect response strategy is still more common than the use of a direct response strategy. This will be proven in the discussion in section 3.6.

3.6 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (-DC+P-D)
Based on the analysis carried out on 40 utterances obtained from DCT-6 above, it is known that in context (-KL + P-D) only 2 negative responses were expressed with direct strategy. Most (38 utterances) are expressed in indirect strategies. Data (11) is an example of a negative response with an indirect strategy. R did not openly say *tidak* 'no' to C. R actually said he had done what was stated by C in his criticism. This is different from data (12). In data (12) R blatantly says *tidak* 'no' word to the criticism put forward by C.
(11):*Mohonmaaf Pak. Sayasetujudenganapa yang Bapaksampaikan. Selamainisayasudahmelakukanseperti yang Bapaksampaikanitu.*'I'm sorry,Sir. I agree with what you say. All this time, I have always done as you say'.
(12) *Sebelumnyasayamohonmaaf Pak. Bapakmendapatinformasidarimanabahwasayaseringmengurusibisnispribadipada jam dinas. Perlusayasampaikanbahwaapa yang Bapaksampaikanitutidakbenar. Terimakasih.*'I apologize in advance. Where did you get the information that I often take care of my own personal business during office hours. I should tell you that what you say is not true. Thank you'.

The question that needs to be answered is why negative responses using an indirect strategy are far more common or preferred in DCT-6 than negative responses using a direct strategy. Based on an analysis of the data, it was found that the parameter that has the greatest influence on the use or choice of response strategy in the context (-DC+P-D) in DCT-6 above is the parameter (+P). The parameter (+P) encourages R to express the negative response using an indirect strategy. Furthermore, in DCT-6, the criticism is expressed using an indirect strategy (-DC), and in addition, C and R are not close (-D), which makes it highly unlikely that R would express the negative response using a direct strategy.

3.7 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (-DC-P+D)
Based on the data analysis, it is known that the negative response strategy that is most widely used in the context (-KL-P + D) is an indirect strategy. Of the 40 negative responses obtained from DCT-7 , 37 of them are expressed by indirect strategy and only 3 negative responses are expressed with direct strategy. Data (13) is an example of a negative response expressed by an indirect strategy. R did not frankly say *tidak* 'no' to C, but R actually questioned the criticism put forward by C. Meanwhile, R in the data (14) said *tidak* 'no' to C, so using direct strategy.
(13) *Pak, manaadaseorangkepalakantor yang membiarkanpegawainyatidakdisiplin? Kalauada, yaharusditegur Pak.* 'Sir, when would a head of office ever allow his employees to be undisciplined? If they are, they should be admonished, sir'.
(14) *Pak, tidakadapegawai yang seringkeluyuranpada jam kantorseperti yang Bapakkatakanitu. Kalauada, pastisayaberisanksi.* 'Sir, there are no employees who wander around during office hours like you say. If there were, I would punish them'.

The question that needs to be answered is why there is a much greater tendency to use a negative response with an indirect strategy in DCT-7 than a negative response with a direct strategy. Based on an analysis of the data, it was found that the parameter that has the most influence on the choice of response strategy in the context (-DC-P+D) is the parameter (-P). As mentioned above, the parameter (-P) gives R the freedom to express a negative response either using a direct or indirect strategy, unlike the parameter (+P), which on the contrary acts as an obstacle for R to express a negative response using a direct strategy. Hence, in DCT-7 above, R could in fact use a direct strategy. However, because C expresses the criticism in DCT-7 using an indirect strategy, R adapts to or follows the strategy used by C, and also uses an indirect strategy. This is the reason why the number of negative responses using an indirect strategy in table 7 above is much greater than the number using a direct strategy.

Meanwhile, the parameter (+D) in the context (-DC-P+D) appears not to have any significant influence on the use of response strategy. This is proven by the fact that if the parameter (+D) is changed to (-D), thus making the context (-DC-P-D), this does not alter the response strategy, and the use of an indirect response strategy is still be higher than the use of a direct response strategy. This will be proven in the discussion in section 3.8 below.

3.8 Politeness Strategies in Negative Response to Criticism in the Context (-DC-P-D)

Based on the analysis carried out on 40 utterances obtained from DCT-8, it is known that negative responses in context (-KL-P-D) are more likely to be expressed by indirect strategy rather than direct strategy with comparison (5:35). Data (15) is an example of a negative response with an indirect strategy. R does not use words not to express negative response. R only said that he took care of a side business only if there was free time. This means that the side business does not interfere with office work. On the contrary, in the data (16) R actually blatantly says no to C. By using the word *tidak*'no', R means using direct strategy, blatantly denying or not accepting the criticism expressed by C

(15) *Mohon maaf Pak, selama ini kayaknya saya mengurusi bisnis sampingan hanya kalau ada waktu luang saja.*'Sorry, sir, all this time I seem to take care of my side business only if there is free time'.

(16) *Pak, kalaudikatakanbisnissayaitumenggangggupekerjaankantor, sayakiratidakbenar. Sebabsayatahukapanharusmengerjakantugas-tugaskantordankapanharusmengurusibisnis.*'Sir, if you said my business was interfering with office work, I don't think it's right. Because I know when to do office tasks and when to take care of business'.

The question is, why is there a greater tendency to use negative responses with an indirect strategy in DCT-8 than negative responses with a direct strategy? Based on an analysis of the data, it was found that the parameter with the strongest influence on the use of response strategy in the context (-DC-P-D) isthe parameter (-P). As explained above, in the Javanese Cultural Community,theparameter (-P) gives freedom to R to express a negative response using a direct strategy. However, because in DCT-8 above, C expresses the criticism using an indirect strategy to express the criticism, this encourages R to also express a negative response using an indirect strategy.

IV. CONCLUSION

The use of politeness strategies in negative response to criticism in the JCC, as outlined above, is summarized in table 2 below.

Table 2

The Use of Negative Response Strategyin the JCC

No.	Context	Use of Negative Response Strategy		Total Number of Responses
		Direct	Indirect	
1	(+DC+P+D)	4	36	
2	(+DC+P-D)	3	37	
3	(+DC-P+D)	25	15	40
4	(+DC-P-D)	27	13	

5	(-DC+P+D)	5	35	
6	(-DC+P-D)	2	38	
7	(-DC-P+D)	3	37	
8	(-DC-P-D)	5	35	

Table 2 shows that the use of politeness strategies in negative response to criticism in the JCC is actually only determined by a single parameter, namely (±P). If a context contains (+P), then there is a high use of indirect strategy. This can be observed in the contexts in numbers 1, 2, 5, and 6. In these contexts, there is a very low occurrence of direct strategy. This leads us to understand that the parameter (+P) is an obstacle for people in the JCC to express negative response using a direct strategy. This understanding may imply that the use of direct strategy in contexts in which (+P) is present is impolite in the JCC.

On the contrary, if a context contains (-P), then the use of a negative response strategy depends on the strategy used in the criticism. If the C uses a direct strategy to express the criticism, the R is also more inclined to use a direct strategy in expressing the negative response. This can be seen in the contexts of numbers 3 and 4. On the other hand, if the C uses an indirect strategy to express the criticism, then the R is also more likely to use an indirect strategy in expressing the negative response. This can be seen in numbers 7 and 8. Of course, what happens in the JCC is not necessarily the case in other cultural communities. Unfortunately, to date there have been very few studies on the speech act of response to criticism in various cultures, and for this reason, it is not possible to make a comparison with the present study.

REFERENCES

1. Asmalı, M. (2013). "Cross-cultural Comparison of Non-native Speakers' Refusal Strategies in English" in *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(3), 106-128.
2. Allami, Hamid &AminNaeimi. (2011). "A Cross-Linguistic Study of Refusals: An Analysis of Pragmatic Competence Development in Iranian EFL learners" in*Journal of Pragmatics*Volume 43, Issue 1, January 2011, Pages 385-406
3. Abdul Sattar, H. Q. et.al. (2011). "Refusal Strategies In English By Malay University Students" in *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies* Volume 11(3) September 2011
4. Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2012). "An intercultural study of refusal strategies in English between Jordanian EFL and Malay ESL postgraduate students" in *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies* 18(3), 29-39.
5. Brown, Penelope and S.C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Byon, A. S. (2003). "The Korean speech act of refusals: Sociopragmatic analysis" in *Korean Linguistics*, 11, 241-270.
7. BabaiShishavan, Homa and FarzadSharifian. 2016. "The Refusal Speech Act in a Cross-Cultural Perspective: A Study of Iranian English-Language Learners and Anglo-AustralianSpeakers" in*Language & Communication*Volume 47, March 2016, Pages 75-88
8. Bonyadi, A., Ghazanfari, M., & Malekzadeh, S. (2013). "Investigating cross-linguistic differences in refusal speech act among native Persian and English speakers" in *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 2 (4), Pages 49-63.
9. Farnia, Maryam & Xiaojuan Wu. 2012. "An Intercultural Communication Study of Chinese and Malaysian University Students' Refusal to Invitation" in *International Journal of English Linguistics* , Vol 2, NO 1, Februari 2012, Pages 162-176
10. Farnia, Maryam & Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar. 2015. "A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism by Persian Native Speakers" in *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, Volume 2 Issue 3 December 2015, Pages 305-327.
11. Gunarwan, Asim. (1996). "The Speech Act of Criticizing among Speakers of Javanese". Paper presented at the 6th meeting of the South East Asian Linguistics Society. Unpublished.
12. Hoang ThiXuanHoa. (2007). "Criticizing Behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: Topics, Social Factors, and Frequency" in *VNU Journal of Science. Foreign Languages*, Pages 141-154.
13. Hassani, R., Mardani, M., & Hossein, H. (2011). "A Comparative Study of Refusals: Gender Distinction and Social Status in Focus" in *International Journal -Language Society and Culture* (32), Pages 37-46.

14. J. CésarFélix-Brasdefer. (2016). "Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish" in*Journal of Pragmatics*Volume 38, Issue 12, December 2006, Pages 2158-2187

15. Leech, Geoffrey. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

16. Li Honglin(2007). "A Comparative Study of Refusal Speech Acts in Chinese and American English"in *Canadian Social Science* Vol.3 No.4 August 2007

17. Magnis Suseno, Frans. (1988). *Etika Jawa*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

18. MIN Shang-chao. (2008). "Study on the Differences of Speech Act of Criticism in Chinese and English" in*US-China Foreign Language*, March 2008, Volume 6, No. 3 (Serial No.54).

19. Mulac, Anthony et.al. (2000). "Female and Male Managers' Criticism Giving: Differences in Language Use and Effects" in *Journal of Language and Psychology*. Vol. 19. N0 4. December. 2000.

20. Nguyen, Minh ThiThui. (2005). "Criticizing and Responding to Criticism in a Foreign Language: A Study of Vietnamese Leaners of English". A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Language Teaching, The University of Auckland.

21. Searle, J.R. (1996)."Indirect Speech Acts", *The Philosophy of Language*. Third Edition. Edited by A.P. Martinich. New York: Oxford University Press.

22. Sadeghi, K., & Savojbolaghchilar, S. (2011). "A Comparative Study of Refusal Strategies Used by Iranians and Americans" in *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(2), Pages 601-606.

23. Sahragard, R., & Javanmardi, F. (2011). "English Speech Act Realization of "Refusals" among Iranian EFL Learners" in *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 7(2), Pages 181-198.

24. Tracy, K., & Eisenberg, E. (1990). "Giving criticisms: a multiple goals case study" in*Research on Language and Social Interaction* 24, Pages 37-70

25. Tracy, K., Van Dusen, D., & Robinson, S. (1987). "Good and bad criticism: a descriptive analysis" in*Journal of Communication* 37, Pages 46-59.

26. Toplak, M. and Katz, A. (2000). "On the Uses of Sarcastic Irony" in*Journal of Pragmatics*.Volume 32, Issue 10, September 2000, Pages 1467-1488

27. Turgay Han & Assiye Burgucu-Tazegül. (2016). "Realization of Speech Acts of Refusals and Pragmatic Competence by Turkish EFL Learners" in *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal* Volume 16, Number 1, April 2016

28. Wajnryb, R. .(1993). "Strategies for the management and delivery of criticisms" in *EA Journal* 11 (2), Pages 74-84.

29. Zhao Chunli and Siti Nurbaya Binti Mohd Nor. (2016). "The realization of the Speech Act of Refusals among Chinese EFL Speakers in Malaysia" in *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, (June)