REFUSAL STRATEGY IN ENGLISH USED BY THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS OF UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

THESIS

BY:

DJABAL MAULA

REG. NUMBER: A03216013

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2021

DECLARATION

I am the undersigned below:

Name	: Djabal Maula
NIM	: A03216013
Department	: English Department
Faculty	: Arts and Humanities
University	: UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Truly state that the thesis I wrote is my original work and not a plagiarism/ fabrication part or whole.

If in the future, there is a proof that this thesis results from plagiarism/fabrication, either in part or in full, then I am willing to accept sanctions for such actions accordance to the applicable provisions.

Surabaya, January 8th, 2021

Who make the statement

Djabal Maula

ii

APPROVAL SHEET

REFUSAL STRATEGY IN ENGLISH USED BY THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS OF UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

By:
DJABAL MAULA
Reg. Number: A03216013

Approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners, English Department,
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Surabaya, January 8th, 2021
Thesis Advisor

Suhandoko, M.Pd
NIP. 198905282018011002

Acknowledged by:
Head of the English Department

Dr. Wahju Kusumajanti, M. Hum
NIP. 197002051999032002

EXAMINER SHEET

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners, English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya in 20 January 2021.

The Board of Examiners are:

Examiner 1   Examiner 2

Suhandoko, M.Pd.   **Prof. Dr. Zulianti Rohmah, M.Pd.**
NIP. 198905282018011002   NIP. 197303032000032001

Examiner 3   Examiner 4

Raudlotul Jannah, M.App.Ling.   **Dr. A. Dzo'ul Milal, M.Pd.**
NIP. 197810062005012004   NIP. 196005152000031002

Acknowledged by:
The Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities
UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Dr. H. Agus Aditoni , M. Ag
NIP. 196210021992031001

iv

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Djabal Maula

NIM : A03216013

Fakultas/Jurusan : Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris

E-mail address : djabalmaula0144@gmail.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :
☑ Sekripsi ☐ Tesis ☐ Desertasi ☐ Lain-lain (...............................)
yang berjudul :

Refusal Strategy in English Used by The English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Ekslusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara *fulltext* untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 25 Februari 2021

Penulis

(Djabal Maula)

v

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify cases of refusal strategies used by students of the English Department at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Employing a qualitative approach in conducting the study, refusal strategies outlined by Beebe, Takahashi, and Ulil-Weltz (1990), and Scollon and Scollon's (1995) power and distance theory, this thesis seeks to answer two research questions; (i) What types of refusal strategies are used by students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya and (ii) How is students' awareness of power and distance in the applying of refusal strategy cases.

In this study, the researcher assigned himself as the main instrument in collecting and analyzing the data. The researcher provided a stimulus of invitation act to get the data in the form of refusal responses. The invitation was sent to three different social levels (eleven junior, eleven classmates/ equal, and three senior students) using WhatsApp messenger. The invitation was also supplemented with stimulation, which is different for each group of social status (junior, equal/classmates, and senior) in order to investigate the participants' awareness of power and distance when performing refusal strategies. After that, the data which were included in refusal strategies were coded and analyzed following Beebe et al.'s (1990) refusal strategies and Scollon and Scollon's (1995) power and distance.

The study found that indirect refusal, especially statements of excuse, reason, explanation is the most commonly used strategy used by the participants, followed by a statement of regret. This suggests that the participants respect their interlocutors despite performing refusal. In addition, all groups of students (junior, equal/classmates, and senior) tend to perform indirect refusal. They avoid directly refusing because they want to save the face-threatening act. So that communication can run smoothly without feeling offended.

ABSTRAK

Maula, D. 2021. *Strategi Penolakan yang Digunakan oleh Mahasiswa Sastra Inggris UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Pembimbing: Suhandoko, M.Pd.

Kata kunci: penolakan, daya, jarak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi kasus penolakan yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa sastra Inggris UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Mahasiswa dikelompokkan menjadi tiga bagian, yakni mahasiswa tingkat rendah, mahasiswa seangkatan, dan mahasiswa tingkat atas. Peneliti tertarik menyelidiki tindak penolakan berdasarkan status social di lingkungan pendidikan karena masih jarang penelitian yang menganalisa strategi penolakan pada suatu kelompok tertentu, yakni mahasiswa. Kemudian peneliti menggunakan teori tentang pengelompokkan jenis strategi penolakan oleh Beebe, Takahashi, dan Ulil-Weltz (1990) dan dikaitkan dengan teori tentang kesopanan, khususnya daya dan jarak oleh Scollon dan Scollon (1995). Jadi terdapat dua fokus utama yang ingin diungkapkan dalam penelitian ini, mereka adalah: (i) Jenis strategi penolakan apa yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya dan (ii) Bagaimana kesadaran mahasiswa terhadap daya dan jarak dalam penerapan kasus strategi penolakan.

Dalam penelitian ini peneliti menetapkan dirinya sebagai instrumen utama dalam mengumpulkan dan menganalisis data. Peneliti memberikan stimulus tindakan undangan untuk mendapatkan data berupa respon penolakan. Undangan dikirim ke tiga tingkatan sosial yang berbeda (sebelas mahasiswa tingkat bawah, sebelas teman sekelas / sederajat, dan tiga mahasiswa tingkata atas) menggunakan WhatsApp messenger. Ajakan tersebut juga dilengkapi dengan stimulasi yang berbeda untuk setiap kelompok status sosial (junior, sederajat / teman sekelas, dan senior) guna mengetahui kesadaran peserta akan kekuasaan dan jarak saat melakukan strategi penolakan. Setelah itu, data yang termasuk dalam strategi penolakan diberi kode dan dianalisis mengikuti strategi penolakan Beebe et al. (1990) dan teori daya dan jarak oleh Scollon dan Scollon (1995).

Hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa penolakan tidak langsung terutama pernyataan permintaan maaf, alasan, penjelasan merupakan strategi yang paling sering digunakan oleh peserta diikuti dengan pernyataan penyesalan. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa partisipan menghormati lawan bicaranya meskipun melakukan penolakan. Selain itu, semua kelompok mahasiswa (junior, sederajat / teman sekelas, dan senior) cenderung melakukan penolakan tidak langsung. Mereka menghindari menolak secara langsung karena ingin menyelamatkan tindakan yang mengancam mukanya. Sehingga komunikasi dapat berjalan dengan lancar tanpa merasa tersinggung.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

x

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

xii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope and limitation, and definition of key terms. Those parts describe the primary reasons for this research and what aspects are related therein.

1.1 Background of the Study

Communication is an essential part of life as a social being. With communication, humans can convey ideas, feelings, and views in seeing the world. However, not all communications in practice run as well as expected. It all depends on how the speaker and listener understand what each other wants. According to Yule (2010, p. 127), communication does not always focus on the speaker's words, but on deeper than that. Sometimes the speaker includes the implied meaning in each speech so that the listener must catch what it means. An understanding of the use of language is necessary to prevent misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

A language is an essential tool in communication. Wardaugh (2006) argues that language is utterance produced by a person in a society. Good communication requires a reciprocal process, giving messages or information to the interlocutor and receiving an idea or information. Communication can be said to be successful if there are two elements. The first is the speaker who provides information. The second is listeners who receive information, or vice versa (Rosdiana, 2018). In

1

communication, language serves several functions, such as making the statement, requesting, inviting, greeting, and promising (Austin, 1962; Finnegan, 1993). This function is always present in every communication, depending on the type of situation that occurs. For example, a participant wants to convey ideas about a problem during a meeting. A person may not speak immediately before the leader asks him to do so. Hence, the participant must ask permission first before talking about their ideas. This case suggests that paying attention to language function during communication is very important. In addition to showing the right attitude, the speaker needs to make communication run smoothly. Participants use a request to state their opinion first before expressing their opinion.

The way someone uses language in communication studies in the study of pragmatics. Crystal in Barron (2003, p. 7) argues that pragmatics is the science of language which influences a person to choose the words to be spoken, the effect caused by the spoken words, and the obstacles that may be obtained from the choice of utterance in a social environment. On the other hand, communication is not always related to the speaker's statement, but also actions that reinforce an utterance. The action here means a movement that accompanies a speech, for example, is body language. According to Ozuorcun (2013, p. 13), body language is a part of communication that involves the movement of limbs to express an emotion. Parts of the body can mean eyes, face, head, hands, shoulders, and feet. This action is needed to help the listener get much clearer information. An utterance accompanied by an action is called a speech act (Yule, 1996, p. 47).

From Searle's view (1976, p. 17-18), a language is a speech act related to a sentence produced by an utterance with its meaning. In other words, it is not always the utterance produced by the speaker that is the true meaning. There is, to some extent, an implied meaning contained in it. Aitchison (2013, p.106) explains that speech acts are a collection of words that have a role like an action. Then with that word, the speaker wants to emphasize a purpose and then have an effect. On the other hand, Birner (2013) argues that if someone produces a word, it means that he is also doing an action. From some opinions of language experts that have previously described, it can be seen that a speech cannot be separated from the action in communication.

Searle (1976), who is known as the philosopher of language, emphasizes that language is a speech act activity with several purposes, such as making comments, making a request, and stating a statement. A teacher, for example, does not need to erase scratches on the blackboard when starting lessons. The teacher says, "The blackboard still seems full and a little dirty," to make the students erase what is on the blackboard. With these words, students will understand if the teacher wants the blackboard to be cleaned from writing before he starts the lesson. From this case, it can be concluded that a word is sufficient to carry out an action.

Yule (1996) divides actions into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Locutionary is an action that produces meaningful speech. In other words, a speech that has a specific purpose for the listeners to understand later. Agreeing with Yule, Cutting (2002, p. 16) states that locutionary is what is

spoken. Then from the utterances produced by the speaker, there are several purposes. The purpose of what is conveyed in the speaker's utterance is called the illocutionary act. Illocutionary is a real action caused by the utterance. Yule (1996) classifies the illocutionary into declarations, representative, expressives, directives, and commisives. Declarations are speech acts that are related to changes caused by words. The word here has the meaning of speech, so it has an impact that can be felt by both the speaker and the listener. The examples are blessing and firing. A representative is a speech act related to what the speaker believes and confirms. The speaker has his point of view in assessing an event. An example is suggesting. Expressives is a speech act related to a person's feelings and emotions, such as apologizing. Directives is a speech act that allows the speaker to act to provide direction to the interlocutor. Someone can give orders or requests, for example, requesting. Commisives is a speech act related to actions to be performed by listeners in the future, for example, refusing.

Yule's last type of speech act is perlocutionary, which is the effect that is caused by the previously produced utterances. The speaker gives an emphasis on his speaking so that it allows the listener to understand what it really means, then some effects arise (Yule, 1996). The effect is then accepted by the listener so that it can change thought patterns, feelings, and habits. This case arose because of previous actions, locutions, and illocutions. In some cases, the effects of perlocutionary acts can be divided into two kinds, intentionally and unintentionally. Intentionally, for example, when the speaker tells the listener to take a particular action. Unintentionally, for example, when a speaker does an act

that irritates or annoys the listener. So, the listener is forced to take specific actions without intending to do it beforehand.

Systematically, the speech act aims at receiving a response from the listener. However, sometimes those goals get unexpected feedback or even fail to get feedback. It happens because the listener does not understand what the speaker means. In every communication, one speaker must convey an implicit message in his speech (Austin, 1991). If the interlocutor has good linguistic competence, they will understand the message. The message could affect him. For example, when you want to invite your friend to go on vacation to the beach, then your friend refuses by saying, "Actually I want to go with you, but I already have an appointment to accompany mom to go shopping at the mall. Sorry." This statement was later known as the refusal.

Refusal is a scientific study that goes into pragmatics, which is very complex (Abed, 2011). This knowledge covers all language users, as well as other speech act disciplines. Hassani, Mardani, and Hossein (2011) argue that refusal is one of the sciences of speech act related to response to initiation actions that have been previously given, for example, requests, invitations, offers, or suggestions. If the response contains refusal, it can be called refusal. This refusal can occur in several ways depending on the situation where the other person is.

According to Beebe et al. (1990), there are three types of refusal strategies. First is direct refusal, refusing an invitation directly without giving an explanation, for example, "No" or "I can't." The second is indirect refusal. This type provides a space to explain a reason when refusing an invitation, for

example, "I have a headache" or "I'll do it next time." The last is adjunct, for

example, pause fillers ("Uhhh," "hmmm," "well"). Other than to refuse an

invitation, refusal also gives space to the negotiation of requests, offers,

suggestions, and invitations. People may refuse indirectly, such as by giving a

reason why they refuse it. When people decide to refuse the invitation act from

someone else, they probably use three methods of refusal strategies, that are

refusal, the proposal of alternative, and postponement (Gass & Houck, 1999).

Refusal refers to direct refusal; for example, "I can't or sorry." The respondent

could use an alternative answer to refuse an initiation; for example, "I will have to

see my schedule this week first." These answers are called postponement. The

next version is the proposal of alternative occurring when the respondent

disagrees with an initiation. The respondent could answer, "How about next

month?" In that statement, the respondent gives or offering an alternative answer

to refuse subtly.

Since refusals are common in all languages and cultures, many scholars

have devoted their attention to studying these phenomena in different contexts and

cultures, such as refusal strategies in Korean and American English (Kwon,

2003), Chinese and English (Guo, 2012), Arabic and English (Al- Shalawi, 1997;

Nelson et al., 2002), Jordanian English and Malay English (Al- Shboul et al.,

2012), Thai and American (Wanaruk, 2008), Japan and Arabic (Dedoussis, 2004),

Arabic and American (Al- Issa, 2002), Chinese and American (Yuh-Fang-Chang,

2008), Mandarin and American English (Liao & Bresnahan, 1996), Vietnam and

English (Nguyen, 2006). It suggests that studies on refusal strategies are very

significant, especially in understanding how different cultures perceive refusals in communication. It is in line with Beebe et al. (1990, p. 56) that refusal is a "major cross-cultural sticking point for many non-native speakers." Usually, cross-cultural makes one language as the main, and other languages as a comparison. Many scholars choose English as the primary language in refusal research. Then this English will be used as a benchmark for the native English speakers and EFL speakers. They are required to uniform their way of refusing into one language, namely English.

Apart from the above studies, many scholars have studied refusal strategies using various subjects and methods. The first research related to strategy refusal was put forward by Rosdiana (2018). This research aims to determine the types of refusals and what types are dominant in the *Despicable Me* movie. Using all characters as the research subject, she found that most of the characters' refusal strategies are direct refusals. She noted that each character does not impose his will on every communication so that the other characters feel not to be offended. Communication in every scene is positive. Then with indirect refusal, character reduces the impact of misunderstandings.

Another study on refusal strategies was conducted by Permataningtyas and Sembodo (2018). This research aims to identify the types of refusal used by the characters in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* and *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* and how the characters express it in the movie. Most strategies were used with negative willingness, more than other types. Researchers suspect that the frequent use of direct refusal is because the characters have an

open-minded and straightforward nature in every communication. This is also
supported by the characters' backgrounds and personalities who do not like small
talk and are wise. It can see from the way the characters discuss and negotiate in
refusing a request.

Furthermore, Rifandi, Kamil, and Ningksih (2019) studied refusals in the
Walking Dead in season 9 featuring 16-episode movie found that the characters
used both direct and indirect refusal. They found 35 refusal strategies, consisting
of four different types of refusal response. There are 12 conversations in response
to a request, 11 conversations in response to an offer, five conversations in
response to an invitation, and seven conversations in response to suggestion. In
one of the data, the researcher found two types in one speech. The character uses
direct refusal by saying "No," followed by indirect refusal (giving a reason).
There are adjuncts while the character used refusal, like appreciation.

In maintaining good communication, politeness has an essential role in the
refusal strategy. Holmes (2001) explains that politeness takes on a part related to
each other's feelings. When refusal occurs in communication, the interlocutor will
be the main concentration, how he uses the right choice of words to offend the
other. A refusal is a face-threatening act (FTA), which can affect the way of
interaction between speaker and listener (Umale, 2011). Face here means self-
esteem, the way a person places himself in a group. Holmes (2001) says, "refusal
involves assessing social relationships along the dimension of social distance and
relative power or status." This opinion is directly proportional to the theory of
Scollon and Scollon (1995). Every individual has their level in a community, for

example, in a school. Teachers have a higher degree than students, while students also have their status, depending on their learning level.

The explanation above demonstrates how refusal strategies interplay with politeness. However, the researcher argues that the previous studies described above are still incomplete, especially inconsistency, in selecting the theory. Some missing points include choosing similar subjects as a movie and using the same instruments as an observation. The decision to choosing observation as an instrument means placing the researcher as the key in processing the data, only highlighting the movie script and finding data that includes refusal strategies. Therefore, this study aims at investigating how each level of students perform refusal strategies.

Apart from using conversations in real life, this study also used stimulation to get a realistic picture of invitees' awareness of power and distance. So far, research on the refusal strategies used the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) so that the data obtained is only limited to how the invitees performed refusal strategies. With stimulation, the invitees were also given some clue on how to refuse by paying attention to the power and distance of the inviter and invitees. With the use of stimulation, researchers will explore more about how specific refusal strategies are used by invitees who are aware of power and distance.

Beebe et al. (1990) mention three types of refusal strategies: direct, indirect, and adjuncts. When people refuse an invitation, they might be refused briefly without an explanation or reason. They lack maintaining face-threatening and talk directly. This situation is called direct refusal. Different from direct, indirect type

keeps the face-threatening of the speaker. Indirect refusal aims to maintain the speaker from negative effects. While adjunct, sometimes it precedes or follows the primary refusal act.

In addition to politeness, refusals have also been believing to be intertwining with power relations and distance. This study's social variable is related to the politeness system by Scollon and Scollon (1995). Power and distance have also been classified into the variable of speech act situation by Brown and Levinson (1987). They argue that power is related to a relationship between speaker and listener in social status. In contrast, distance is a form of closeness between two or more people who are interacting. With the existence of power and distance, the language used and the behavior can differ, depending on how close or familiar the two interlocutors are.

In a study, Kwon (2004) argues that status plays an essential role in an interaction. He researched between two people who have different languages and cultures, Korean and English. He concluded that English speakers are less sensitive to social status than Korean. Al-Eryani (2007) examined the various types used by interlocutors in refusing an initiated act. In the conclusion of his research, the status between interlocutors affects the way they choose the language to refuse.

In response to the background above, this study investigates how the respondents perform refusal strategies in response to the stimulation given. Furthermore, further analysis of the interplay of refusal strategies used and power relation and distance were also conducted.

1.2 Research Questions

Related to the background of the study above, this study aimed to answer

the following research questions:

a. How are refusal strategies employed by students of the English Department

in UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya?

b. How is students' awareness of the power and distance of interlocutors in

applying the refusal strategies?

1.3 Significance of the Study

Hypothetically, this investigation is relied upon to improve the theoretical

point of view on refusal strategies. This study focuses on refusal strategies related

to power and distance. Practically, this research is expected to give knowledge to

the reader about speech acts, especially refusal strategies. Furthermore, this

research is also to increase understanding of refusal strategies for students. This

research is also expected to provide an empirical source for further researcher and

the reader who concern about speech act study. The researcher hopes that this

study would be more developed by other researchers interested in the speech act

field, especially in refusal strategies.

1.4 Scope and Limitation

The present study analyzes the English Department's refusal strategies in

UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya based on Beebe et al. (1990) theory. The researcher

uses stimulation in his instrument. Stimulation is one instrument that allows the

researchers to analyze data naturally. This research collected data taken from the

college students university of English Department in UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

This study focuses on refusal strategies related to power and distance.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

Refusal is the kind of speech act that indicates negative responses to the previous action.

Stimulation is an instrument that allows the researcher to stimulate a particular response by the respondent.

Power is the ability or strength of people to do something or action in a certain condition based on social status.

Distance is the relationship between one person and the other in a community.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents the theories related to this study. The theory includes speech acts, refusal strategies, classification of refusal strategies, politeness strategies, and power and distance.

2.1 Speech Acts

In society, people use language to interact with others. Commonly, they are using utterance to express their feeling or thought and used some act. When someone makes a statement such as "This food is delicious," they are uttering their idea about that food and giving the interlocutor information. Then the speaker delivers a particular act or intention that has some effects on the interlocutor. According to Rosdiana (2018), communication is said to be successful if it covers two aspects. The speaker who conveys the information and the listener who respond to that information. Many ways for speakers to get attention include describing something, uttering a complaint or request, and giving an invitation.

The utterance which is supported by performing an action when someone talks are generally called a speech act. Austin (1962) was the major and the first published theory about speech act in his book entitled *How to do things with words*. He proposed that the speech act delivers information through utterance add by a particular action. Meanwhile, Birner (2013) states about speech act, he said if someone utters something, they refer to doing something too. Uttering something cannot be separated with the system called word. Word is one of the bridges in a

13

communication act then get a certain result. A word that can do something is called a speech act (Mey, 1999).

Austin's idea of speech act was developed by Searle (1969). Searle (1969) expresses a hypothesis that "speaking a language is performing speech act, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, and making promises that are performers following certain rules for the use of linguistics elements" (p. 16). When a speech act appears in a communication, realized to represent the meaning is the key. Austin (1962) pointed out that there are three kinds of speech acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary means a literal meaning of an utterance. Illocutionary reflects the intended meaning of an utterance. Perlocutionary is the actual effect of saying something or the thing itself. The representation of all of the types can follow below:

"This class is too hot."

When the speaker said, *"this class is too hot,"* it indicates the actual act or called locution. The speaker conveys the implied meaning, hope that someone will turn on the AC. The action is called the illocution. After that, the AC is already on. The listener understood what the speaker wants, and it is called the perlocution.

As the originator of the theory of speech act, Austin certainly has many students, one of whom is Searle. Searle continued his teacher's footsteps of researching speech acts and developing the ideas Austin had gotten. Searle (1969) argues that a speech act is a sentence produced by speech with its meaning. In

other words, it is not always the utterance produced by the speaker that is the true meaning. Sometimes there is an implied meaning contained in it. The speaker hopes that the listener can understand what he means. Each speech act activity has its process, depending on how the speaker speaks his speech and the listener's assumptions about the speech that has been given. Knowledge of the meaning of a sentence or speech in a speech act is not two different sciences but a unit related depending on the user's point of view.

In his book, *An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (1969), Searle mentions three kinds of speech acts. They are locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary is a speech act that deals with the meaning of sentences uttered by the speaker. This type focuses on the words, phrases, or sentences that the speaker says. The purpose and function of a speech are considered not very important here, focusing more on what the speaker said in general. Then is the illocutionary act, a speech act that has the characteristic of acting with a specific purpose and function. And the last is a perlocutionary act, a speech that has an impact on the listener. These speech acts are based on actions that previously affected a person.

Cited in Rahardi (2005, p. 35-36), Searle divides the illocutionary act into five parts. An explanation of the five types of illocutionary can be seen below:

a. **Assertives**

This type argues that the speaker believes in truth.

An example is a **statement**. A statement includes in both spoken and written form. This statement is a form of expression to give an opinion. For example, "Art is essential to develop a student's talents."

A suggestion is a form of giving direction to someone, such as an idea, plan, or action. For example, "Instead of going to the mountains, why don't you go to the beach? There you can relax more, hear the roar of the waves and play with the sand on the shore."

Boasting is a form of expression to boast of achievement or success that has been achieved. Usually accompanied by feeling good about yourself. For example, "maybe I am weak at math, but if you need someone to explain the body parts of an organism being, I am the one."

Claiming is a form of proof that something is real or a fact. This truth will still be held by someone, even though many people do not believe it and cannot show strong evidence yourself. For example, "The Indonesian government claims that corona cases have started decreasing. Some areas have started to become green zones, the level of the spread of the virus has reached zero cases."

Complaining is the opposite of claiming, stating an untruth or dissatisfaction with something. For example, "Liverpool players complain to the referee after the game. They regretted the referee's decision to give a penalty to the opponent."

b.   **Directives**

A speech act that requires the listener to take a particular action, for example:

Ordering is an expression to ask someone to take specific actions. For example, "A teacher asks his student to do an assignment to draw a natural landscape."

Commanding is almost the same as ordering, asking someone to take action, but its character is more assertive. For example, "You have to be careful before buying things. Check the quality and price first before paying."

Requesting is a form of a request that is more polite and does not contain any coercion. For example, "This classroom is too dark for learning activities. Help one of the students to turn on the light and open the window to make it brighter."

Advising is an example of a speech act to give someone the right guide for their life. For example, "An old grandfather advised young people not to eat at the door. Because it can hinder his luck."

Recommending is a suggestion that should be made by someone. For example, "A couple wants to buy a pair of pants for their friend. SPG recommends dark jeans for them."

c. **Expressive**

Expressive is a form of speech act related to a person's feelings and emotions. This case arises because a person faces certain situations and how they respond to these situations, for example:

Thanking is an expression to show a return of gratitude to someone who has done a valuable or helpful action. For example, "The patients are grateful to the nurses and doctors who have treated them for several days in the hospital."

Congratulating is an action or speech to express pride in one's achievements for its achievements. For example, "Ardi won first place in his class. When he arrived home, his mother congratulated him and gave him a present."

Pardoning is an expression to express forgiveness for someone's actions. This type is usually polite and performed in formal situations. For example, "Sorry, mom, my explanation was too fast. Are you willing to repeat it one more time?"

Blaming is an act of judging someone that they are wrong. It could also be a response to something terrible. For example, "The police blame a trader for selling on the side of the road."

Condoling is a form of concern or sympathy for a disaster that has befallen someone. Usually, the victim feels sad and suffering. For example, "I'm sorry about your grandmother's death. May God give the best ability and place for her."

d.   **Commissives**

Commissive is a speech act that states a specific promise or action in the future, for example:

Promising is an expression to show a willingness to do something in the future. For example, "Since learning activities carried out online. The school promised to give internet quota to all students."

An offering is an act of offering something to someone. For example, "a merchant offers his products to every visitor who comes to his clothing shop."

e.   **Declaration**

A declaration is a speech act related to facts in the field, for example:

Resigning is a statement to stop or get out of a bond. This case is usually work-related. For example, "An employee decides to leave the company. He wants to focus on becoming an entrepreneur."

Naming is a statement that claims that something is terrible or not valid. This case can be addressed to a person, company, or behavior. For example, "Perpetrator is known as a cold-blooded killer. He managed to kill many victims before going to prison."

Besides, according to another theorist, speech acts become a minor part of speech from the basis and functional elements (Nelson, 2002). It seems like speech acts don't appear in long words, even in sentences that include speech acts. In another statement, differently said that speech act becomes one part of the speech event line. It makes us counting all of the speech act produce by the interlocutors (Scollon & Scollon, 1995).

Speech act cannot be separated from a society. Based on Hymes (1974), a meaning of speech community is a group of people who share the rules about time and how to speak. Someone who is a member of the community must share at least a way to talk when interacting with someone.

Hymes (1974, p.33) stated the theory called S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G. This term has 8 basic components which aim to provide an overview of how to understand a context of a speech event. They are as follow below:

S refers to "situation". It has to do with the scene and setting. Regarding where the speech act activity is carried out and the overall scene in which they are a part.

P refer to "participant". This case relates to the people present and the roles they play. On the other hand, this type can also mean a relationship between participants.

E refer to "ends". Means an objective of an event that is carried out.

A refer to "acts". Speech acts include both formal and content. Any action can be determined a communicative action if it conveys particular meaning to the participants.

K refer to "key". It is shows how the speech sounds and or was delivered.

I refer to "instrumentality". Has the meaning of a channel through which communication flows can be examined.

N refers to "norms". Indicate the patterns guiding talk and it is interpretation can reveal meaning.

G refers to "genres". It is present a cultural or traditional speech of people, such as proverbs, apologies, prayers, problem talk, and so on.

2.2 Refusal Strategies

One of the derivatives of speech act discipline is refusal. According to Al-Eryani (2007), a refusal is a speech act that focuses on the listener's response in a negative way. In other words, refusal was not an initiator because there had to be an action to initiate it. This action can be of various types, such as to request, invitation, suggestion, or offer (Hassani et al., 2011). Al-Eryani's opinion is

directly proportional to Gass & Houck (1999). A refusal is a countermeasure previously given by the speaker.

On the other hand, Chang (2008) argues that a refusal is a form of refusal shown in initiation by the interlocutor. Just like other speech act sciences, refusal also occurs in all languages in the world. That way, he covers all the cultures and norms that apply in each area. But even though it covers all of that, the application is made differently from one another. So that this case sometimes requires expert, pragmatic knowledge (Chang, 2009).

Refusal is an action that is contrary to what the speaker wants. Sometimes the listener does not understand or follow what is the speaker said (Felix-Brasdefer, 2009). Besides, he added if refusal always follows one of the initiations of a speech act, then there is a misunderstanding or refusal. It is what causes negative action. Seen from the way of delivery, refusals are divided into two types, direct and indirect. Both of them have their characteristics. For example, if it includes a face-threatening act (FTA), direct refusal is more dangerous and has a significant impact than an indirect refusal. Therefore, to reduce negative effects, "some degree of indirectness usually exists" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, as cited in Hossaini & Talebinezhad, 2014). Indirect refusal is more complicated because users usually add several speech forms to reduce the negative impact on the refusal.

Beebe et al. (1990, p. 56) argue that the refusal is a "Major cross-cultural sticking point for many non-native speakers." So that refusal becomes a complex science, requiring high pragmatic knowledge to be able to understand. It happens

because the speech act of refusal offends the interlocutor in the act of communication, both linguistically and psychologically. An offense can occur if the other person refuses with harsh and inappropriate words (Abed, 2002).

Some researchers believe that refusals may not always put into this category as refusal, or sometimes it can be a negotiation in which the participants do not even know what the outcome will be. For example, in response to a mother's request for borrowing a clutch tomorrow, one could say *sorry, I can't*, which is included to direct refusal or refusal. Not only the direct refusals, yet in addition, deferments and proposition of options are refusals on the alternative that a respondent does not concur with the underlying solicitation. As it may, these reactions are not equivalent to the ultimate result of a collaboration. Refusals are refined speech acts to show up since positive responses such as acceptance and agreement are usually toward.

2.3   Classification of Refusal Strategies

According to Cohen (1996), this formula of semantic refers to the word, phrase, or sentence with any semantic criteria or strategy so it can be used to perform the act in a question. The expert of the refusal was showed by Bebe et al. (1990), who developed the type of refusal in semantics:

2.3.1 Direct

When people refuse an invitation, they might be refused briefly without an explanation or reason. They lack maintaining face-threatening and talk directly. This situation is called direct refusal. There are two types of direct refusals that

are performative and non-performative. The first one is performative, or called mitigated refusal. The use of performative is to decrease the negative response of addresses. For example, *"I refuse," "It appears I cannot come to swim."* The second one is nonperformative. This term indicates a negative response directly and ignores face-threatening *("I cannot," "I will not")*. The addresses often mixed non-performative with performing negative willingness *("No, I cannot eat meatball")*.

2.3.2 Indirect

Different from direct, this type keeps the face-threatening of the speaker. Based on Felix-Brasdefer (2008), indirect refusal aims to maintain the speaker from negative effects. They have to follow the pattern to get a high degree of their conclusion. Many linguistic strategies include indirect refusals, such as invitation, requesting, suggesting, and offering. From these strategies, the interlocutor can get some results for the initiation act. It is possible to interlocutor give a reason, excuse, or explanation to refuse. On the other hand, it provides a chance for the interlocutor to avoid the negative response. The followings are the strategies of indirect refusal:

a. Statement of regret

Sometimes regret comes with receiving an invitation. The interlocutor uses or shows this attitude when they cannot accept the invitation. (e.g., *"I'm sorry. . ."; "I feel terrible. . ."*)

b.   Wish

This response is often known as a positive opinion. Before declining an invitation or offer, the speaker must show this expression to respect the other person first. (e.g., *"I wish I could help you. . ."*)

c.   **Excuse, reason, explanation**

(e.g., *"My children will be home that night."; "I have a headache."*)

d.   Statement of alternative

- I can do X instead of Y (e.g., *"I'd rather. . ," "I'd prefer. . ."*)

- Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., *"Why don't you ask someone else?"*)

e.   **Set condition for future or past acceptance**

(e.g., *"If you had asked me earlier, I would have. . ."*)

f.   **The promise of future acceptance**

(e.g., *"I'll do it next time"; "I promise I'll. . ." or "Next time I'll. . ." — using" will" of promise or "promise"*)

g.   **Statement of principle**

(e.g., *"I never do business with friends."*) rather..." I'd prefer..."),

h.   **Statement of philosophy**

(e.g., *"One can't be too careful."*) else?") earlier, I would have...")

i.   Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

- Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester (e.g., *"I will not be any fun tonight"*)

- Guilt trip (e.g., *"I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"*)

- Criticize the request/ requester (e.g., *"Who do you think you are?"*, *"that is a terrible idea!"*)

- Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.

- Let interlocutor off the book (e.g., *"Don't worry about it,"* *"That is okay,"* *"You don't have to"*)

- Self-defense (e.g., *"I am trying my best,"* *"I'm doing all I can do"*)

j. **Acceptance that functions as a refusal**

- Unspecific or indefinite reply.

- Lack of enthusiasm (e.g., *"Ok,"* *"Right,"* *"Cool"*)

k. **Avoidance**

- Nonverbal (silence, hesitation, make nothing, physical departure

- Verbal (topic switch, joke, repetition of the part request. E.g., *"Monday?"*. Postponement, e.g., *"I will think about it."* Hedging, e.g., *"I do not know"*)

2.3.3 Adjuncts

Adjunct cannot stand alone, and it combined with other refusal strategies. Sometimes it precedes or follows the primary refusal act. There are some kinds of adjuncts, they are:

a. **Statement of positive opinion/ feeling/ agreement**

(e.g., *"That is a good idea,"* *"I would love to.."*)

b. **Statement of empathy**

(e.g., *"I realize you're in a difficult condition"*)

c.   **Pause fillers**

(e.g., *"uhh," "well," "oh," "hmmm"*)

d.   **Gratitude or appreciation**

(e.g., *"Thank you for your response"*)

e.   **Alerts**

(address terms)

In this current research, the researcher will get the results of the participants' refusal responses by referring to the theories above. Besides that, the researcher gave a special code to distinguish the types of refusal strategies on each statement. For example, when someone refuses a friend's invitation to have dinner together by saying, *"I'm sorry, I already have plans. Maybe next time."* Then those sentence is coded to make it easier for researchers to analyze data, such as **I'm sorry** [statement of regret], **I already have plans** [excuse], **maybe next time** [promise of future acceptance] (Beebe et al. 1990, p. 57).

Based on Gass and Houck (1999), many aspects can cover by refusal. However, it is not only related to the long concatenation of agreement and the cooperative process to set the non-compliant feature of the behavior.

2.4   Politeness Strategies

In the interaction to communicate with other people, they sometimes use politeness strategies to soften the threat to others' faces (Akatsu, 2009). Politeness can be explained as the meaning to show awareness of another person's face. Face here refers to the public self-image of a person. It means an emotional and social

sense that every person expects everyone else to be recognized (Yule, 1996). According to Fasold (1996), was explained that face means something that is invested emotionally. It can be lost, maintained, or enhanced and must be attended to during interaction continuously. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987) explained that there are two kinds of the face in politeness, which are positive and negative.

The positive face needs to be appreciated or accepted as a group member and to know that their expectation is shared with others. Brown and Levinson (1987) claimed that a specific speech act could damage or threaten another person's face, known as face-threatening acts. Otherwise, a cynical look highlights the freedom of action and the feeling not imposed on others. In this case, the listener is free to do an act that can show negative politeness. Negative face is the primary claim, such as freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

The politeness strategy case, especially the face-threatening act, is in line with the refusal act. Moaveni (2012) stated that face is similar to a refusal case, an action that can both cause damage to its users, including the speaker and the listener. With the emergence of politeness strategies in cases that can negatively affect the interlocutor, including refusal. It hoped that it could reduce bad face threats and keep the face of the interlocutor.

2.5 Power and Distance

Power and distance have also been classified into the variable of speech act situation by Brown and Levinson (1987). They argue that power is related to a

relationship between speaker and listener in social status. There are three stages of this kind, depends on the speaker and listener in a society. Those stages are higher to lower, equal status, and lower to higher.

According to Gray (2009), power relates to the social context possessed by individuals who are influenced by differences in status. That way, someone has the special right to accept or refuse a particular action, depending on that person's power against others. This case is directly proportional to Liu (2004, p. 15), who states that power is interpreted as authority or influence. It covers one or more social situations in society. Furthermore, that power determines what plans to do and self-evaluation of the interlocutor when communicating (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

While distance is a form of closeness between two or more people interacting, with the existence of power and distance, the language used and the behavior showed can differ, depending on how close or familiar the two interlocutors are.

Another conventional theory in the pragmatic and politeness field is Scollon and Scollon's politeness system (1995). They develop a theory that focuses on the variation of power and distance (p. 54). Furthermore, in their observation, they established that there are three kinds of politeness system:

2.5.1 The difference politeness system

The difference politeness system deals with interlocutors possessing equal status in some sort of social setting. Simply, this type has the characteristics of less power (P -) but increases the distance relationship (D +). That way,

interlocutors can reduce the risk of misunderstanding. On the other hand, it is possible to maintain face-threatening acts.

Interlocutor 1 < ===== independence ===== > Interlocutor 2

[+ D = Distance between the interlocutor]

The characteristic of the difference politeness system as follows below:

- Symmetric (P -), interlocutor places themselves as similar level or status with another.

- Distant (D +), interlocutor independently expresses opinions or ideas to others.

2.5.2 The solidarity politeness system

It deals with interlocutors who feel no power difference nor social distance in their communication. This type is almost the same as the difference politeness system, with a lack of power (P -). The difference is the distance here is quite close (D -). Interlocutor hopes that there will be a reciprocal process in the communication process, especially those related to politeness.

Interlocutor 1 < = involvement = > Interlocutor 2

[D - = Minimal distance between interlocutor]

The characteristics of the solidarity politeness system as described below:

- Symmetric (P -), interlocutor places themselves as equal status with the other.

- Close (D -), interlocutor involves politeness strategy with the other.

2.5.3 The hierarchical politeness system

It deals with mostly formal interaction where the difference in power and social distance do exist. This system has high power (P +), in line with a long-distance relationship (D +). In other words, one individual acts as a superordinate, while another acts as a subordinate.

Interlocutor 1

(involvement strategy)

Interlocutor 2

(independence strategy)

The characteristics of the hierarchical politeness system as following below:

- Asymmetric (P +), the interlocutor places themselves as difference in social status.

- Asymmetric in face strategy, the higher status uses involvement strategy. Besides that, the lower status uses the independence strategy.

According to Guodong and Jing (2005), the higher interlocutors applied involvement politeness strategies, whereas lower interlocutors applied independent politeness strategies.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

In this chapter, the researcher provides the methodology of the research. It presents the research design, data collection, research data, subjects of the study, instrument, data collection technique, and data analysis technique.

3.1 Research Design

This research employed qualitative research. Qualitative research design is descriptive form, and the data refers to the phrase or figures rather than numbers (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This method focuses on understanding the social issues from the point of view of the human being in a society (Ary, 2010). Involving the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya as the participants, this study investigated how they performed refusal strategies and their awareness of power and distance when performing refusals. The study examined the most common refusal strategies used and presented them in the form of a percentage of each refusal strategies.

3.2 Research Data

This research used the sentence as the primary data. The researcher used a WhatsApp application to collect the answers from participants. Then the results of the conversation were screenshot and used as data. Previously, researchers transcribed the screenshot results into writing on paper. This activity made it easier for researchers to process the data that has obtained.

31

3.2.1 Subjects of the Study

The researcher used students of English Departments as his research subject. These students are English Department of UIN of Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The researcher chose 40 students as subjects, consisting of 20 junior students, 15 classmates or equal, and 5 senior students. But only 25 students were successfully contacted. They consist of 11 junior students, 11 classmates or equal, and 3 senior students. A total of 15 students were unable to be contacted due to several obstacles, for example there was no response and had changed their telephone numbers. They were still actively studying in the English Department of UIN of Sunan Ampel Surabaya when this researcher conducted.

3.2.2 Instrument

The main instrument of this research was the researcher himself, supported by another instrument, stimulation. The use of stimulation aims to collect participants' responses and understand how participants notice power and distance by providing stimulation.

3.2.3 The Technique of Data Collection

There were some procedures to collect the data and will explain below:

a. The researcher made a framework of stimulation. He arranged the initiation act of invitations. Then the researcher determined some situation depends on different participants.

> *"Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb*
>
> *I'm (sender name), a ninth semester of English Literature. Because soon there is a New Year's Eve celebration. I want to invite you to attend an event organized by foreign friends. The event will be held on December 31, 2020, starting at 15.00 WIB - finished. Thus this invitation is made, thank you for your attention.*
>
> *Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb."*

Figure 3.1 Invitation form of the difference politeness system

In figure 3.1 above, the invitation is addressed to senior students. Invitations are sent on December 30, 2021, or the day before the event takes place. Researchers chose the New Year's Eve momentum because the chance of rejection by the participants was very possible. This is based on a regulation from the regional head, prohibiting all activities related to New Year celebrations and also holding a curfew.

> *"Jun (address name)...*
>
> *Are you free on Saturday? Let's go on vacation to Malang. I want to refresh my mind."*

Figure 3.2 Invitation form of the solidarity politeness system

In figure 3.2 above, the researcher sends an invitation to classmate or equal. Invitations were given suddenly to participants, so the opportunity to refuse was wide open.

> "Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb
>
> I'm (sender name), a ninth semester student of the English Department,
>
> UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Soon, there will be an important celebration
>
> for Christians, namely Christmas Day. Therefore, I would like to invite
>
> you to participate in a seminar on the theme "Christmas from the
>
> Perspective of Muslims." The event will be held online through the Zoom
>
> meeting on Friday, December 25, 2020, at 14.00 WIB. Thank you for
>
> your attention.
>
> We're looking forward to hearing back from you.
>
> Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb."

Figure 3.3 Invitation form of the hierarchical politeness system

In Figure 3.3 above, there is a higher to lower status or the hierarchical politeness system. Researchers sent invitations a day before the event was held. The researcher deliberately held the event at 14.00 WIB because most of the participants, who in fact were still junior students, attended lecture hours. So it is likely that the invitation given by the researchers was rejected by participants.

b. The researcher started to collect the data by sending messages to 11 junior students, 11 classmates or equal, and 3 senior students. These participants are those who could be reached and contacted by the researcher.

c. The researcher using the WhatsApp messenger application to give an invitation; if the participants have not been familiar with the researcher, he introduced himself first before giving the invitation. This treatment applied to senior students as a higher status and junior students as lower status.

While for classmates or equal, the researcher directly invited them without giving self-introduction

d. From all participants who were successfully contacted by the researchers. All of them refused the invitation that was given. This is due to several factors, such as an invitation to be given suddenly or an event being held that collides with the participants' busyness. The researcher collected the refusal acts from the participant to be analyzed.

e. After the data collected, the researcher classified the data according to the classification of refusal strategies by Beebe et al. (1990). Besides, the researcher also identified how power and distance influence refusal strategies.

Table 3.1 Invitation Rules Based on the Status

Relation	Respondents	Description
Low to high status	The researcher – senior students	The researcher invited the senior students to attend an event suddenly. This event will hold to celebrate New Year's eve.
Equal status	The researcher – Classmate or intimate	The researcher invited his classmate or roommate to go on vacation to Malang on the weekend (Saturday).
High to low status	The researcher – junior students	The researcher invited junior students to attend the study, which has the theme "Christmas from the Perspective of Muslims." This study will hold on Christmas day through an online meeting.

3.3 Techniques of Data Analysis

There were some steps to analyze the data that steps were as follows:

1. The researcher identified the data. At this stage, the researcher read the data carefully and determined what type of refusal strategy the data would categorize.

2. After identifying the data, the researcher coded the data. The coding consists of the type of refusal strategies and power and distance. The researcher used the initial form to mark the data involved in the category.

Table 3.2 Coding: Types of Refusal Strategies

Types	Codes
Direct	(D)
Indirect	(IND)
Adjuncts	(ADJ)

After coding to classify the types of refusal strategies, the researcher made coding to classify each type of refusal strategy.

Table 3.3 Coding: Sub-types of Refusal Strategies

Refusal strategies	Types	Codes
Direct	Performative	PF
	Nonperformative	NPF
	Negative willingness/ ability	NWN
Indirect	Statement of regret	SOF
	Wish	WS
	Excuse, reason, explanation	ERE
	Statement of alternative	SOA
	Set condition for future or past acceptance	SFP
	Promise of future acceptance	PFA
	Statement of principle	SOPR
	Statement of philosophy	SOPH
	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	ADI
	Acceptance that functions as a refusal	AFR
	Avoidance	AVD
Adjuncts	Statement of positive opinion/ feeling or agreement	SPO
	Statement of empathy	SOE
	Pause fillers	PFL
	Gratitude or appreciation	GOA
	Alerts	ATR

Table 3.4 Coding: Types of Power and Distance

Power and distance	Codes
The difference politeness system	TDPS
The solidarity politeness system	TSPS
The hierarchical politeness system	THPS

The following is an example of data coding

Figure 3.4 Example of the data

"**Oh** (ADJ/ PF) **I'm sorry** (IND/ SOR) bro, **I can't attend** (D/ PF) on your birthday party, **because tomorrow I has scheduled to attend the football match with my crush.** (IND/ ERE) Nevertheless, **I'll send a gift on your special day.** (IND/ PFA)"

The data above has several types of refusal strategies in one statement; for example, the word "Oh" includes adjuncts strategies, especially in the pause filler statement. The researcher gives a code "ADJ" as adjuncts and

"PF" as a pause fillers statement. While in the phrase "I'm sorry," the

researcher gives a mark with code (IND / SOR). It means that phrase

includes indirect strategies or "IND." The sub-strategies is "SOR" or

statement of regret.

3. After the coding stage, the researcher analyzed the data following Beebe et

al.'s (1990) refusal strategies.

4. In analyzing the participants' awareness of Power and Distance, the

researcher separated the three social status responses. The researcher then

compared the refusal strategies performed across social status following

Scollon and Scollon's (1995) power and distance theory to investigate the

participants' awareness of power relations and distance.

5. After analyzing the data, the researcher concluded.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher explained and classified the types of refusal strategies used by English Department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Besides, here described whether the students are aware of power and distance when refusing an invitation.

This study's results are based on the theory about the politeness system put forward by Scollon and Scollon (1995). Interlocutors have different power and distance (Power -, Distance +), (Power +, Distance +), and (Power +, Distance -). Interlocutors were giving a stimulus in the form of an invitation. In the end, the researcher will present a summary of the research results.

4.1 Findings

Based on the cases raised in this study, this finding was divide into two parts. The first part contains the classification of refusal strategies, according to Beebe et al. (1990). There were three types, including direct, indirect, and adjuncts. The second part was an analysis of students' awareness of power and distance when refusing an invitation. Researchers link this case to the theory of power and distance by Scollon and Scollon (1995).

4.1.1 The Refusal Strategies Used by the English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

The statements that have previously been obtaining from the participants will be present in table 4.1 below. The researcher gave a stimulus in the form of an invitation to the participants. Based on the background social status among the

39

researchers and participants. The researcher split the invitation into three variants.

Social status means junior to senior, equal (classmates), and senior to junior. All

of the participants are the English Department students of UIN Sunan Ampel

Surabaya who are still active. The most frequent type of refusal strategy is the

indirect strategy, especially giving excuse, reason, and explanation. All

participants, regardless of their level, prefer to use this type over the others.

Meanwhile, the kind of strategy that was rarely used is direct refusal, especially

the performative kind.

Table 4.1 result of refusal strategies used by participants

Refusal Strategy	Type	Frequency	%
Direct strategies	Performative statement	5	4.9 %
	Non-performative statement	14	13.9 %
Indirect strategies	Statement of regret	22	21.6 %
	Excuse, reason, explanation	23	22.6 %
	Promise of future acceptance	3	2.9 %
	Statement of principle	3	2.9 %
	Wish	3	2.9 %
	Set condition for future or past acceptance	1	0.9 %
	Acceptance that functions as a refusal	3	2.9 %
	Avoidance	1	0.9 %
Adjuncts	Statement of positive opinion	10	9.9 %
	Pause fillers	5	4.9 %
	Gratitude or appreciation	8	7.9 %
Total		**102**	**100 %**

4.1.1.1 Direct Strategies

When people refuse an invitation, they might refuse briefly without an

explanation or reason. They lack maintaining face-threatening and talk directly.

This situation is called direct refusal.

4.1.1.1.1 Performative Statement

Performative, or called mitigated refusal. The use of performative is to

decrease the negative response of addresses. The example of a performative verb

such as *"refuse"* and *"reject."* The sentences that often appear at the time of

refusal are like *"I refuse," "It appears I can't go to,"* or *"It's impossible."* All of

these sentences indicate a refusal. The results of the study revealed that the

performative statements appeared as many six times at all levels. Here is the data

that goes into this type:

Data 1
"Waalaikumsalam. Thank you for your invitation but **<u>no</u>**, because it was *haram*
for me to celebrate Christmas."

Data 2
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb, I'm sorry kak**<u>, it appears [that] I cannot join your
event</u>** because I have some business on that day."
"Sorry."

Data 3
"Ummm, I'm sorry, Djabal. I can't. Because I have to help my mother to finish
her job.'
"**<u>No,</u>** Djabal. Maybe next time. Because I already have an appointment for playing
badminton with my friends."

Data 4
"**<u>No</u>**, I'm not really up for that. Sorry"

The data above show several statements used by the participants in refusing

an invitation. Data 1, 3, and 4 show us how a participant refused the invitation

using the word "no," indicating that the participant directly refused the invitation,

yet mitigating the face-threatening acts. Other phrases that a person commonly

uses when refusing invitation directly but still attempt to reduce negative

responses to minimize face-threatening acts are "It appears I cannot join the

event," as in Data 2.

4.1.1.1.2 Non-Performative Statement

Different from the previous type, non-performative tends to express refusal

openly. Besides that, the sentence *"I cannot"* or *"I don't think"* can also be used,

which is negative willingness. This case is directly proportional to the statement

of Beebe et al. (1990). Negative willingness sentences usually follow non-

performative statements. That way, it can minimize the negative effects that might

arise. The study results revealed that the non-performative statements appeared as

many 14 times at all levels. Here is the data that goes into this type:

Data 5
"Waalaikumsalam, first of all, thank you for your invitation. But I'm sorry, **I can't join the meeting**. I have class at that time, yet preparing for my presentation."

Data 6
"**I [can] not [join the meeting because]** I'm going to my friend's wedding on Saturday. [I am sorry]."

Data 7
"This Saturday?"
"**I think I couldn't make it**. I just checked out the schedule that I have an appointment with a doctor in the morning."
"Sorry."

Data 8
"Hmmm... **I cannot make sure [that I can] join vacation on Saturday**, because I have to go to my sister's birthday."

Data 9
"Ummm, I'm sorry, Djabal, **I can't** because I have to help my mother finish her job.'

The data above shows the refusal, which includes in a non-performative statement. Participants refused the invitation given by the researcher in various ways. Various reasons influence participants to take action.

Participants refused directly with the used phrase "I cannot" in data 5, 8, and 9. They delivered it phrase followed by a reason, as a form of respect for the invitation act given. Data 6 also shows non-performative refusal, followed by negative willingness. Participants use the sentence *"I'm not."* He was not interested in the invitation and preferred to visit other events. In data 7, the participant said, *"I think I couldn't make it.*

He immediately said that because there were the more important thing and the promise he had made with the doctor. He wasn't sure if he still had time to accept the invitation, so he chose to refuse rather than give a fake promise. He doesn't feel guilty, just using non-performative statements.

4.1.1.2 Indirect Strategies

Based on Felix-Brasdefer (2008), indirect refusal aims to maintain the speaker from negative effects. They have to follow the pattern to get a high degree of their conclusion. Many linguistic strategies include indirect refusals, such as invitation, requesting, suggesting, and offering. From these strategies, the interlocutor can get some results for the initiation act. It is possible to interlocutor give a reason, excuse, or explanation to refuse. On the other hand, it provides a chance for the interlocutor to avoid the negative response.

4.1.1.2.1 Statement of Regret

Sometimes regret comes with receiving an invitation. The interlocutor uses

or shows this attitude when they cannot accept the invitation. Apart from being a

form of regret, this statement also shows a form of politeness. It makes a case for

refusal softer. Examples of statements of regret are *"Sorry"* and *"I apologize."*

The researcher found a statement of regret as much as 22 times by the

participants. The relevant data can be seen below:

Data 10
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. Thank you in advance for inviting me to participate in
the event. However, **I apologize for not being able to accept this offer**. I am not
a Christian, and in my religion, I am not allowed to participate in [that]
celebration."

Data 11
"**I'm sorry** I have to meet my old friend on Saturday. Maybe next time."

Data 12
"I [can] not [join the meeting because**]** I'm going to my friend's wedding on
Saturday. **apologize** [I am sorry]."

Data 13
"**I'm sorry, mate**. I wish I could go. But my nephew [is] going married this
weekend, so right now I'm busy helping with the preparation and stuff."

The data above illustrates that participants used two different statements of

regret. Data 10 and 11 used the phrase indicated the different status. While data 12

and 14 used the word phrase meant the close relationship. The two phrases have

in common to refuse an invitation.

The first statement, the statement of regret, is implemented with the

sentence *"I apologize for not being able to accept this offer"* Participants refuse

by adding a reason afterward. The second and fourth statements have an

equivalent using the phrase *"I'm sorry,"* But in data 13, the participant adds the

address name, which is the familiar greeting "mate." Denotes the closeness

relationship between interlocutors. Meanwhile, data 12 explained that he could

not join the researcher for a reason, which ended with a statement of regret.

4.1.1.2.2 Wish

This response is often known as a positive opinion. Before refusing an

invitation or offer, the speaker must show this expression to respect the other

person first. Interlocutor uses this as a form of hope or wishes that will come true

in the end. The sentence included in the wish, for example, is *"I wish I could go"*

or *"I hope the best for you"* From the research results, the researcher found as

many as 2.9 % statements of wish, including the following:

Data 14
"Wow, that event sounds interesting, and [I] **really want to participate in it**, but
unfortunately, that day, I already had an appointment with the others, sorry."

Data 15
"**I am**. But I already have a plan with my sister."
"So sorry I can't go with u."

Data 16
"I'm sorry, mate. **I wish I could go**. But, my nephew [is] going married this
weekend, so right now I'm busy help preparing and stuff."

Participants used statements of wish to avoid bad feedback from

interlocutors. On the other hand, they refused within the statement of wish. There

is something that may be more urgent or important that must take precedence first.

So they use it as a form of refusal.

The participant expressed his interest. But he had an appointment with

someone else at the same time, such as in data 14 and 15. They proved by the

used phrase *"I am"* and *"I really want to"* as a desire. They followed by a reason

to refuse. Finally, data 16 is the same as the previous statement of wish.

Participants want to go with researchers using the phrase *"I wish,"* but there are

other priorities that they must do. He has a family event in the form of his

cousin's wedding.

4.1.1.2.3 Excuse, Reason, and Explanation

Participants usually use sentences in the form of excuse, reason, or

explanation as a form of their inability to fulfill an initiation act. This type

supports successful communication because there is a sense of mutual respect

between interlocutors. By giving the word or sentence excuse, reason, or

explanation in a refusal, the possibility of misinterpretation can be reduced or

even lost. Participants can use sentences such as *"My children will be home that*

night."; *"I have a headache."* In this study, as many 21 participants used the

excuse, reason, or explanation statements. The data will display below; here is an

example:

Data 17
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. Thank you in advance for inviting me to participate in the event. However, I apologize for not being able to accept this offer because **I am not a Christian,** and in my religion, I am not allowed to participate in [that] celebration."

Data 18
"Waalaikumsalam, first of all, thank you for your invitation, but I'm sorry, I can't join the meeting. **I have class at that time, yet preparing for my presentation**."

Data 19
"Hmmm, I'm sorry Bal, I can't join [to go vacation] with you, **because I'm very busy now. I have another event**."

Data 20
"This Saturday?"

"I think I couldn't make it. **I just checked out the schedule that I have an appointment with a doctor in the morning**."
"Sorry"

Participants considered using statements of excuse, reason, or explanation to be smoother than they had to say *"No."* Phrases in this type tend to function as an accompaniment or precursor to direct refusal. So that participants felt not guilty if they refused an invitation that showed to them. He has given reasons or explanations that support this inability.

In data 18, 19, and 20, the participant tries to minimize any negative friction that might arise with used the statement of explanation *"I have."* These phrases indicating that participants prefer did their task than accepted the invitation. Besides, participants tried to reinforce their refusal by revealing an explanation. In the other data, the participant forced the interlocutor to understand their condition like "I am not a Christian" as data 17. The use of an explanatory statement is the sub-strategies of indirect refusal.

4.1.1.2.4 Set Condition for Future/ Past Acceptance

Set conditions for future or past often used to express objection or disapproval, mainly a matter of time. Interlocutor asked a question why the initiation act gave suddenly, so he refused. An example of a sentence that can be used by the participant is *"If you had asked me earlier, I would have. . . "*. Data included in the future or past acceptance will display below:

Data 21
"Oh [I am sorry] Bal, **you should have asked me earlier**. I have a plan on Saturday with my girlfriend."

The success or failure of communication depends on mutual understanding between interlocutors. Many problems allow refusal to occur, one of which is the free time problem each interlocutor has.

In data 21, participants expressed their inability to fulfill the interlocutor invitation with the sentence *"you should have asked me earlier."* The sentence refers to past acceptance, which means the participant offers a negotiation. He asked why he made the invitation in advance. There was a plan he had made with his girlfriend at the same time. Maybe if the participant accepts the invitation earlier, the refusal case will not occur.

4.1.1.2.5 Promise of Future or Past Acceptance

The promise is related to an action that will do in the future. The interlocutor has a particular reason for the busyness that it lives. So he chooses an alternative statement with a promise. Interlocutor can use the sentence *"I'll do it next time"*; *"I promise Ill. . . "* or *"Next time I'll. . . ".* Using "will" of promise or "promise" so that there will be no lousy prejudice for the interlocutor. In the research results, the participant uses the promise of future or past acceptance as many3 times. The data can be seen below:

Data 22
"I'm sorry I have to meet my old friend on Saturday. **Maybe next time**."

Data 23
"I'd love to [go with you]. But I am so sorry I have to help my mom cooking for her birthday on Saturday."
"Sure, **just text me when you will go to Malang net time**."

Data 24
"Ummm, I'm sorry, Djabal, I can't, because I have to help my mother to finish her job.'

"No, Djabal, **maybe next time**, because I already have an appointment to play badminton with my friends."

All of the data above shows a statement of promise. Participants use the phrase *"next time"* more often than any other form of a promise. They use this type to express their busyness simultaneously, so they promise to fulfill future interlocutor invitations; moreover, the statement of promise can also be used to express a refusal.

4.1.1.2.6 Statement of Principle

A principle must be adhered to for anyone who runs it. The statement of the principle means a statement that cannot be influenced by other people's opinions. Principles can relate to a person's vision and mission or the religion he believes in. If they get an initiation act that goes against their principles, there's a possibility that refusal will occur. The statement of principle has an example sentence *"I never do business with friends."* Some participants used this statement to refuse. The data will describe below as follows:

Data 25
"Sorry, I can't, **because in the gospel of Islam that I adhere to, it is not allowed for us to celebrate or just say "Merry Christmas" for them**."

Data 26
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. Thank you in advance for inviting me to participate in the event. However, I apologize for not being able to accept this offer because I am not a Christian, and **in my religion, I am not allowed to participate in that celebration.**"

Data 27
"Waalaikumsalam. Thank you for your invitation but no, **because it was haram [forbiddien] for me celebrate Christmas.**"

Participants can use the principles they have as a form of refusal. This statement helps the interlocutor to understand someone's situation so that there is no coercion of the will. Mutual respect between interlocutors can minimize the negative effect. Refusal is not always synonymous with inability, but there is a principle one must continue to live.

Data 25, the participant clings to the religion he believes in. He does not want to interfere in other religious matters. Even just saying a celebration, it's not allowed to do, *"not allowed for us to celebrate or just say"* Merry Christmas *"for them."* Same as before, data 26 also refused the invitation. It has a solid religious principle. His religion forbids celebrating other religions' holidays. In data 27, the participant thought that it was haram to celebrate other religious holidays. It's a form of self-principle. Meanwhile, in his statement, do not forget to add a greeting to protect the face-threatening act.

4.1.1.2.7 Acceptance that Functions as a Refusal

Researchers found two types of acceptance function as a refusal on the results of the obtained data. These types are as follows:

4.1.1.2.7.1 Unspecific or indefinite reply

Not all statements can be understood directly by the interlocutor. Usually, the participant only mentions the surface meaning without adding an exact reason or explanation afterward. So that interlocutors need to think hard to grasp the true meaning. Examples of unspecific words like *"No, let me go."* There are data results related to an ambiguous or indefinite statement, as follows:

Data 28
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. It's been an honor to be invited to the event. Unfortunately, I have already been inviting to another family event. I'm sorry, I cannot attend your invitation. Wishing you a Happy New Year, **cheers**."

Data 30 above has an unspecific statement, namely *"cheers."* Cheers can have a double meaning, for example, friction between glasses made by two or more people. Perhaps also as a form of activity to shake hands.

4.1.1.2.7.2 Lack of enthusiasm

There is a statement found by researchers related to lack of enthusiasm. An apology usually accompanies this statement, so the interlocutor is not offended when receiving feedback from the participant. Researchers found the following data:

Data 29
"Waalaikumsalam, kak. I'm sorry I can't join the event because **honestly, I'm not interested in the topic**. Thank you for inviting me."

Data 30
"No, **I'm not really up for that,** sorry."

The data above shows if the participant refuses the interlocutor invitation. He has reasons if he is not interested in the topic of the proposed program. This statement will be rude if it is not interspersed with other statements. Participants added forms of regret and apologies before showing their lack of enthusiasm. Communication can run successfully by reducing the negative feedback that may arise directly proportional to the data 30. The participant said if he's not really up for that. Invitations sent by the Interlocutor are considered less attractive. To

avoid impoliteness, the participant does not forget to add an apology at the end of the sentence.

4.1.1.2.8 Avoidance

Avoidance is a form of refusal that goes into an indirect strategy. When the participants are not very interested in the invitation, they dodge the conversation or look for another topic. Subconsciously, he refused softly. Essentially, avoidance statements are divide into some types, namely verbal, non-verbal, postponement, and repetition. Examples of verbal types are hedging, changing the topic of conversation, sarcasm expression, and joking.

Meanwhile, non-verbal, for example, just kept quiet, didn't answer, walked away, and ignored the interlocutor's invitation. Finally, postponements, such as deferral of invitation and repetition of the word or sentence *("Weekend?")*. Some data results enter the avoidance statement, namely:

Data 31
"**This Saturday?**"
"I think I couldn't make it. I just checked out the schedule that I have an appointment with a doctor in the morning."
"Sorry."

The data above shows if the participant avoids the invitation. He used the phrase *"This Saturday?"* to make sure about what Interlocutor said before. When the participant saw his schedule, he had to go to the doctor on the same day. In this data, the participant used an avoidance statement, followed by a reason and regret statement at the end, to reduce misunderstandings that occur.

4.1.1.3 Adjuncts

Adjunct cannot stand alone. It must combine with other refusal strategies.

Sometimes it precedes or follows the primary refusal act.

4.1.1.3.1 Statement of Positive Opinion, Feeling, Agreement

A positive opinion is a form of praise or interest in an invitation, suggestion,

or offer given. However, something more important has become a priority *(Thank*

you for your suggestion, but"). Not only that, the participant uses the sentence "I

would like to join, but" as a form of desire even though it ends in a refusal. For

example, the statement of agreement is *"Okay, but."* The participant uses it before

saying refusal. In this research, researchers found as many as ten statements

included in the positive opinion/feeling/agreement. Here are the reviews:

Data 32
"Waalaikumsalam kak Djabal. Thank you for your invitation**. It sounds great**, but
I'm sorry I can't. Because I've had a few things come up."

Data 33
"Waalaikumsalam, **I would like to**. **That's a great event**, but I would like to say
sorry I can't join that event. I have so many schedules on that day."

Data 34
"**I'd love to,** but I am so sorry I have to help my mom cooking for her birthday on
Saturday."

"Sure, just text me when u will go to Malang net time."

Data 35
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. **It's been an honor to be invited to the event**.
Unfortunately, I have already been inviting to another family event. I'm sorry, I
cannot attend your invitation. Wishing you a Happy New Year, cheers."

There are several uses of statements of positive opinion on the data above.

This statement is a form of praise and respect for the initiation act given by the

interlocutor. At least starting with a sentence that has a positive connotation reduces the negative effect of refusal. The participant gave an appreciation about the event as in data 32 and 33. Moreover, a statement of positive opinion can reduce the negative effect in a conversation. In data 34 and 35, participants showed their positive statements by using the phrase "I'd love" and "It's been an honor to be invited to the event."

4.1.1.3.2 Pause Fillers

The term of pause fillers means a meaningless word. Its function is a form of pause at the beginning, middle, or end of a sentence. Furthermore, this type also became a form of participant hesitation while speaking. Some examples of pause fillers include *"hmm," "oh," "ok," "umm," "wow," etc*. Adding pause fillers in a sentence or speech can give a moment to think and choose the right word spoken to disappoint the interlocutor. Researchers found several statements of pause fillers on the data results, including:

Data 36
"**Wow**, that event sounds interesting, and I really want to participate in it, but unfortunately, that day, I already had an appointment with the others, sorry."

Data 37
"**Hmmm,** Im sorry Bal, I can't join you, because Im very busy now. I have another event."

Data 38
"**Oh,** sorry, Bal, you should have asked me earlier. I have a plan on Saturday with my girlfriend."

Data 39
"**Ummm,** I'm sorry, Djabal, I can't, because I have to help my mother to finish her job.'

"No, Djabal, maybe next time, because I already have an appointment to play badminton with my friends."

From the data shown above, all participants used pause fillers as the prefix for the statement. There are two possible uses of pause fillers here, either as a pause for the next sentence, or the participant is still hesitant to accept or refuse the interlocutor's invitation.

In data 36 begins a form of refusal with praise. The participant uses the word *"wow,"* which means to express a feeling of surprise. Although it does not have an official meaning, "wow" here already represents if the participant appreciates the interlocutor's invitation. On the other hand, data 37 and 39 chose the word *"Ummm"* and *"hmm"* before refusing. It expressed the act of muttering when someone is thinking about something. Thus, before making a refusal, the participant thinks about what word would be appropriate to use next. The participant may be accustom to using the word in everyday life to produce the utterance, as in data 38 spontaneously.

4.1.1.3.3 Gratitude or Appreciation

The purpose of using gratitude or appreciation is not to offended, especially for the interlocutor when refusing an initiation act. Typical sentences, for example, *"Thank you for."* That way, the interlocutor feels calm and does not feel guilty when expressing his inability. There were a total of 7.9 % cases of gratitude or appreciation that were found, including the following:

Data 40
"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. **Thank you in advance for inviting me to participate in the event**. However, I apologize for not being able to accept this

offer because I am not a Christian, and in my religion, I am not allowed to participate in the celebration."

Data 41

"Waalaikumsalam, kak. I'm sorry I can't join the event because honestly, I'm not interested in the topic. **Thank you for inviting me**."

Data 42

"Waalaikumsalam. **Thank you for your invitation** but no, because it was haram for me to celebrate Christmas."

Data 43

"Waalaikumsalam, **first of all, thank you for your invitation**, but I'm sorry, I can't join the meeting. I have class at that time, yet preparing for my presentation."

Data 44

"Waalaikumsalam Wr. Wb. It's been an honor to be invited to the event. Unfortunately, I have already been inviting to another family event. I'm sorry, I cannot attend your invitation. **Wishing you a Happy New Year**, cheers."

The data above presents a form of gratitude or appreciation used by participants in refusing the invitation from the interlocutor. They prefer to use the word *"Thank you"* rather than *"I appreciate."* That statement makes it easier for the interlocutor to understand the participant's reasons for refusing the previously given invitation. All the data above used the phrase "Thank you" as gratitude except for data 44. In data, 44 participants showed their appreciation and gave felicitation to save the face-threatening act. The use of gratitude and appreciation is part of the sub-strategies of adjuncts.

4.1.2 The Students' Awareness of Power and Distance when Performing Refusal

Scollon and Scollon (1995) divided power and distance into three categories: the difference politeness system, the solidarity politeness system, and

the hierarchical politeness system. Furthermore, in this chapter, the researcher wants to explain how each stage students of the English Department of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya apply and produce refusal strategies when refusing an initiation act. Then the result was obtained by giving the stimulus in the form of an invitation by the interlocutor.

The data below show a difference in refusal strategies used by the three groups (junior, equal/classmates, and senior). It is seen in figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 The Students' Awareness of Power and Distance when Performing Refusals

Figure 4.1 demonstrates that the most frequently used refusals strategies in the junior group is the indirect strategy, which appears 22 times. In classmate status, the most strategies that appear are the indirect strategy as many 30 times. Line with the other, in senior also indirect strategy as the most appear than direct or adjuncts. All participants prefer to use indirect strategy rather than the other

because they still uphold the prevailing norms, especially in educational environments.

4.1.2.1 The Difference Politeness System

The difference politeness system deals with interlocutors possessing equal status in some sort of social setting. Simply, this type has the characteristics of less power (P -) but increases the distance relationship (D +). That way, interlocutors can reduce the risk of misunderstanding. On the other hand, it is possible to maintain face-threatening acts.

Afterward, to get data from participants, the researcher sent a stimulus. The stimulus was in the form of invitations sent via short messages, enabling participants to respond. The invitation is in the form of an invitation to join in enjoying New Year's Eve. The contents of the invitation are as follows:

"Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb

I'm (sender name), a ninth semester of English Literature. Because soon there is a New Year's Eve celebration. I want to invite you to attend an event organized by foreign friends. The event will be held on December 31, 2020, starting at 15.00 WIB - finished. Thus this invitation is made, thank you for your attention. Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb."

The invitation above is a form of initiation act between lower to higher. Then the researcher saw how the participant responds to the stimulus that has been previously given. Whether they were aware of the social status that underlies communication or not, the results of the response will then be presented in table 4.2.1 as follows:

Table 4.2 The Responses of Stimulation of Type 1

Refusal Strategy	Type	Frequency	Percentage
Direct Strategies	Performative Statement	1	7.7 %
	Non-Performative Statement	1	7.7 %
Indirect Strategies	Statement of Regret	3	23.0 %
	Excuse, Reason, Explanation	2	15.4 %
	Acceptance that Functions as a Refusal	2	15.4 %
Adjuncts	Statement of Positive Opinion	2	15.4 %
	Gratitude or Appreciation	2	15.4 %
Total		**13**	**100 %**

The data presented above is the result of the responses of several

participants. The researcher and participants have different social statuses,

namely, lower to higher. The researcher sent an invitation to senior students to

attend an event to welcome the New Year. Then, participants' responses or

answers are presented in the table above. Researcher demonstrate the results in

two, in the form of frequency and percentage.

The strategy most often used in situation 1 is the indirect strategy, especially

the statement of regret. These statements appear in the 23% range. The participant

uses the sentences *"Sorry"* or *"I'm sorry"* to express their regret. This statement

of regret is followed by another statement, hoping to avoid a lack of face-

threatening act. The participant uses excuse, reason, explanation to honor the

interlocutor. For example, the sentence *"I have ..."* The participant unconsciously

refuses the activity or plan he has. Besides, the participant also chooses the

acceptance that functions as a refusal statement as the answer. The invitation that

was given by the interlocutor was not attractive, so the participant showed a lack

of enthusiasm with the sentence *"I'm not really up for that."*

On the other hand, the participant also chooses an unspecific sentence,

namely *"cheers."* This word has two meanings that can change meaning. There

are two types of adjuncts used, and they are a statement of positive opinion and

gratitude or appreciation. The use of these two types has the same intensity,

15.4%. Positive opinion sentences used such as *"It's been an honor to be invited*

to the event" and *"I'd love to attend."* While the gratitude said is *" Thank you for*

your invitation" and *"Wishing you a Happy New Year."* Then the strategy that is

rarely using is direct refusal, be it performative or non-performative. The

participant selects *"No"* as refusal, but it still follows a statement of regret.

Another partner chose the sentence *"I cannot attend your invitation"* as a non-

performative statement.

From the explanation above, the researcher concludes that situation 1 is

lower to a higher status. The participant is aware of the power and distance that a

conversation takes. They prefer to use an indirect strategy rather than a direct

strategy. So that the conversation goes smoothly, no one feels pressured by each

other.

4.1.2.2 The Solidarity Politeness System

The solidarity politeness system deals with interlocutors who feel no power

difference nor social distance in their communication. This type is almost the

same as the different politeness system, with a lack of power (P -). The difference

is the distance here is quite close (D -). Interlocutor hopes that there will be a

reciprocal process in the communication process, especially those related to

politeness.

In this section, the researcher stimulated participants in the form of an invitation. The invitation is in the form of an invitation to go on vacation together on the weekend. The invitation text is below:

"Jun (address name)...

Are you free on Saturday? Let's go on vacation to Malang. I want to refresh my mind."

The invitation above is referring to as equal status. The researcher wanted to see how the participants responded to the invitation, who were close friends and classmates. The results of the participants' responses will be explained in table 4.2.2 as follows:

Table 4.3 Finding of Stimulation of Type 2

Refusal Strategy	Type	Frequency	Percentage
Direct Strategies	Performative Statement	1	2.3 %
	Non-performative Statement	7	15.9 %
Indirect Strategies	Statement of Regret	10	22.7 %
	Excuse, Reason, Explanation	13	29.5 %
	Promise of Future Acceptance	3	6.8 %
	Wish	2	4.5 %
	Set Condition for Future or Past Acceptance	1	2.3 %
	Avoidance	1	2.3 %
Adjuncts	Statement of Positive Opinion	1	2.3 %
	Pause Fillers	4	9.1 %
Total		**43**	**100 %**

The data presents the results where the researcher and participants have an equal position. They come from the same semester and in the same department. The researcher sent a participant invitation to go on vacation together. Afterward, the table above presents some of the responses that have been given by participants. The table results' presentation is divide into two, namely frequency and in the form of presentation.

In situation two above, the dominant statement that appears is excuse, reason, explanation that goes into the indirect refusal type, which is 29.5 %. Participants tend to resist using excuses such as *"I have ..."* They explain the various reasons they refused the initiation act. For example, other activities, attending other events, or having appointments with friends or family. Then, the second most frequently used statement is the statement of regret. The average participant prefers *"I'm sorry"* to *"apologize."* Although both are expressions of regret, the use of the word "sorry" is more appropriate for equal status.

On the other hand, it has an informal impression in a conversation. Then the promise of future acceptance. The participant promises to accept the interlocutor invitation at a future time. This is because they prioritize another thing over accepting interlocutor invitations by using the sentence *"Maybe next time"* as a complement to a refusal. In the statement of wish, the total percentage was 4.5%. The participant uses this type as a wish to accept a given invitation. Examples are *"I am"* and *"I wish I could go."* Set condition for future or past acceptance was conveyed by the participant with the sentence *"You should have asked me earlier."* He has many activities and appointments with other people. Maybe if the invitation is sent earlier, the participant would accept it. The last type of indirect strategy is avoidance. The participant performs a repetition in the form of *"This Saturday?"* He wanted to make sure that what Interlocutor said was certain so that the participant performs repetition, intending to receive a changed answer. Because he already has another schedule for the day.

Furthermore, statements that are rarely used are direct refusals, followed by adjuncts. In direct refusal, 15.9% of the participants used non-performative statements. They use *"I can't"* to denote their inability. Meanwhile, for the performative statement, the participant conveys the sentence *"No."* followed by reason and regret.

Moreover, there are two types of adjuncts, namely statements of positive opinion and pause fillers. An example of using a positive opinion is *"I'd love to."* The sentence reveals a participant's interest in the invitation given. The last one is pause fillers, which use to pause one word from another. The participant uses several pause fillers, for example, *"Hmmm," Ummm,"* and *"Oh."*

The researcher concludes from the above statement that equal status is aware of their position. Position means the power and distance they have from the interlocutor. Participants prefer to use the indirect strategy instead of the direct strategy. This case indicates that even though they have equal status, the value of politeness must be upheld.

4.1.2.3 The Hierarchical Politeness System

It deals with mostly formal interaction where the difference in power and social distance do exist. This system has high power (P +), in line with a long-distance relationship (D +). In other words, one individual acts as a superordinate, while another acts as a subordinate.

Furthermore, the researcher performed an initiation act in the form of an invitation. Invitations were sent via the Whatsapp application with a stimulus to join a study. The following were the invitation stimuli given to participants:

"Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb

I'm (sender name), a ninth semester of English Literature. Because soon, there

will be an important celebration for Christians, namely Christmas Day. I want to

invite you to take part in a study on the theme "Christmas from the Perspective of

Muslims." The event will be held online through the Zoom meeting on Friday,

December 25, 2020, at 14.00 WIB. Thus this invitation is made, thank you for

your attention.

Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb."

The invitation above is a form of initiation act between seniors to juniors.

Then the researcher saw how the participant responds to the stimulus that has

been given previously. Are they aware of the social status that underlies

communication? The results of the response will then be presented in table 4.2.3

as follows:

Table 4.4 Findings of Stimulation of Type 3

Refusal Strategy	Type	Frequency	Percentage
Direct Strategies	Performative Statement	4	8.9 %
	Non-performative Statement	6	13.3 %
Indirect Strategies	Statement of Regret	9	20.0 %
	Excuse, Reason, Explanation	7	15.6 %
	Statement of Principle	3	6.7 %
	Wish	1	2.2 %
	Acceptance that Functions as a Refusal	1	2.2 %
Adjuncts	Statement of Positive Opinion	7	15.6 %
	Pause Fillers	1	2.2 %
	Gratitude or Appreciation	6	13.3 %
Total		**44**	**100 %**

The data presented above is the result of the responses of several

participants. The researcher and participants have different social statuses, namely

higher to lower. Interlocutor sent an invitation to junior students to take part in

studies on religion. Then, participants' responses or answers are presented in the table above. Researcher demonstrates the results in two, in the form of frequency and percentage.

In situation 3, which is higher to a lower status, the most frequently used statement is regret. It goes into indirect refusal with a presentation reaching 20%. The participant avoids refusing directly by saying,*" I'm sorry"* or *"I apologize."* The second position is then occupied by adjuncts strategy, particularly the statement of positive opinions with 15.6%. A participant expressed interest by saying, *"It sounds great," "that event sounds interesting,"* or *"I would like to."* Often the statement is followed by an excuse, reason, explanation. Such as *"I have a class"* or *"I have a plan."* The explanation is to tell the interlocutor if they refuse for some reason. Whereas indirect refusal, non-performative is more used than performative. Participants refused the invitation saying *"I can't"* as non-performative and *"It appears I cannot"* as performative. They prefer other activities than taking part in the study. Besides that, several participants refused the invitation because they had the principles of their beliefs. The statement of principle is, for example, *"It was haram for me"* and *"It is not allowed for me."* Furthermore, without reducing respect, the participant does not forget to give gratitude, such as *"Thank you for your invitation."*

From the data above, it concluded that the use of indirect refusal is the most frequently seen, among others. This case proves that participants are aware of the power and distance. This can be seen from the data above, where they avoid being

rude to all status, not only lower to higher, but also higher to lower and equal status.

4.2 Discussion

Refusal is the kind of speech act that indicates negative responses to the previous action. Chang (2008) argues that a refusal is a form of refusal shown in initiation by the interlocutor. This study examined the type of refusal strategy used by UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya students, covering three social statuses: junior, equal (classmates), and senior. In addition to investigating the strategies used, this study also examined students' awareness at each level of power and distance in refusal cases.

This study found that the most strategy that appears was an indirect refusal, with a rate reaching 57.6% compared to other types. Meanwhile, the most frequent statement was the statement of excuse, reason, explanation 23 times. All participants of each social status used regret to keep the faces from the interlocutor. The second most frequent statement was the statement of regret as much as 21.6% or 22 times. They were followed by a non-performative statement, which included in the direct refusal, 14 times. Meanwhile, the least used statements were set conditions for future or past acceptance and avoidance, with a percentage of only 0.9% or appearing only once.

This study's findings corroborate that of Permataningtyas and Sembodo (2018) and Rosdiana (2018). Both studies found that indirect strategy was the most common issue by all characters in the movie. This statement proves that the interlocutor is aware of power and distance by a save of face-threatening act.

Avoiding the use of direct referrals aims to reduce the negative impact that occurs during conversations. Interlocutors prefer to give an excuse, reason, explanation, and statement of regret to replace the sentence *"I can't"* or *"I refuse."*

However, Rifandi, Kamil, and Ningksih (2019) found that indirect was not the most commonly used strategy among the movie characters. They found that direct refusal is the most frequently used. The characters in the movie prefer to use non-performative and negative willingness in every dialogue. Based on Guo (2012), a direct strategy is often found in communications involving equal status, such as intimates. The power is lacking, and the distance is also lacking, so the conversation runs near without any offense. In contrast to this current researcher, the researcher found that the dominant strategy was the indirect strategy, with excuse, reason, and explanation is the most widely used statements in an equal status situation.

Furthermore, this study found differences in the refusal strategies used by the three groups of participants. The refusal strategies used by junior participants are the indirect strategy as many 21 times followed by adjuncts as many 14 times and direct with appears ten times. Meanwhile, in classmate or equal, the most used strategies are indirect, 30 times, followed by direct and adjuncts, as many eight times and five times. The last is senior; the most issues that appear are indirect as many eight times, adjunct as many four times, and direct as many two times.

This finding is in line with Al-Eryani's (2007) research findings and Al-Shboul (2012). Their research concluded that the three groups he participated in

(Lower, equal, higher) used the same politeness strategy in initiation acts. These results are the same as in current research. Each existing status level more often uses an indirect strategy. It can conclude that the use of indirect refusal is the most frequently seen, among others. It proves that participants are aware of the power and distance. Politeness cases are closely related to one's social status.

In this study, researchers had a limited number of subjects as participants. So that it cannot describe the full or real comparison of the result.

An understanding of pragmatic competence is deemed necessary to create smooth and efficient communication. Two aspects that reinforce this success are the speaker's presence as a deliverer of information and a listener as a receiver for information. The awareness of power and distance applies to higher status and covers all aspects, including equal and lower status. In this way, a harmonious social environment can be created without any friction with one another. Moreover, we must be smart in choosing the right words so not to offend the interlocutor. Then there is a good reciprocal process occurs. For that reason, it is very important to keep your words to avoid misunderstanding.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter describes the conclusion and suggestion of the study. The conclusion covers the summary of the finding and discussion which discussed previously. Meanwhile, the suggestion present recommendation for guidelines for the next research.

5.1 Conclusions

This research investigates refusal strategies carried out by students of the UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Participants are divided into three social statuses. They are junior, equal, and senior students. In addition to knowing what types are used by students, researchers also relate it to power and distance. It aims to determine student awareness about the social status that occurs. After looking at the analyzed data, the researcher concluded that each participant had its characteristics in refusing the initiation act, depending on their status. On the other hand, researchers also found several conclusions to complement the objectives of the studies.

Furthermore, the result found that the participant's use of refusal covered all strategies. Consisting of direct strategies 20 times (19.8%), then indirect strategies 59 times (57.6%), and finally adjuncts 23 times (22.7%). So it concluded that the most frequent strategy that appears is the indirect strategy.

Meanwhile, the most frequent statement is the statement of regret, 21.6% or 22 times. It followed by excuse, reason, explanation in the second rank with 20.6% or 21 times. If the two previous types are included in indirect refusal, it is

69

different from position three. It was occupied by direct refusal, especially non-performative statements, 14 times or 13.9%. In contrast, the rarely used types are set conditions for future or past acceptance and avoidance. Each only appeared once with a percentage of 0.9%. The use of indirect refusal proves that each status still holds a high value of politeness and prefers to reduce the negative impact on communication.

In this research, all participants were aware and sensitive to the politeness value. They still respect interlocutors, including when dealing with different social statuses (lower and higher) or the same social status (equal). In the case of equal status, participants did not involve a greeting statement when they refused something. It is based on the close relationship that exists between interlocutor and participant. So they get straight to the point they want to say. However, equal status did not refuse immediately. They added regret, reason, or wish to each of their statements.

This study involved a small number of participants, so it could not accurately describe the comparison between statuses.

5.2 Suggestions

This chapter shows recommendation for future research which focuses on the pragmatics area, especially on refusal strategies. Researchers hope for next research to add more than one instrument to study cases. It is intended so that the results obtained are more accurate. The researcher also believes that film as an object also needs to be updated because many previous researchers have used the same objects and instruments, namely movie and observation.

Afterward, if the next researcher chooses the same subject as the current researcher, they can look for new alternatives in participant selection, significantly higher status. They can add lecturers as subjects in addition to senior students. This case can provide more data so that types of refusal are also more found.

Finally, the researcher hopes that the current research can evaluate and compare for the next researcher. On the other hand, this research is also suitable for readers to learners to think before speaking. It is additionally promoting mutual respect.

REFERENCES

Abed, A. (2011). Pragmatic transfer in Iraqi EFL learners' refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol. 1 (2). Pp. 166-185. Doi: 10.5539/ijel1v1n2p166.

Aitchison, J. (2003). *Teach yourself: Linguistics*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd.

Akutsu, Y. (2009). Positive politeness strategies in oral communication I textbooks. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*. Vol. 52 (1). Pp. 59-70.

Al-Eryani, A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners: *the Asian EFL Journal*. Vol. 9 (2). Pp. 19-32.

Al-Issa, A. (2002). Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behavior evidence and motivating factors: *International journal of intercultural relations*. Vol. 27. Pp. 581-601

Al-Shalawi, H. (1997). *Refusal strategies in Saudi and American culture*. Unpublished master's thesis. Michigan University, USA.

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. 3L *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 18 (3). Pp. 29-39.

Ary, D. Lucy, C. J. Chris, S. & Asghar, R. (2010). *Introduction to research in education 8th edition*. US: Wadsworth Change Learning.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford university press.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bataineh, R. (2008). A Cross-cultural comparison apology by native speaker of American English and Jordan Arabic: *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 40. Pp. 821-792

Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T. & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). *Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals*. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Anderson, and S. D. Krashen (Eds.), Developing communicative competence in a second language (pp. 55-94). New York: Newburry House.

Birner, B. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, P. & Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge.

Byon, A. (2004). Sociopragmatics analysis of Korean requests pedagogical settings: *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 36 (9). Pp. 1637-704

Chang, Y. (2008). How to say no: an analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Language sciences*. Vol. 31. Pp. 93-447.

Chang, Y. F. (2018). An exploratory study of situational effects on the use of apology strategies. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*. Vol. 26 (4). Pp. 1-11.

Cohen, A., & Olstain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning*. Vol. 31. Pp. 113-134.

Cohen, D. (1996). Law, social policy, and violence: the impact of regional culture. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. Vol. 70. Pp 961-978

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Routledge.

Dedoussis, E. (2004). A cross-cultural comparison of organizational culture: Evidence from Universities in the Arab world and Japan. *Cross Cultural Management*. Vol. 11 (1). Pp. 15-31.

Fasold, R. (1996). *The sociolinguistics of language*. USA: Blackwell.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning*. Vol. 54 (4). Pp. 587-653.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. 7th edition. New York: McGraw-hill.

Gass, S. M., & Houck, N. (1999). *Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese-English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Guodong, L. & Jing, H. (2005). A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English and Mandarin Chinese. *Asian EFL Journal*. Vol. 7. Pp. 1-12.

Guo, Y. (2012). Chinese and American refusal strategy: a cross-cultural approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. Vol. 2 (2). Pp. 247-256.

Hassall, T. (2003). Requests by Australians learners of Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 32. Pp. 1903-28.

Hassani, R., Mardani, M., & Hossein, H. (2011). A comparative study of refusal: gender distinction and social status in focus. *The International Journal-Language Society and Culture*. Vol. 32. Pp. 37-64.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman

Hossaini, H., & Talebinezhad, M. R. (2014). A comparative study of the use of refusal strategies between Iranian EFL learners and native speakers of English. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*. Vol. 5 (2). Pp. 176-188.

House, J & Kasper, G. (1987). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language*. In W. Lorscher and R. Schultzhe (eds) Perspectives on Language in Performnace. Festschrift fur Werner Hullen. Tubingen: Narr.

Koike, A. (1996). *Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning*: in SGJ Neu (ed). Speech act across culture. Berlin: Moution de Gruyter.

Kwon, J. (2003). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingual*. Vol. 23 (4). Pp. 339-364.

Liao, C & Bresnahan, M. (1996). A contrastive pragmatics study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. *Language sciences*. Vol. 18. Pp. 27-703

Lodico, M. G. Spaulding, D. T. & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. San Francisco.

Marti, L. (2006). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 38 (11). Pp. 1836-1869.

Matsumura, S. (20010. Learning the rules for offering advice: a quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language learning*. Vol. 51 (4). Pp. 79-635

Mey, J. L. (1994). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Moaveni, H. T. (2014). *A study of refusal strategies by American and international students at an American university*. Unpublished master thesis. Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Nelson, G., Al Batal, M. & EL Bakary, W. (2002). Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Vol. 26 (1). Pp. 39–57.

Nguyen, T. (2006). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: refusals of requests by Australian native speakers of English and Vietnamese learners of English*. (Dissertation for the Degree of Master of Arts in TESOL studies). University of Queensland.

Ozuorcun, F. (2013). The importance of body language in intercultural communications. *EUL Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 4 (2). Pp. 70-81.

Permataningtyas, W. & Thomas, J. P. S. (2018). Refusal strategies in two Harry Potter movies. *Lexicon* Vol. 5 (2). Pp. 115-126.

Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan imperatif bahasa indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Rifandi, D. R., Wahyu, K. S. F. & Wiyasukti, N. (2019). Refusal strategies in the movie the Walking Dead: *A Pragmatic Study*. Vol. 11 (2). Pp. 61-67.

Rosdiana, Y. (2018). *Refusal strategies used by character in Despicable me movie. Medan*. Unpublished Thesis. University of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, R. (1995). *Intercultural communication: A discourse analysis*. Blackwell: Oxford

_____. (2001). *Mediated discourse: The nexus of practice*. London: Routledge

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech act: An essay in philosophy of language*. London & New York: Longman.

_____. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*. Vol. 5. Pp. 1-23. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848

Shardakova. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Vol. 2. Pp. 423-451.

Soliman, A. (2003). Apology in American English and Egyptian Arabic. Paper presented to *TESOL 3rd Annual*. USA: Baltimore Maryland.

Umale, J. (2011). Pragmatic failure in refusal strategies: British vs Omani interlocutors. *Arab World Journal*. Vol. 2 (1). Pp. 18-46

Umar, A. (2004). Request strategies as used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language: *Journal of Educational & Social Sciences & Humanities*. Vol. 16 (1). Pp. 41-87

Wannaruk, A. (2005). Pragmatics transfer in Thai EFL refusals. Paper presented to *the 13th annual KOTESOL International conference*. Korea: Seoul.

Wardani, F. D. (2019). *Refusal strategy used by 5th semester students of English department in Islamic State University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya*. Surabaya: UIN Sunan Ampel.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

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

_____. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.