CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter comprises of two aspects; research finding and discussion. The writer finds there are similarities refusal strategies, differences refusal strategies and politeness strategies made by ILE and TLE. Furthermore, the writer tries to discuss the finding.

A. Research Findings

In this chapter the writer analyzes and presents the finding of the research, by using Beebe et al, Brown and Levinson’s theory.

1. Refusal Strategies to Request by ILE and TLE

This part comprises three sub-discussions; the similarities and the difference of refusal strategies to equal status, to lower status and to higher status.

a. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to Interlocutor of equal status

DCT scenario:

You are a junior in collage. You attend classes regularly and take good notes. Your friend often misses a class and asks you for your notes. But you refuse.

Friend : “Oh God! We have an exam tomorrow but I don’t have notes from last week. I am sorry to ask you this, but could you please lend me your notes once again?
You say : __________________________
The scenario is about refusal to request some notes in equal status. The researcher found ILE tended to be indirect while TLE tended to be direct.

The data can be seen like in the following comparison chart:

**Chart 01: Refusal strategies in declining request to interlocutor of equal status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLE</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed that direct strategies were dominant in TLE (80%). It was higher than ILE did (33%). By contrast, ILE were higher in indirect strategy (67%) than TLE (20%). The detail refusal strategies made by both groups can be seen in the following chart:
Chart 02: The comparison between refusal strategies in declining request to interlocutor of equal status

The data showed TLE inability was the highest frequencies of all strategies (60%). By contrast, ILE inability only got 20%. However, ILE in excuse strategy was more dominant than TLE (47%). Furthermore, No one of ILE used direct no while TLE achieved 13%. In unwillingness both groups got similar frequency (7%), and in other strategies ILE dominated with low frequency (see on chart 02).

TLE direct strategies mostly applied inability as the head act of refusal strategies. Commonly, inability was used with others semantic formula such as apology and excuse, for examples:

*Sorry, I cannot give my notes to you, because I will study for exam tomorrow too.* [apo+ina+exc] (TLE/04/1)

*Sorry, I cannot, I want read it.* [apo+ina+exc] (TLE/07/1)
Sorry, I can’t give my note to you because I must use it now. [apo+ina+exc] (TLE/12/1)

Some respondents of TLE used direct no and unwillingness but in low frequency, such as the examples below:

No, I am sorry I think you can borrow another. [No + Apo + Alt] (TLE/13/1)

No, because I just have one. [no+exc] (TLE/05/1)

Sorry guys, I will not lend you note again because you often misses a class and if you want to be successful, you must clever, I believe you can do it. [Apo + Unw + Exc] (TLE/02/1)

In low frequencies, ILE sometimes used inability to express their direct refusal. ILE usually combined with apology and excuse such as in the following examples:

I’m sorry I can’t, my book has been borrowed by another friend [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/02/1)

I’m sorry, I can’t borrow my notes, because I want to study [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/04/1)

Most ILE used excuse to decline a request in equal status. They sometimes involved adjunct and apology in their expressions, for examples:

Oh I’m sorry, tonight I need my note to finish my assignment [fil + apo + exc] (ILE/07/1)

Oh, I’m sorry. I also don’t have the notes [fil + apo + exc] (ILE/08/1)
ILE indirect refusal strategy mostly comprised of excuse as the head act and apology/regret as the politeness strategies for examples:

*I’m sorry, I will complete my notes tonight* [apo+exc] (ILE/09/1)

*I am sorry Sista, my book was broken because many friends borrow my notes* [apo+exc] (ILE/03/1)

*I’m sorry, I will complete my notes tonight* [apo+exc] (ILE/09/1)

To express their indirect refusals, ILE used alternative, acceptance or statement of principle. However these strategies occurred in very low frequencies, for examples:

*I am so sorry, if you need my note why not long ago or a week before examination.* [apo+alt] (ILE/05/1)

*It’s okay no problem, but I think not know.* [acc] (ILE/10/1)

*Sorry, I use it only for my self.* [apo+prin] (ILE/14/1)

In low frequencies, TLE sometimes used indirect strategies to express their refusal. They applied excuse and apology to decline a request, for examples:

*Sorry! tomorrow I have an exam also.* [apo+exc] (TLE/01/1)

*Sorry, I want complete my notes.* [apo+exc] (TLE/10/1)

Although, both of groups did not use apology as the head act, the frequencies of apology in semantic formula was high enough. Based on the data, the writer found that apology and excuse became the highest semantic
formula which were used by both of groups. The comparison chart of semantic formula in equal status made by ILE and TLE can be seen such as the chart below;

**Chart 03: The comparison chart of semantic formula in declining request to interlocutor of equal status**

The data showed that the frequency of apology and excuse in both of groups are frequently high. The researcher found, the way they produced apology is different. ILE tended to use ‘I am sorry’, while TLE tended to use ‘Sorry’. The percentage of direct strategy such as inability, direct no and unwillingness of TLE is higher than ILE. Furthermore, ILE dominated in indirect strategy such as alternative, filler, acceptance as refusal and principle statement.
b. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to Interlocutor of lower status

DCT scenario:

You are a fifth semester student. A junior student (a third semester student) asks you to borrow all your presentation slides that you used at the third semester, and you refuse the request.

Your junior: ‘Terrible, this year I get a lot of presentation and assignment. Can I use your slide presentation? I heard that you were great at third semester.
You say: ……………………

The DCT is about refusal to request in lower status. The respondents have to decline a request from their junior who wants to borrow their slide presentation. The researcher found ILE tended to be direct while TLE tended to be indirect. The data can be seen in the following comparison chart:

Chart 04: Refusal strategies in declining a request
To interlocutor of lower status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed that the percentage of direct strategies made by ILE were higher than TLE (33%). On the other hand, the percentage of indirect
strategies made by TLE became the highest percentage in DCT 2 (73%). The
deep explanation can be seen in the following chart:

Chart 05: The comparison between refusal strategies in declining
request to interlocutor of lower status

The data presented excuse in TLE was the highest strategies in DCT 2, it
achieved 60%. By contrast, ‘excuse’ in ILE occurred in low frequency (13%).
However, ‘alternative’ of ILE was higher (33%) and ILE was more dominant in
using ‘inability’ (27%) than TLE. In other strategies such as ‘acceptance’ and
direct ‘no’, ILE became dominant while no respondent of TLE used those
strategies. Although ILE became frequent in acceptance and direct no, the
percentage of unwillingness was less than TLE.

Based on the data, ILE used inability as head act. Commonly inability
was combined with apology and excuse, for examples:
I’m sorry, I can’t give you because my laptop has broken and my entire file has loss. [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/04/2)

I’m sorry Sist, you can’t borrow my presentation slide, because some of them are lost. [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/12/2)

In ILE, unwillingness appeared in low frequencies combined with alternative, for examples:

I can’t give you my slide presentation, you must do it by your self, I think it will be better. [unw+alt] (ILE/11/12)

By contras, TLE did not use inability like ILE did. To express direct refusal strategies, TLE used unwillingness as head act, commonly unwillingness were attached with apology and excuse, for example:

Sorry, I didn’t give you my presentation and assignment, because you must have the experience of learning by doing and than you must make it. I believe you can. It is for your own good. [apo+unw+exc] (TLE/02/2)

I apologize but I will not give it to you, you must have the experience of learning by doing for your own presentation. It’s for your own good. [apo+unw+alt] (TLE/03/2)

ILE indirect strategies commonly used ‘alternative’, and apology as politeness, for examples:

I’m sorry Sist, can you do it by your self? because if you are not know, you are looser. [apo+alt] (ILE/03/2).

I’m sorry, but you have to make your own slide presentation. [apo+alt] (ILE/09/2)
ILE sometimes used ‘acceptance as refusal’ as their indirect refusal strategies as the following examples:

Yes you can, but now I didn’t bring my slide presentation. [acc] (ILE/10/2)

I want, but I want to see your own effort [acc] (ILE/02/2)

Declining request to lower status, ILE used excuse but in low frequency, for examples:

Unfortunately, my laptop broken I lost all of the documents, I’am sorry. [exc+apo] (ILE/08/2)

I forget where I save the presentation file. [exc] (ILE/01/2)

Unlike ILE which has many variations in their indirect strategies, TLE was dominated with excuse. In the following examples are indirect refusals produced by TLE where ‘excuse’ became the head act of the strategy:

Sorry, I have deleted. [apo+exc] (TLE/04/2)

Sorry, I don’t save the data. [apo+exc] (TLE/07/2)

Sorry, my slide presentation is not complete. [apo+exc] (TLE/10/2)

However in very low frequency, TLE chose alternative to decline request as follows:

Sorry dear, I think you must do it by yourself [apo+alt] (TLE/12/2)
The comparison chart of semantic formula in lower status made by ILE and TLE can be seen such as the chart below:

Chart 06: The comparison chart of semantic formula in declining request to interlocutor of lower status

The data showed TLE apology (41%) and excuse (35%) was higher than ILE. However, in alternative (24%) and acceptance as refusal (14%), ILE was more dominant than TLE. In other strategies, both of groups got low percentage with little deference of frequency.
c. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to interlocutor of higher status

DCT scenario:

Your lecturer asks you to help him to take research data because he is too busy. However, you cannot help him due to some reasons.

Your lecturer : “Could you help me to take data for my research? This month I will be very busy”.

You say : ......................................

The scenario is about refusal to lecturer’s request to take research data. The researcher found ILE tended to be direct while TLE tended to be indirect. The data can be seen in the following comparison chart:

**Chart 07: Refusal strategies in declining a request to interlocutor of higher status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TLE</th>
<th>ILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed that the percentage of direct strategies made by ILE were more dominant than TLE (60%). By contrast, TLE indirect strategies were higher than ILE (47%). The detail refusal strategies made by both groups can be seen in the following chart:
Chart 08: The comparison refusal strategies in declining request to interlocutor of higher status

The data depicted ILE used excuse, acceptance as refusal and inability to decline a request in higher status, while TLE only used excuse and inability. ILE inability (60%) was higher than TLE did (53%). However, ‘excuses’ (47%) TLE were more dominant than ILE (13%). The researcher found no one of TLE respondent used acceptance as refusal while ILE obtained 27%.

The researcher found that ILE commonly used inability to decline a request in higher status level. As the head act of refusal, inability usually combine with others strategies such as apology and excuse to express their direct refusal, for examples:

*I'm sorry Mam, I cannot help you, because I have a lot of assignment. [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/09/3)

*I'm sorry Mr, I can’t help you to take data for your research because I must join the class. [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/10/3)

*I'm sorry Sir, I can’t help you. Because this month I have training in my organization [apo+ina+exc] (ILE/04/3)
Similar with ILE, inability in TLE were combined with apology and excuse, for examples:

\[\text{I am so sorry, I can not help you. In this month I will have the examination. [apo+ina+exc]} \text{ (TLE/15/3)}\]

\[\text{Sorry, I can’t help you because I have project [apo+ina+exc]} \text{ (TLE/13/3)}\]

\[\text{Sorry, I can not help you because now I am in hurry for going home to finish my work [apo+ina+exc]} \text{ (TLE/11/3)}\]

ILE used acceptance as refusal to express their indirect strategy. Acceptance as refusal sometimes has been used by positive opinion such as ‘I loved too’ to express indirect strategy. These are the examples of indirect refusal strategy made by ILE:

\[\text{I’m sorry, Mam. I’d love too but I have many assignments this month. [Apo + Acc]} \text{ (ILE/15/3)}\]

\[\text{I am so sorry mom, I really want to help you. But, I have to do my own research. It must be submitted two days later. [Apo + Acc ] (ILE/14/3)}\]

\[\text{I am so sorry sir, I want to help you, but I still have a lot of assignments [Apo + Acc]} \text{ (ILE/15/3)}\]

Excuse as head act of indirect strategy occurred in low frequencies, for examples:

\[\text{I’m sorry, this moth I have to go to my hometown, really sorry. [Apo + Exc + Apo]} \text{ (ILE/08/3)}\]

\[\text{I’m so sorry sir. I have many assignments this month [Apo + Exc]} \text{ (ILE/13/3)}\]
Unlike ILE, **excuse** was mostly used to express indirect refusal in TLE. There are 7 from 15 respondents used indirect refusal strategy, and all respondents who used indirect refusal strategy placed excuse as head act, for examples:

*Sorry, now I have alot of homework and not yet done.
[apo+exc] (TLE/04/3)*

*Sorry, I have class [apo+exc] (TLE/05/3)*

*Sorry, I am busy everyday [apo+exc] (TLE/08/3)*

Although, apology is not existed as head act of refusal strategies, both of them became the highest semantic formula in the two groups. In the following chart showed some semantic formulas made by ILE and TLE:

**Chart 09: The comparison chart of semantic formula in declining request to interlocutor of higher status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DCT-3 Semantic formula in declining request (lower -higer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILE</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLE</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data showed both of groups were dominated by apology, excuse and inability. However, apology and inability of ILE was higher than TLE (38% and 23%). TLE semantic formula dominated in apology and excuse which got same percentage (36%). Since both of groups were dominated by apology, excuse and inability, other strategies occurred in low frequency.

2. Refusal Strategies to Suggestion by ILE and TLE

This part comprises three sub-discussions; the similarities and the difference of refusal strategies to suggestion in equal status, lower status and higher status.

a. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to interlocutor of equal status

DCT scenario:
Your friend suggests you to take rest, because you look so tired from doing your thesis for the past two weeks, but you refuse.
Your friend : “Why don’t you rest at home for a day, you look terrible”
You say : ................................

The fourth DCT is about declining suggestion to equal status. The researcher found that the percentage of indirect strategies made by TLE were the highest percentage. The detail information can be seen in the following comparison chart:
Chart 10: Refusal strategies in declining a suggestion to interlocutor of equal status

The data showed that the percentage of direct strategies (39%) produced by ILE were higher than TLE (7%). By contrast, TLE indirect strategies got the highest percentage of all (93%). The detail refusal strategies made by both groups can be seen in the following chart:

Chart 11: The comparison refusal strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of equal status
The data showed that TLE excuse strategy was higher than ILE (40%). In dissuasion strategy, TLE became more dominant than ILE which achieved only 13% while TLE got 40%. However, direct strategies such as unwillingness and direct no of ILE was too higher than TLE (33% and 13%). In acceptance as refusal, both of groups obtained similar frequency (7%). Furthermore, alternative was dominated by ILE with low frequency (7%) and the researcher found no respondent of TLE used alternative. This condition also occurred in statement of philosophy, but TLE was higher than ILE where the difference between them is not too significant.

In direct refusal strategies, ILE used ‘no’ to decline a suggestion, for examples:

No, I really enjoy to do this. [no+exc] (ILE/07/4)

No guys, I should finish this thesis as soon as possible. [no+exc] (ILE/12/4)

They also used unwillingness as head act of their direct refusal, unwillingness commonly combine with excuse and wish or positive utterances, for examples:

I'd like to, but I can’t. I still have so many things to do. [pos+unw+exc] (ILE/01/4)

I hope so, but I cannot because I have to finish my thesis soon. [wish+unw+exc] (ILE/09/4)

By contrast, there was only one respondent of TLE using direct refusal strategies:
I can’t rest because I have a little time to finish my thesis. [unw+exc] (TLE/12/4)

Excuse became frequent in ILE indirect refusals (27%). Commonly, excuse combined with adjunct such as in the following example:

Okay thanks for your attentions. I want take a rest after I finish [gra+exc] (ILE/02/4)

Thanks for your care, but I must finish my thesis soon, because tomorrow I will present my thesis. [gra+exc] (ILE/04/4)

They also used dissuasion to express their refusal, this dissuasion usually followed by adjunct or acceptance as refusals for examples:

No problem, I can do it Sist, thank you for your attention for me. [dis+gra] (ILE/03/4)

I just work for my deadline, I will take a rest after finish this thesis. Thanks for your caring. [dis+acc +gra] (ILE/15/4)

Yes, I tired too but you don’t need to command me if I tired I will take arrest. [acc + dis] (ILE/05/4)

TLE refusal strategies were dominated by dissuasion (40%), this commonly involved gratitude for examples:

Thank you, never mind, I’m OK. [gra+dis] (TLE/04/4)

Maybe after this, sorry [dis+apo] (TLE/07/4)

Thank you, I am not tired I’m fine. [gra+dis] (TLE/08/4)

Excuse became significant in TLE indirect refusal achieved 40%, for examples:
Because I have many programs to day and I must finish it sooner. [exc] (TLE/13/4)

Because my project deadline tomorrow, I must finish my project to day [exc] (TLE/02/4)

Thanks you, for take care me. But I should finish it. so I can go home and my parents will not wait me so long. [gra+exc] (TLE/09/4)

In low frequencies, TLE used statement of philosophy and statement of principle to express their refusal strategies, for examples:

Never mind, I want finish my work, although it is hard but success can make me happy. [dis+phil] (TLE/10/4)

It’s okay, better to be tired for a while than regretting being lazy all of my life [dis+prin] (TLE/03/4)

Since the two of groups used direct and indirect strategy to decline a suggestion in equal status, many semantic formula appeared especially adjunct. However, no respondent used adjunct as the head act to decline a suggestion in equal status (see in chart 16). In the following chart showed semantic formulas made by ILE and TLE:
Based on the data, excuse (27%) and gratitude (24%) dominated in ILE semantic formula, while TLE were dominated not only excuse (27%) and gratitude (24%) but also dissuasion which achieved 30%. In comparing with ILE dissuasion, TLE dissuasion (30%) was too higher than ILE. However, in unwillingness (12%) and direct no (6%), ILE was more dominant than TLE. In other strategies such as apology, acceptance, principle as refusal, alternative, wish and positive statement, the frequency of occurrence in both of groups were very rare.
b. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to interlocutor of higher status

DCT scenario:

You are presenting your thesis proposal in a seminar class. Your lecturer suggests you to change your topic because it is too common, but you refuse the suggestion.

Your Lecturer : “Previous students have worked on this topic. Why don’t you try something new and change your research topic?
You say : ………………………………..

The DCT is about declining lecturer’s suggestion to change research topic. Based on the data, the researcher found that the percentage of direct strategies became dominant in ILE than TLE. The comparison chart between direct and direct refusal strategies can be seen below:

Chart 13: Refusal strategies in declining a suggestion to interlocutor of higher status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DCT-5 Refusal strategy in declining suggestion (lower - higher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>TLE 23% ILE 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>TLE 74% ILE 67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data showed that the percentage of direct strategies made by ILE were higher than TLE did. By contrast, in indirect strategies the percentage of TLE was too higher than ILE (74%). The detail information in declining suggestion to higher status can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 14: The comparison refusal strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of higher status**

The data showed that, TLE in excuse strategy was too higher than ILE (67%). By contrast, ILE unwillingness was more frequent than TLE (53%). In direct ‘no’, both of groups used this strategy in low frequency where ILE achieved 7% and TLE got (13%). TLE also used dissuasion in declining suggestion with low frequency (7%) while no respondent of ILE used dissuasion. In other strategies such as avoidance, alternative and acceptance as refusal no respondent of TLE used those strategies while ILE dominated with low frequency (7-13%)
In direct refusal strategies, ILE commonly used unwillingness to decline a suggestion, for examples:

I’m so sorry mom, I can’t try the new one. You may see my proposal again. My topic has different explanation. [apo+unw+exc] (ILE/15/5)

I’m so sorry sir, I can’t change it because I had finished my thesis and I think my thesis will be extremely different with the other researcher. [apo+unw+exc] (ILE/14/5)

I’m sorry Sir, I can’t change it because I’m tired and don’t have any idea. [apo+unw+exc] (ILE/12/5)

Based on the data, the researcher found unwillingness dominated in ILE direct strategy. It commonly was combined with apology and excuse. Furthermore, in low frequency ILE used direct no to express their refusal.

In very low percentage, TLE used direct strategy. They used unwillingness and direct no to express their direct refusal like the examples below:

I want to this topic, I do not change the topic because I will edit this topic for more complete. [unw+exc] (TLE/06/5)

Never mind, but I don’t changes the topic. I want take this topic because I get a lot of benefits and make me skillful. [dis+unw+exc] (TLE/10/5)

No please, I want do this research so badly. [no+exc] (TLE/11/5)

Although ILE tended to be direct in declining suggestion to higher level, in some cases they used indirect strategies by employed alternative. For examples:
I’m sorry mister, I have a lot of theory from this topic, so I want to finish this thesis, may I? [apo+exc +alt] (ILE/06/5)

Sir, I think your reason to change my topic is does not make sense. Maybe you can give me the other options, can I? [alt] (ILE/05/5)

In low frequency, ILE used avoidance and excuse, for examples:

I’m sorry, I have no idea. haha... [apo+avo] (ILE/08/5)

I am so sorry Sir, this topic is very interesting for me. I have tough about it [apo+exc] (ILE/13/5)

By contrast, indirect strategy became frequent in TLE. TLE commonly used excuse to express their indirect refusals strategies. They sometimes involved apology in the beginning of the utterances, for examples:

I’m sorry! I don’t know this topic was worked previous students before. [apo+exc] (TLE/01/5)

I am so sorry Sir, I don’t know this topic was worked with other students. I think even though we worked same topic but our argument is different. [apo+exc] (TLE/14/5)

Most TLE used excuse to decline a suggestion to higher social level without adding other strategies, for examples:

I think my topic was very important for me. I choose my topic because I like this and I’m very interested in it. I really want to learn more about this. [exc] (TLE/09/5)

But my data is different. [exc] (TLE/05/5)

If I change my topic now, I don’t have an idea and I like this topic [exc] (TLE/02/5)
Since, both of groups used different refusal strategies, their semantic refusal exertion also different. The comparison of semantic formula made by ILE and TLE to decline suggestion in higher status level can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 15: The comparison chart of semantic formula in declining suggestion to interlocutor of higher status**

The data showed the exertion of excuse in TLE was more dominant than ILE (57%). However, the percentage of unwillingness and apology of ILE was higher than TLE (26%). This condition also occurred in alternative, where ILE was more dominant than TLE (14%). In other strategies such as direct no and dissuasion the percentage of TLE was higher than ILE even though it happened in very low frequency (9%). Avoidance, acceptance and filler made by ILE occurred in very low frequency (3%).
c. The similarities and the differences of refusal strategies to interlocutor of lower status

DCT scenario:
You have been waiting for your supervisor almost two hours. A junior student suggests you to put the documents on your supervisor’s desk, but you refuse the suggestion.

Your Junior: “why don’t you leave your research paper on his desk?”

You say: ……………………………

Sixth scenario is refusal strategies to lower status. The scenario talked about suggestion to put the documents on lecturer desk. Based on the data, TLE indirect strategies were more dominant than ILE. The detail information can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 16: Refusal strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of lower status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLE</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILE</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data showed that the percentage ILE direct strategies were higher than TLE. In direct strategies ILE got 60% while TLE got 47%. By contrast, TLE became more dominant in indirect strategies which achieved 53% while ILE got 40%. The detail information between refusal strategy made by ILE and TLE can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 17: The comparison refusal strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of lower status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refusal Strategy</th>
<th>ILE</th>
<th>TLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented both of groups used excuse as their refusal strategy to decline a suggestion in lower status, but the exertion of excuse in TLE (53%) was higher than ILE (33%). Both of groups also used direct ‘no’ in declining a suggestion, the data showed ILE and TLE have the same percentage (33%). Since no respondent of TLE used inability and acceptance as refusal, automatically ILE became dominant in those strategies (20% and 7%). The last strategy used by both groups is unwillingness, this strategy used by ILE and TLE in low frequency.
ILE commonly applied unwillingness to express their direct refusal, sometimes they merged unwillingness with apology or excuse, for examples:

I’m sorry I can’t put this research paper on his desk because it is very important, I worry I will lost it. [apo+unw+exc]  
(ILE/06/6)

Sorry, I can’t leave my research paper on his desk. [apo+unw]  
(ILE/10/6)

I Can’t to do it because I want to talk something with him, and I also afraid if my documents are lost. [unw+exc]  

ILE also used direct no to decline suggestion in a lower status, it sometimes merged with excuse, for examples:

No, because I want wait my supervisor. [no+exc] (ILE/02/6)

No, I will wait her. [No] (ILE/07/6)  

No, I don’t have any brave. [no+exc] (ILE/09/6)

Similar with ILE, TLE direct refusal mostly used direct ‘no’ to decline suggestion. It sometimes was added by filler and excuse/explanation, for examples:

No, because this document is very important. [no+exc]  
(TLE/01/6)

No, it is important so I must meet the lecturer [no+exc]  
(TLE/07/6)

Oh no, I am afraid my assignment will be lost. So I must meet him. [fil+no+exc] (TLE/08/6)

Some respondents of TLE used unwillingness to refuse suggestion, like in the following examples:
I think, I cannot put this document on his desk. I am afraid lost it. [unw+exc] (TLE/06/6)

Sorry, I don’t think so, I will give it directly. [apo+unw] (TLE/04/6)

In indirect strategies, TLE excuse strategy (53%) was higher than ILE (33%). However, in some cases the respondent of ILE tended to use excuse, for examples:

Thanks for your suggestion, I think I should wait the supervisor until he arrive here. Because I must have a face to face moment with him and I think it’s better to do. [gra+exc] (ILE/11/6)

Because I don’t believe, it will be seen by the supervisor. [exc] (ILE/12/6)

I need to meet my supervisor first, then give a little explanation about my documents. [exc] (ILE/15/6)

The researcher found, only one respondent of ILE used acceptance as refusal, for example:

I think that is good idea, but I must wait him because I have waited 2 hours, so I have wait him till the end. [pos+acc+exc] (ILE/05/6)

Interestingly, all indirect strategies employed by TLE used excuse to decline a suggestion. For examples:

Because I confused do it and if I do, my supervisor will think that I am careless. [exc] (TLE/02/6)

Because I’m afraid, it will lost. [exc] (TLE/05/6)

Because I want to meet supervisor’s I have some questions to him. [exc] (TLE/13/6)
Since, both of groups showed different dominated in exertion of refusal strategies, their percentage of semantic formula became difference. The comparison of semantic formula made by ILE and TLE to decline suggestion in lower status level can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 18: The comparison of semantic formula in declining suggestion to interlocutor of lower status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCT-6 Semantic formula in declining suggestion (higher - lower)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed the percentage of excuse in both of groups was dominant. However, the percentage of excuse in TLE was higher than ILE (52%). ILE unwillingness was higher than TLE (15%), but the percentage of direct ‘no’ in both of groups almost similar only difference 1% where TLE was higher than ILE (20%). Although adjunct was not dominant in both groups, the data showed that ILE commonly used gratitude (11%) while TLE applied filler (12%). In other semantic formula, such as apology and acceptance as refusal both of groups used those strategies in very low frequency.
3. Politeness strategies in refusal to request by ILE and TLE

The section analyzed four politeness strategies: bold on record (BOR), positive politeness (PP), negative politeness (NP) and off record (OFF) strategy to decline request and suggestion in equal, lower and higher social status level. The number after abbreviation has strategy number such as in list of abbreviation (see p. ix)

a. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 1 (equal - equal)

DCT scenario 1 is about declining friend’s request to borrow some notes. The researcher found ILE and TLE commonly combined their politeness strategy to decline a request in equal strategy. The data can be seen like in the following comparison chart:

Chart 19: Politeness strategies in declining request made by ILE and TLE (equal - equal)

The data showed combination strategy got highest percentage in both groups. However, TLE combination was higher than ILE. The occurrence
of positive politeness was less, ILE achieved 13% while TLE 7%. Deep discussion can be seen in the following explanation:

1) **Positive Politeness**

Positive politeness (PP) was the most common politeness strategy applied by TLE and ILE. However, the percentage of independent positive politeness (without adding other strategies) was less. The researcher found only one respondent of TLE used independent PP, for example:

> No, *because I have just one* (TLE/05/1)

[PP13]

The example below was positive politeness made by ILE:

> *Oh, why don’t you follow the class? That’s very important.*

PP13

> I will not lend you my notes

[ILE/06/1]

> *It’s okay no problem,* but I think not know

PP5

2) **Combination Strategy**

Combination strategy means the speaker formulated more than one strategy to decline hearer’s wants. Combination strategy divided into two; intra combination (combining strategy in one variety politeness) and inter combination (combining strategy but in different variety politeness). In DCT 1, the researcher found all combination strategy made by ILE and TLE used inter combination.
a) Inter Strategy

ILE and TLE used inter strategy to decline a request in equal status level. Detail explanation can be seen in discussion below:

(1) NP6+OFF 1

ILE and TLE used apology (NP6) and hint (OFF1) to decline a request in equal status. In the following examples were NP6+OFF1 made by ILE:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I'm sorry, I also need the notes} & \quad \text{(I can not give my note)} \\
\text{NP6} & \quad \text{OFF1} \\
\text{(ILE/01/1)}
\end{align*}
\]

Oh I am sorry. to night I need my notes to finish my assignment

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP6} & \quad \text{OFF1} \\
\text{(ILE/07/1)}
\end{align*}
\]

I'm sorry, I will complete my note to night

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP6} & \quad \text{OFF1} \\
\text{(ILE/09/1)}
\end{align*}
\]

Those examples showed that, ILE used hint ‘I also need the note’, rather than directly say ‘no’ or ‘I can not give the note’. However, the utterance ‘I also need the note’ or ‘I will complete my note’ implicitly has equaled meaning with ‘I can not give my note’. To show their politeness ILE added NP6 before produced hints, ‘I am sorry’. Like ILE, TLE applied NP6+OFF1 to decline a request in equal status, for examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sorry, tomorrow I have an exam also} & \quad \text{(TLE/01/1)} \\
\text{NP6} & \quad \text{OFF1}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sorry, I want complete my note} & \quad \text{(TLE/10/1)} \\
\text{NP6} & \quad \text{OFF1}
\end{align*}
\]
I am sorry, I also have an exam tomorrow and I also want to read it. I think you must borrow with other students.

(2) NP6+PP13

The data showed combination between apology (NP6) and reason (P13) was appear frequently in both groups, the examples of NP6+PP13 made by ILE can be seen in these examples:

I'm sorry, I can't borrow my notes because I want to study

I think I can't give my note to you because I have to read my notes again and review all the lesson, I'm sorry, I can't

In one occasion, ILE repeat NP6 in the end of strategy but it was rarely happened, for example:

I'm sorry, I couldn't, because I need to review the lesson more to prepare my exam too. I'm sorry

TLE also used NP6+PP13 to refuse a request in equal status such as in the following examples:

Sorry, I can not give my notes to you, because I will study for exam tomorrow too

Sorry, I cannot, I want read it
Sorry, I can not give you, I have work to do (TLE/08/1)

(3) NP6 + PP4 + OFF1

ILE combined apology (NP6), identity marker (PP4) and hint (OFF1) to decline a request in equal status. The researcher found this combination occurred in low frequency and only done by ILE, for examples:

\textit{I am sorry Sista, my book is broken because many friends borrow my notes} (ILE/03/1)

\textit{Sorry my friend, I need my notes to study first, You must ask somebody else} (ILE/15/1)

In the beginning, the respondent produced regret (NP6) and group identity marker (PP4) 'Sista' or 'my friend'. Instead of declining with unwillingness and then giving reason, ILE tended to use hint (OFF1).

(4) NP6+PP4+PP1

TLE combined apology (NP6), identity marker (PP4) and attendance to hearer interest (PP1). This combination occurred in low frequency and was used by TLE only, for examples:

\textit{Sorry dear, I believe if you want to be successful you should try to collect your own notes, I can’}t lend you my notes anymore (TLE/03/1)
The researcher found direct refusal strategy such as inability or unwillingness commonly was merged with apology (NP6). In declining a request, group identity marker (PP4), reason (PP13) and notice/attend to hearer interest (PP1) sometimes existed such as in the following example made by one of TLE respondent:

```
Sorry guys, I didn’t lend you note again because you often miss the class and if you want to be successful, you must be clever, I believe you can do it.
```

The main head of refusal is inability ‘I didn’t lend you anymore’ and the respondent used NP6, PP4, PP13 and PP1 to show her politeness.

The researcher found that this strategy was done by TLE only.

The comparison politeness strategy made by ILE and TLE can be seen in the following chart:
Chart 20: Politeness strategies in declining request to interlocutor of equal status

The data showed ILE and TLE used similar strategy to decline a request in equal status level even though in some parts the percentage of frequency was different. NP6 (apology) became the highest strategy in both of groups, the percentage was equal only 1% deference. In giving reason (PP13), the frequency of TLE was more dominant than ILE, TLE achieved 31% while ILE got 16%. However, ILE became higher in OFF1 which achieved 29% while TLE only got 13%. In other strategies such as PP5, PP4, PP1 occurred in very low frequencies, of these both speaker used different frequencies.
b. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 2 (higher - lower)

DCT scenario 2 is about declining junior’s request to borrow slide presentations. The researcher found ILE and TLE commonly combined their politeness strategy to decline a request in equal strategy. The data can be seen like in the following comparison chart:

**Chart 21: Politeness strategies in declining request made by ILE and TLE (higher - lower)**

![Chart](chart.png)

The data depicted both groups commonly used combination strategy to decline a request in lower status. The percentage of TLE combination was higher than ILE, the data showed that combination occurred 93% in TLE. Automatically, ILE became dominant in other strategies especially in positive politeness (33%). Deep discussion about politeness strategy made by ILE and TLE in declining a request to lower status can be seen in the following explanation:
1) Off record

The two groups used off record to decline a request in lower status. In this strategy both groups got the same percentage (7%). In the following example are hints that were made by ILE and TLE:

*I have forgotten where the presentation folder I save.* (ILE/01/2)  
OFF1

*I think the slide is different, may be you can improve and get new subject.* (TLE/13/2)

Based on those examples, ILE and TLE used hinting instead of making a direct refusal. This strategy may make the addressee understand that the respondent can not give the addressee wants by saying ‘*I have forgotten where the presentation folder I save*’ (please borrow another friend), ‘*I think the slide is different, may be you can improve and get new subject*’ (you must do it by your self).

2) Positive politeness

Positive politeness (independent positive politeness) only produced by ILE (33%), the researcher found ILE used reason (PP13), seek agreement (PP5), avoid disagreement (PP6) to decline a request in lower status. In the following examples are PP13 made by ILE:

*I think I can’t give what you want, because I have sell my laptop.*  
PP13 (ILE/05/2)

No, I can’t give you my slide presentation. *You should do it by your self. You must do it well by yourself. So you will prove your best presentation. I think it will be better.*  
PP13 (ILE/11/2)
In other cases, ILE used seek agreement (PP5) to decline a request, for examples:

I want, but I want to see your own effort  
PP5  

Yes you can, but now I didn’t bring my slide presentation  
PP5  

ILE also used avoid disagreement to decline a request, however this strategy occurred in very low frequency:

I hope so, but you must make it by yourself  
PP6  

3) Combination

Combination strategy became the highest strategy made by the two groups, which ILE obtained 60% and ILE achieved 93%. The researcher found both of groups used inter strategy instead of intra strategy like in the discussion above.

a) Inter Strategy

(1) NP6+OFF1

In declining a request, the two of groups used combination between apology (NP6) and hint (OFF1). In the following examples are combination between NP6+OFF1 were made by ILE:

I’m sorry, 
NP6  

but you have to try make your own slide presentation  
OFF1  

(ILE/09/2)
In some cases, ILE tended to switch position between NP6 and OFF1, where they preferred put OFF1 in the beginning and NP6 in the end of the utterances, for examples:

**Unluckily, my laptop was broken and I lost all of the**
**OFF1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>document</th>
<th>I'm sorry</th>
<th>NP6</th>
<th>(ILE/08/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It will be better if you do it by your self, you will more</strong></td>
<td><strong>understand it, sorry</strong></td>
<td>OFF1</td>
<td>NP6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hints such as ‘*unluckily, my laptop was broken and I lost all of the document*’ and ‘*but you have to try make your own slide presentation*’ implicitly have the equal meaning with ‘*I can not give to you*’ or ‘*I will not give my slide presentation to you*’. Instead of decline with direct no or unwillingness ILE used hint and apology to show their politeness. This strategy dominantly was used by TLE, for examples:

**Sorry, I have deleted** (TLE/04/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP6</th>
<th>OFF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sorry, I don’t save the data** (TLE/07/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP6</th>
<th>OFF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sorry, the slide presentation you want not with me** (TLE/08/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP6</th>
<th>OFF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(2) NP6+PP13

The combination between apology (NP6) and reason (PP13) occurred in both groups. In the following examples are the combinations of NP6+PP13 made by ILE:
I'm sorry, I can't give you. Because my laptop have broken and my entire file has loss. (ILE/04/2)

This combination applied in TLE such as in the following examples:

I'm sorry I can't give you about this, because my slide presentation is lost. (TLE/09/2)

I'm sorry, I can't give you because if the teacher know, both of us will get trouble. (TLE/11/2)

(3) PP1+NP6

This combination only was done by ILE in very low frequency, for example:

Yes, you're right, but I can't give my PPT to you. (ILE/06/2)

(4) OFF1+PP1

In very low frequency, ILE combined hint (OFF1) with giving notice to addressee (PP1). This combination only was done by ILE for example:

It will be nice if you make your own presentation slide. (ILE/13/2)
(5) NP6+PP4+PP13

ILE used combination among apology (NP6), group identity marker (PP4) and reason (PP13). This strategy occurred in low frequency and no respondent of TLE used this strategy, for example:

-I’m sorry Sist, you can’t borrow my presentation slide, because some of them are lost

(IIE/12/2)

(6) NP6+PP4+NP1

ILE used combination among apology (NP6), group identity marker (PP4) and conventionally indirect (NP1) to decline a request in lower status. This strategy occurred in low frequency and no respondent of TLE used this strategy, for example:

-I’m sorry Sist, can you do it by your self?

(IIE/03/2)

(7) OFF1+PP4+PP13

This combination has done by ILE in very low frequency. No one of TLE participants applied this combination. In the following example is OFF1+PP4+PP13 made by ILE:

-It’s better for you to make your own slide dear.

(IIE/15/2)
(8) NP6+PP13+PP1

Inter combination among apology (NP6), reason (PP13) and giving notice to addressee (PP1) was done by TLE in low frequency, for example:

_Sorry, I didn’t give you my presentation and assignment, because you must have the experience of learning by doing and than you must make it.
_I believe you can. It is for your own good._

(9) NP6+PP4+OFF1

The researcher found only TLE used this strategy to decline a request in lower status. TLE combined three combinations among apology (NP6), group identity marker (PP4) and hint (OFF1), for examples:

_Sorry dear, I think you must do it by yourself._

The comparison politeness strategy made by ILE and TLE can be seen in the following chart:
The data showed the two of groups used similar strategies to decline a request in lower status. NP6 (apology) became the dominant of the strategies used by both groups. However, NP6 TLE was higher than NP6 ILE which only achieved 27% while TLE 45%. In using hint (OFF1) the percentage of TLE was higher than ILE, ILE got 23% and TLE got 35%. Both of groups also used reason (PP13) in declining request. The percentage of both was almost balance, only 6% difference. ILE got 19% while TLE got 13%. In other strategies such as seek agreement (PP5), avoid disagreement (PP6), using group identity marker (PP4) and giving noticed to the hearer (PP1), ILE was higher than TLE even though it was in low frequencies.
c. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 3 (lower - higher)

DCT scenario 3 is about declining lecturer’s request to take research data. The researcher found ILE and TLE commonly combined their politeness strategy to decline a request in equal strategy. The data can be seen such as in the following comparison chart:

Chart 23: Politeness strategies in declining request made by ILE and TLE (lower - higher)

The data presented combination strategy became very dominant in both groups. It means that the respondent mostly did not use single strategy/independent strategy to decline a request. Complete discussion can be seen in the following explanation:
1) Positive politeness

In DCT 3 the researcher found ILE applied positive politeness in very low frequency (7%). The researcher noted that only one respondent of ILE produced that strategy. In the following example is avoid disagreement (PP6) made by ILE, for examples:

\[\text{Actually, I want to help you but this week I have many job in collage}\]

2) Combination strategy

Combination strategy means the speaker used more than one strategy to decline something such as request or suggestion. Combination strategy divided into two categories namely intra combination and inter combination. In DCT3 the researcher found no one of ILE and TLE used intra combination. All respondents used inter combination, complete explanation can be seen in the following discussion:

a) Inter combination

The researcher found ILE and TLE used inter combination to decline a request in higher status level. Deep explanation can be seen in the following discussion:

(1) NP5+PP13

The combination between deference (NP5) and apology (PP13) was used only by TLE in very low frequency. The researcher found, only one respondent of TLE used this combination, for example:
No, I can’t help you my teacher, because I have final exam tomorrow.

(2) NP6+PP13

The combination between apology (NP6) and reason (PP13) was applied by the two of groups to decline a request in higher status. In the following examples were the combination between apology (NP6) and reason (PP13) made by ILE:

*I'm sorry, I can’t because I have the other research*  
NP6  PP13  (ILE/02/3)  
IEL/03/3

Similar with ILE, TLE combined apology (NP6) and reason (PP13), for examples:

*Sorry, I can’t help. I have a lot of work and I am not sure*  
NP6

*I can finished my work and your research in same time*  
PP13  (TLE/10/3)

*Sorry, I can’t help you because I have project*  
NP6  PP13  (TLE/13/3)

*I am so sorry, I can not help you.*  
NP6

*In this month I will have the examination*  
PP13  (TLE/15/3)

Based on those example, apology (NP6) and reason (PP13) were used for showing their politeness as consequence used inability as the main head of their refusal.
(3) NP6+OFF1

The combination between apology (NP6) and hint (OFF1) commonly were used by TLE. However, this combination appeared rarely in ILE with repeating apology (NP6) in the end of utterances, for examples:

I'm sorry, this month I have to go to my hometown, NP6 OFF1
really sorry, NP6 (ILE/08/3)

In the following examples are combinations between NP6+OFF1 made by TLE:

Sorry, now I have alot of homework and not yet done (TLE/04/3) NP6 OFF1
Sorry, I have class (TLE/06/3) NP6 OFF1
Sorry, I have important business in my home (TLE/07/3) NP6 OFF1

(4) NP6+NP5+PP13

Inter combination make the speaker is possible to combine three strategies. The researcher noted, ILE and TLE applied combination among apology (NP6), deference (NP5) and reason (PP13), the examples above were made by ILE:

I'm sorry Sir, I can’t help you, NP6 NP5
Because this month I have training in my organization PP13 (ILE/04/3)
I'm very sorry Mister, I can't help you
because I have to finish something quickly. (ILE/06/3)

I'm sorry Mam, I cannot help you,
because I have a lot of assignment.

In the following examples are the combinations among NP6+NP5+PP13 were made by TLE:

I'm so sorry my lecturer, I can't help you because now I'm busy, I have a lot of activity in campus and homework

Sorry Sir, I can't help you because I have some project with another lecturer.

(5) NP6+NP5+OFF1

ILE and TLE used this apology (NP6) difference (NP5) and hint (OFF1) to decline a request in higher status. In the following examples are NP6+NP5+OFF1 made by ILE:

I am really sorry Sir/Ma'am, I am afraid that I cannot help you because I have other agendas too

I'm so sorry Sir, I have many assignments this month

(ILE/13/3)
ILE used this combination to decline a request, for example:

*I'm sorry lecturer, because I'm busy too*

NP6  NP5  OFF1  (TLE/01/3)

*I am so sorry Sir, this month I also busy, and I am not in Indonesia for this month because I will go to United Kingdom for International program. I think I will go back to Indonesia to month ago.*

OFF1  (TLE/14/3)

(6) NP6+NP5+PP6

The formula NP6 (apology), NP5 (deference) and NP6 (avoid disagreement) only used by ILE, for examples:

*I'm sorry, Mam.*

NP6  NP5

*I'd love too but I have many assignment this month*  (ILE/07/3)

PP6

*I am so sorry Mom, I really want to help you but, I have to do my own research.*  (ILE/14/3)

PP6

*I am so sorry Sir, I want to help you but*

NP6  NP5  PP6

*I still have a lot of assignments*  (ILE/15/3)

(7) NP6+NP5+PP13+NP6+NP5

In inter strategy the respondent may combine more than 4 strategies in declining hearer’s wants. However, the researcher found no one of TLE respondent used this strategy, in the following example is the combination made by ILE:
I'm sorry Sir.
NP6   NP5

I couldn’t do it.
Because I will go home this month.
NP13

sorry Sir
NP6   NP5

(ILE/12/3)

The comparison politeness strategies between ILE and TLE in higher status can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 24: Politeness strategies in declining request to interlocutor of higher status**

![Chart 24: Politeness strategies in declining request to interlocutor of higher status](image)

The data presented that both of groups used similar politeness strategy, even though in avoid disagreement no one of TLE respondent used that strategy while ILE got 10%. The percentage of apology (NP6) achieved the highest strategy, however the percentage of NP6 in TLE was higher than
ILE. The appearance of deference (NP5) in ILE was more significant than TLE, but in OFF1 strategy the percentage of TLE was too higher than ILE which only got 8%. In using apology (PP13), ILE and TLE used it almost in the same frequency, where TLE more dominant than ILE, deference 4%.

4. Politeness strategies in refusal to suggestion by ILE and TLE

The section analyzed four politeness strategies; bold on record (BOR), positive politeness (PP), negative politeness (NP), and off record (OFF) to decline suggestion in equal, lower and higher social status level.

a. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 4 (equal - equal)

DCT scenario 4 is about declining friend’s suggestion to take a rest. The researcher found ILE and TLE commonly combined their politeness strategy to decline a request in equal strategy. The data can be seen like in the following comparison chart:

Chart 25: Politeness strategies in declining suggestion made by ILE and TLE (equal - equal)
The data showed that combination strategy became the highest frequency in both groups. In combination strategy, the percentage of ILE was higher than TLE. However, in OFF strategy, TLE was more dominant than ILE. In positive politeness both groups got the same percentage (13%), only 7% of ILE respondent used bald on record (BOR). Deep discussion can be seen in the following explanation:

1) **Positive politeness (PP)**

a) **PP13**

   Giving reason concluded in positive politenesss (PP13). The researcher found PP13 were used by the two groups. In the following examples are PP13 were made by ILE:

   No, *I really enjoy to do this* (ILE/07/4)

   PP13

   I can’t take a rest *because tomorrow I must meet with my supervisor so should revise it* (ILE/10/4)

ILE used reason to show their politeness when decline a suggestion in equal status. This way also applied by TLE in very low percentage, for example:

*I can’t rest because I have a little time to finish my thesis* (TLE/12/4)

PP13
2) **Bald on record (BOR)**

Bald on record perhaps used whenever a speaker wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than wants to satisfy the hearer’s face (Brown and Levinson: 1987). In the data, the researcher found only ILE used bald on record (BOR) to decline a suggestion, but it happened in very low frequency, for example:

*Yes, I tired too, you don’t need to command me if I tired I will take arrest!*

BOR   

(ILE/05/4)

3) **Off record (OFF)**

Based on the data, the researcher found ILE and TLE used hint (OFF1) to decline a suggestion in equal status. In the following examples was made by ILE:

*Because I have another agenda and I don’t have a lot of time*

OFF1   

(ILE/08/4)

*I think I have to finish my thesis as soon as possible*

OFF1   

(ILE/13/4)

Similar with ILE, TLE also used OFF1 to decline a suggestion, for examples:

*My project deadline is tomorrow, I must finish it to day*

OFF1   

(TLE/02/4)

*Oh, I have appointment with my friend*

OFF1   

(TLE/05/4)

*Because I have many programs to day and I must finish it sooner*

OFF1

(TLE/13/4)
4) **Combination Strategy**

a) **Intra Combination**

Intra combination means combination between two or more strategies in one type of strategy (e.g., PP4+PP13). The researcher only found ILE used intra strategy to decline a suggestion in equal status level. However, this strategy appeared in very low frequency.

(1) PP4+PP13

ILE applied combination between group identity marker (PP4) and reason (PP13) to reject a suggestion, for example:

\[
\text{No } \textit{guys}, \text{ I should finish this thesis as soon as possible.} \quad \text{(PP4)}
\]

\[
\text{Because as soon as I finish, mean as soon as I'll take a rest} \quad \text{(PP13)}
\]

To make it their refusal smoothly, ILE used group identity marker, ‘guys’, and were continued by reason (PP13)

(2) PP6+PP13

The researcher found this combination made by ILE only in low frequency, for example:

\[
\text{I hope so, but I cannot} \quad \text{(PP6)}
\]

\[
\text{because I have to finish my thesis soon} \quad \text{(PP13)}
\]

(3) PP15+PP13

In declining suggestion, only ILE used giving gift or thanks (PP15) combined with reason (PP13), for example:
I’d like to, but I can’t. I still have so many things to do
PP15 PP13 (ILE/01/4)

I can’t, I have task to do soon. Thanks for your care
PP13 PP15 (ILE/14/4)

b) Inter Combination

(1) PP15+OFF1

The two of groups commonly used combination between giving
gift or thanks (PP15) and hint (OFF1). In the following examples
was made by ILE:

Thanks for your care, but I must finish my thesis soon
PP15 OFF1 (ILE/04/4)

Oh, I can’t rest before I finish my thesis.
OFF1
Thanks for your attention
PP15 (ILE/06/4)

Similar with ILE, TLE applied PP15+OFF1 in their politeness
strategy, for examples:

Never mind, I want finish my work.
PP15 OFF1 (TLE/10/4)

Never mind, I should finish it sooner because
PP15 OFF1
it must be sent tomorrow (TLE/11/4)

Oh! Thanks for your suggests
PP15
but I think I have to finished for my thesis sooner.
OFF1 (TLE/15/4)

(2) PP6+NP6

Combination strategy between avoid disagreement (PP6) and
apology (NP6) was used by TLE in very low frequency. The
researcher found no one of ILE respondents used this combination.

In the following example is combination between PP6 and NP 6, for example:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Maybe after this, sorry} \\
\text{ PP6 \quad NP6 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

(TLE/07/4)

(3) OFF1+PP4+PP15

This combination only was done by ILE in low frequency. In the following example is combination among hint (OFF1), identity marker (PP4) and giving gift (PP15) made by ILE:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{No problem, I can do it \quad Sist.} \\
\text{ OFF1 \quad PP4 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\textit{thank you for your attention}

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ PP15 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

(ILE/03/4)

(4) OFF1+PP10+PP15

Combination among hint (OFF1), promising (PP10) and giving gift (PP15) was done by ILE, for example:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{I just work for my deadline.} \\
\text{ OFF1 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\textit{I will take a rest after finish this thesis.}

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ PP10 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\textit{Thanks for your caring}

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ PP15 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

(ILE/15/4)

In another case, ILE repeated PP15 in the beginning of utterances, for example:

\textit{Thank you, But, I think I'm good enough. I can pass it.}
I should do this thesis and I promise I will take a rest after that. Thanks for your concern.

The comparison politeness strategies between ILE and TLE to decline a suggestion in equal status can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 26: Politeness strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of equal status**

The data showed that OFF1 TLE was the highest percentage of all. It achieved 54% while ILE only got half of it (25%). In giving gift (PP15) the percentage of TLE was higher than ILE (33%). However, in giving
reason the percentage of ILE was more dominant than TLE (21%). PP6 and NP6 frequencies showed that TLE was higher than ILE. Furthermore, in other strategies such as BOR, PP4, PP5, PP10 ILE generally was higher than TLE.

b. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 5 (lower - higher)

DCT scenario 5 is about declining lecturer’s suggestion to change proposal research topic. The researcher found ILE commonly used combination strategy while TLE commonly varied their strategies. No one used BOR in DCT 5. The data can be seen such as in the following comparison chart:

**Chart 27: Politeness strategies in declining a suggestion to interlocutor of higher status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TLE</th>
<th>ILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFF 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed the percentage of combination strategy made by ILE was higher than TLE (80%). However, in other strategies such as positive politeness and off record TLE was higher than ILE. Complete explanation can be seen in the following discussion.
1) Positive politeness

a) PP1

Noticed or attend to hearer interest (PP1) was applied only by ILE in low frequency, for example:

*It is a good advice*, but I think I will not take the suggestion

\[ \text{PP1} \]  

(I/LE01/5)

Instead of declining directly, ILE produced PP1 in the beginning of utterances for attending to the hearer’s positive wants.

b) PP13

The two of groups used reason (PP13) to decline a suggestion in higher status level. In the following examples are PP13 made by ILE:

No, because I like my topic so much (ILE/02/5)

\[ \text{PP13} \]

I don’t want to changes my topic because I have no idea

\[ \text{PP13} \]  

(I/LE09/5)

Similar with ILE, TLE applied reason (PP13) to decline a suggestion in higher status, for examples:

No, I want learning about this topic and I think this topic is different another

\[ \text{PP13} \]  

(TLE/04/5)

I want to this topic and I do not want to change it, because I will edit this topic for more complete

\[ \text{PP13} \]  

(TLE/06/5)

No please, I want do this research so badly.

\[ \text{PP13} \]  

(TLE/11/5)
2) Off Record

Based on the data, the researcher found only TLE used off record strategy in declining higher status suggestion. Complete explanation can be seen in the discussion below:

a) OFF1
The researcher found, only TLE used independent hint (without adding other strategies) in declining suggestion, for example:

*If I change my topic now,*

*I don’t have an idea and I like this topic*

OFF1 (TLE/02/5)

*I inspired by this topic, I choose it because I want to learn something that I like it. If I like what I am learning, I want be creative at it*

OFF1 (TLE/03/5)

*But my data is different*

OFF1 (TLE/05/5)

Instead of producing unwillingness or inability, TLE applied OFF1 to decline a suggestion. However, the function of OFF1 has equal meaning like ‘I don’t want to change my research proposal’.

3) Combination strategy

Combination strategy consisted of two types; intra strategy and inter strategy. In DCT scenario 5, there is no respondent of both groups used intra strategy.
a) Inter Strategy

In inter strategy, the respondent possible to apply more than one combination in different type of strategy (eg. PP13+NP6+PP15).

(1) NP5+PP13

The combination between NP5 and PP13 were used only by ILE in low frequency, for example:

Oh Sir, I don’t have any idea again. I don’t want to change NP5
because I have got the data PP13

(ILE/04/5)

(2) NP6+PP13

Apology (NP6) and reason (PP13) was combined by both groups. This combination happened rarely. In the following example is NP6+PP13 made by ILE:

I’m sorry I can’t,
NP6
I have done for this presentation and prepare all night and I really want this topic PP13

(ILE/07/5)

This combination was produced by TLE, for example:

I’m sorry! I don’t know this topic was worked previous
NP6 students before PP13

(TLE/01/5)

(3) NP6+OFF1

Even though this combination not appeared frequently, but the two of groups used it to decline a suggestion. In the following example is NP6+OFF1 made by ILE:
"I'm sorry, I have no idea.

NP6       OFF1     (ILE/08/5)

This combination was applied by TLE, for examples:

Sorry, I think this topic have difference angle.
NP6
So it is not same with other
OFF1     (TLE/07/5)

I am so sorry, I really want to present about this topic.
NP6
Although it is same topic with other student but I think it's so different in material and method of presentation.
OFF1     (TLE/15/5)

(4) OFF1+PP5

This combination was used by TLE in declining suggestion, the researcher found no body of ILE used this combination.

Because I think my proposal is good and I interesting for
OFF1

this topic. If I must change, maybe on the variable
PP5     (TLE/13/5)

(5) NP5+ OFF1

This combination was used by ILE in low percentage, for example:

Sir, I think your reason to change my topic is does not
NP5
make sense maybe you can give me other options.
OFF1     (ILE/05/5)
In another case, this combination was adding by apology (NP6) in the beginning of utterances, for example:

*I am so sorry Sir,*

NP6      NP5

*this topic is very interesting for me, I have tough about it*

OFF1  (ILE/05/5)

(6) NP6+NP5+PP13

Combination strategies make the respondents possible to use three combinations in declining request or suggestion. The researcher found, there is no respondent of TLE used this combination. ILE combined apology (NP6), difference (NP5) and reason (PP13) to reject suggestion in higher status, for examples:

*I'm sorry Sir, I can’t change it*

NP6      NP5

because I’m tired and don’t have any idea  (ILE/12/5)

PP13

*I'm so sorry Sir, I can’t change it because I had finished my thesis and I think my thesis will be extremely different with the other researcher*

NP6      NP5

PP13  (ILE/14/5)

*I'm so sorry mom, I can’t try the new one.*

NP6      NP5

You may see my proposal again. My topic has different explanation  (ILE/15/5)

PP13
(7) NP6+NP5+PP5

ILE combined apology (NP6), difference (NP5) and reason (PP13) to decline a suggestion in higher social status, for example:

*I'm sorry* Mr.
NP6       NP5
*I have a lot of theory from this topic, so I want to finish this thesis, may I?*
PP5

*I'm sorry* Sir, I can’t change the topic
NP6       NP5
*but I will put something different on my thesis proposal*
PP5

(8) PP15+NP5+OFF1

The researcher found, there is no respondent of TLE used this combination. This combination used by ILE in low frequency, for example:

*Thank you sir, about your suggestion but,*
PP15       NP5
*I think this is the best topic*
OFF1

(9) NP6+NP5+PP13+OFF1

Inter combination gives opportunities to the respondent to combine more than three type strategies. TLE combined apology (NP6), difference (NP5), reason (PP13) and hint (OFF1) to decline a suggestion in higher social status, for example:

*I am so sorry* Sir.
NP6       NP5
*I don’t know this topic was worked with other students.*
The comparison politeness strategies between ILE and TLE to decline a suggestion in higher status can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 28: Politeness strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of higher status**

The data showed that TLE OFF1 was the most dominant in DCT 5. This is too high if compared with ILE which only got 11%. In PP13, the frequency of TLE was higher than ILE (29%). ILE was dominant in NP5 which achieved 29% while TLE only got poor percentage (5%). Although, TLE got many respondents who used NP6, but the percentage of NP6 ILE
was higher than TLE (26%). In general, both groups used no more than 5% in other strategies such as PP1, PP5 and PP15.

c. The similarities and the differences of politeness strategies in DCT 6 (higher - lower)

DCT scenario 6 is about declining junior’s suggestion to put the document on the lecturer desk. The researcher found ILE and TLE commonly used positive politeness to decline a suggestion. The data can be seen such as in the following comparison chart:

**Chart 29: Politeness strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of lower status**

The data presented TLE off record strategy was more dominant than ILE (53%). On the other hand, ILE positive politeness (PP), negative politeness (NP) and combination was higher than TLE.
1) **Positive politeness**

a) PP13

The researcher found all independent positive politeness strategy in both groups are reason (PP13). The percentage of PP13 increased and became dominant in both groups (see on table 36). In the following examples are PP13 made by ILE:

I don’t want to do it. (Because) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{I want to meet the supervisor directly} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(ILE/01/6)}
\end{align*}
\]

No, because I want to wait my supervisor

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(ILE/02/6)}
\end{align*}
\]

I Can’t to do it because I want to talk something with him, and I also afraid if my documents are lost

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(ILE/14/6)}
\end{align*}
\]

Similar with ILE, TLE also used PP13 to decline a suggestion, for examples:

No, because this document is very important

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(TLE/01/6)}
\end{align*}
\]

I cannot put this document on on his desk. I am afraid to lost it

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(TLE/01/6)}
\end{align*}
\]

No, I must give to the lecturer because I want to meet him and I am afraid my assignment will lost if I put on the desk.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP13} \\
\text{PP13} & \quad \text{(TLE/11/6)}
\end{align*}
\]
2) Negative Politeness

Negative politeness strategies only were used by ILE to decline a suggestion. ILE use apologize (NP6) and it produced in very low frequency (7%), for example:

Sorry, I can’t leave my research paper on his desk (ILE/10/6)

NP6

3) Off Record

In declining a suggestion ILE and TLE used off record strategy. Commonly they applied hint (OFF1) to decline a suggestion. In the following examples are OFF1 made by ILE:

Because I don’t believe, it will be seen by the supervisor
OFF1 (ILE/12/6)

I need to meet my supervisor first then give a little explanation about my documents
OFF1 (ILE/15/6)

Like ILE, TLE also applied OFF1 to decline a suggestion in lower status, for examples:

Because if I do, my supervisor will think that I am careless or being disrespect to him, so I prefer to wait him
OFF1 (TLE/03/6)

Because I’m afraid, it will lost
OFF1 (TLE/05/6)

Because I want to meet supervisor’s I have some questions to him
OFF1 (TLE/13/6)
4) **Combination Strategy**

a) Inter strategy

(1) **PP1+OFF1**

The combination between notice/attend to hearer (PP1) and hint (OFF1) was done by ILE in low frequency, for example:

\[
I \text{think that} \text{is good idea, but I must wait him because I have waited 2 hours, so I have wait him till the end.}
\]

\[PP1\quad \text{(ILE/05/6)}\]

\[OFF1\]

The researcher found, there is no TLE respondent used this combination.

(2) **NP6+PP13**

This combination was used in very low frequency. Such as in the following example made by ILE:

\[
I'm \text{ sorry} I \text{can’t put this research paper on his desk because it is very important, I worry I will lost it.}
\]

\[NP6\quad \text{(ILE/06/6)}\]

\[PP13\]

Similar with ILE, TLE used it to decline a suggestion for example:

\[
\text{Sorry, I don’t think so, I will give it directly}
\]

\[NP6\quad \text{(TLE/04/6)}\]

\[PP13\]

(3) **PP15+OFF1**

This combination was done by ILE in low frequency, for example:

\[
\text{Thanks for your suggestion, I think I should wait the supervisor until he arrive here}
\]

\[PP15\quad \text{(ILE/11/6)}\]

\[OFF1\]
The researcher found, there is no TLE respondent used this combination.

(4) PP15+OFF1+PP15+PP4

Inter combination gives opportunity to the speaker/respondent to combine more than 3 strategies in one combination. The researcher found combination among PP15+OFF1+PP15+PP4 was used by ILE, for example:

**Oh, thank you.** But, I can wait again for my supervisor, **OFF1**

**no problem and it’s okay. Thank you sist**

**PP15** **PP4**

The comparison politeness strategies between ILE and TLE to decline a suggestion in lower status can be seen in the following chart:

**Chart 30: Politeness strategies in declining suggestion to interlocutor of lower status**

![DCT6- Politeness strategy in declining suggestion (higher - lower)]
The data presented OFF1 in TLE was the highest percentage of politeness strategy in DCT 6 (50%). It was higher than ILE did which achieved 29%. The deference percentage between ILE and TLE in PP13 was 0.2%, which TLE more dominant than ILE (44%). In other strategies with percentage no more than 10% such as NP6, PP15, PP4 and PP1, ILE was higher than TLE.

B. Discussion

Refusal to request and suggestion in equal status

The present study found that TLE tended to be direct than ILE in declining request to equal status. Although, they tended to be direct in declining friends’ request but in fact they avoided “no” and tended to use ‘inability’. Inability were chosen because the respondent of TLE did not want to be direct, but they also hope that the interlocutor can catch their refusal clearly. Moreover, by using inability the speaker wants to put an image that they were unable to accept a request because it was not their wants. They aware by using ‘no’ can threat interlocutor positive face and may hurt interlocutors feeling.

Surprisingly, to decline a suggestion TLE tended to be indirect. TLE tended to hide their disagreements with silence and produced indirect strategies. They carefully kept interlocutors feeling and avoid clash, so even though they disagree they hardly used direct ‘no’. This founding is in line with Leech’s (1997) about Tact maxim, ‘Minimize cost to the speaker and maximize benefit to the hearer’. It became reasonable when TLE tended to be
direct in declining a request but indirect in declining a suggestion. It is because when interlocutor gives suggestion, the respondent will gets benefit but when interlocutor produced a request the benefit becomes to the interlocutors. That is why, the respondent of TLE tended to be more direct in declining a request but more indirect in declining a suggestions.

In declining a request ILE was more indirect than TLE. The percentage of direct strategy in declining request to equal status of ILE decreased if compared with other scenarios. It was quite different with previous studies in which ILE tended to be direct when they refused a request to equal status (Amarien: 2008). Based on follow up interview, ILE believed that they need friend’s help in the future. They were afraid if they hurt their friend’s feeling, their relationship become worse. So that, they hardly to say ‘no’. Hence, the respondent of ILE tended to be more indirect in declining a request because they are afraid to get bad stereotype.

In declining a suggestion ILE was more direct than TLE. ILE tended to use unwillingness and direct no while TLE tended to use excuse. Based on follow up interview, there was no intention from ILE to insult interlocutor feeling. ILE tended to use direct strategy because they did not have any responsibility or obligation to their friends so the speaker becoming free and independence. Then, they felt secured and do whatever they wanted to and they even wanted to use their right to say ‘no’ (Haipoglu: 2010). This result is in line with Suseno (1997), he stated that the speaker will feel secure to express their feeling to their friend.
On the other hand, TLE tended to be indirect by using excuse or dissuasion to decline a suggestion. TLE tended to be indirect because they believed when someone gives a suggestion especially come from their friends it is for their own goodness. This result is in line with Tact maxim of Leech (1997) that suggestion included in maximizing benefit to the hearer’. So that is why, to avoid impoliteness, TLE tended to be indirect when decline a suggestion. Moreover, TLE gave more specific information such as give the date and how the importance their assignment (DCT 4) such as because my project deadline is tomorrow, I must finish my project to day (TLE/02/4). In some data, TLE produced gratitude to the interlocutor for example, Thank you I’m not tired I’m fine (TLE/04/4).

In refusal strategies to request and suggestion in equal status, the researcher found that not all strategies purposed by Beebe, et al (1990) were used by both of groups. ILE used inability, unwillingness, acceptance as refusal, alternative, excuse, and principle to decline a request while TLE only used inability, no, unwillingness and excuse. In declining suggestion to equal status ILE tended to use no, unwillingness, acceptance as refusal, alternative, dissuasion, and excuse, while TLE tended to use unwillingness, acceptance as refusal, dissuasion, and statement of philosophy.

Refusal to request and suggestion in lower status

In declining request and suggestion to lower status, ILE tended to be direct while TLE tended to be indirect. The researcher found ILE tended to use ‘inability’ instead of ‘no’ in declining request. The reasons why they
employed ‘inability’ were because they do not want to be direct, but on the other side they want their refusal can be seen by interlocutor. By using ‘inability’ their intention to reject interlocutor wants is clearly understood.

In declining suggestion, ILE tended to use direct ‘no’. The researcher realized mostly the respondent of ILE are Javanese. Correlated with Javanese social hierarchy, older people are most assertive and direct employed language to younger people. People who have higher status level will fell their authority were threatened when the lower status gives suggestion to them. So that is why, they tended to use ‘no’ rather than other strategies.

Interestingly, excuse made by TLE became shorter and unspecific in declining request to lower status. But, they added apology before giving excuse. Based on the follow up interview, the respondents of TLE did not want to be indirect. However they were aware, by using direct refusal could hurt the interlocutor’s feeling. Finally, they tended to be indirect but they employed short and unspecific excuses to strengthen their refusals. To compensate to their refusals they added apology.

In declining suggestion to the lower status, TLE tended to give specific excuses. Surprisingly, the respondents of TLE mostly did not employ gratitude such as when declining suggestions to equal status or apology when declining suggestion to higher status. They used excuses without adding ‘gratitude’ or ‘apology’ that could be that they needed a sense of direct in their excuses even though their strategy was indirect. This may be the reason that they did not use gratitude. Based on follow up interview, For example,
because if I do, my supervisor will think that I am careless or being disrespect to him, so I prefer to wait him (TLE/03/6).

The researcher found not all strategies purposed by Beebe, et al (1990) were used by both of groups. ILE used inability, no, acceptance as refusal, alternative and excuse to decline a request while TLE tended to use inability, alternative and excuse. In declining suggestion, TLE only used three strategies namely; no, unwillingness, and excuse while ILE tended to use no, inability, unwillingness, acceptance as refusal and excuse to reject a suggestion in lower status.

Refusal to request and suggestion in higher status

In declining request and suggestion to higher status ILE tended to be direct while TLE tended to be indirect. ILE tended to use inability when declining a request and tended to use unwillingness when declining a suggestion. The use of inability and unwillingness by ILE assumed that ILE did not want to be direct but they needed something that could be seen by interlocutor clearly, that the respondent could not accept or fulfill interlocutor’s wants. This fact showed that ILE were aware with face threatening act, that the use of direct ‘no’ may cause impoliteness and hurt interlocutor’s feeling. On the other hand, TLE tended to be indirect by employing ‘excuse’. If comparing with other scenarios this ‘excuse’ was the most specific and longest. Interestingly, they also tended to add apology before their ‘excuse’. Based on the follow up interview, TLE were worried
when the interlocutor got misunderstanding so that they tended to give specific explanation.

The researcher found, not all refusal strategies purposed by Beebe et al (1990) are used by both of groups. There are only two strategies used by TLE in declining a request those are inability and excuse while ILE tended to use inability, acceptance as refusal and excuse. In declining suggestion ILE tended to use unwillingness, no, acceptance as refusal, alternative, avoidance, and excuse while TLE tended to use no, unwillingness, dissuasion, and excuse.

**Politeness Strategy**

Not all politeness strategy purposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) were used by both of group. The researcher found six strategies of positive politeness commonly used by ILE, including notice, group identity marker, seek agreement, avoid disagreement, reason and giving gift. While TLE dominantly tended to use reasons and giving gift. In negative politeness strategies, both groups tended to use deference and apology. The researcher also found fifteen from off record strategy only one strategy commonly used by both of group, hint. Surprisingly, bald on record almost did not exist in all DCT scenarios. Based on follow up interview, both of groups were aware to another person’s face need. They avoided using bald on record because they knew that bald on record may threat interlocutor face and being impolite.
All in all the data showed that, ILE were more polite than TLE. Most of ILE tended to be polite to the interlocutor as the higher, equal, even to the lower status. It occurred because of ILE respondent mostly are Javanese. In Javanese culture they have a speaking role named ‘Sopan Santun’. Since interpersonal communication was regulated based on sociopolitical and economic power, it brings different speaking role in each status. This role trained them to speak properly and politely based on the social power.

There are three styles in Javanese language used as a means to legitimate social hierarchy, *Krama* (language role to the higher status), *Madya* (language role to the middle level), *Ngoko* (language role to lower status) (Foley, 1997; Geerts, 1961; Koentjaraningrat, 1985 cited in Wijayanto, 2011). *Krama* is applied to the higher level as to show respect and honor. So in higher status, the participant of ILE used more complicated politeness strategy such as combination among apology, deference, and reason.

*Madya* is commonly used to show mutual deference and it is addressed to stranger or unfamiliar interlocutor. While *ngoko* is mostly used to lower status, but sometimes it is used to show familiarity. So in equal and lower status, the respondent of ILE used politeness strategy but more simple than it in higher status. Thus, selecting proper language is very important in Javanese communication.
TLE produced politeness strategy less than ILE did. This might be that TLE tended to use indirect refusal to the interlocutor as the higher, equal, lower status. In their perception, indirect refusal represented politeness strategy. So the respondent of TLE tended to give direct explanation without tied apology, for example because I am afraid it will lost (TLE/05/6) while ILE tended to say I'm sorry I can't put this research paper on his desk because it is very important, I worry I will lost it (ILE/06/6). Even though in declining a request to lower status TLE added apology, the degree of politeness still less than ILE, for example Sorry, I have deleted (TLE/05/2) while ILE tended to say I'm sorry, I can't give you because my laptop have broken and my entire files has lost (ILE/04/2)

Meanwhile, based on 180 refusal utterances made by ILE and TLE, the researcher found 69% used politeness strategies in combination. Combination strategy means the respondents used more than one strategy in their utterances. In declining request and suggestion to their lecturer (DCT 3,5), 90% of ILE participant used combination strategy. For example, ILE produced negative politeness, ‘apology’ and ‘give deference’ in the beginning their utterances. Then, after produced refusal, ILE used positive politeness ‘reason’. Based on the follow up interview, they used combination strategy to give honor and to compensate their refusal. They tended to add ‘reason’ after direct refusal because they do not want the interlocutor misunderstanding with their refusal.
In declining request to lower status (DCT 2), 60% of the respondent of ILE used combination strategy. Commonly, they combined negative politeness and off-record strategy. By contrast, only 26% used combination in declining suggestion to lower status (DCT6). They used positive politeness and off-record strategy.

The use of combination in equal status by ILE in declining request (DCT 1) got 86%, while 66% in declining a suggestion (DCT4). In refusal to request, they commonly used negative politeness and off-record. On the other hand, in declining suggestion they tended to use ‘giving gift’ and ‘reason’.

This result had similarity, in declining request to their lecturer (DCT 3) 100% or all of TLE used combination politeness strategy. However, their combinations are simpler than ILE. TLE commonly combined ‘apology’ and ‘hint’. By contrast, in declining suggestion to their lecturer (DCT 5), 77% used non-combination strategy. They only used off-record strategy or one positive politeness.

In DCT 1 (refusal to request in equal status), the respondent of TLE 93% used combination strategy, while 66% used combination politeness strategy in declining to suggestion in equal status (DCT 4). In equal status, commonly they combine negative politeness and positive politeness. In DCT 2 (refusal to request in lower status), 93% TLE used combination politeness strategy. They commonly combined ‘apology’ and ‘hint’. By contrast, only 26% of TLE used combination strategy in DCT 6 (refusal to suggestion in
lower status). Mostly, TLE used independent off record. The fact that the respondent of both groups combine politeness strategies, explicitly can be said that politeness strategy cannot be separated with other politeness strategies. This result is quite different with Brown and Levinson theory (1987) that politeness strategies stand independently.

As compared to the result of previous study, the writer found different result. Such as the research conducted by Maros, Shboul and Yasin (2014) who examined refusal strategies between Jordanian EFL and Malaysia ESL. They found that dominantly both of group used indirect refusal. While in the present study ILE tended to use direct refusal and TLE tended to use indirect refusal. In Jordanian EFL there are denying vocabulary in declining higher status, while in the present study the researcher did not found denying vocabulary in all DCT. Malaysia ESL used direct refusals style in higher and equal status while in the present study ILE used direct refusal almost in all social level.

Narges (2013) conducted refusal made by Iranian ESL learners and native English. The result showed there was no significant difference at the 95% confidence level between native Persian and native English speaker in the type of illocutionary act in their production of refusals in any of the items. In the present study, ILE and TLE have greatly differentiation in declining request and suggestion.
Saragard and Javanmardi (2011) investigated the similarities and differences of the speech act of refusal in English made by Iranian EFL at different levels of education. They found that there is no differentiate between refusal strategy made by BA students and MA students. By contrast, the present study did.

Umale (2008) studied refusal strategies used by British and Omani interlocutors. Both the British and the Omanis used indirect strategies to refuse request, especially when dealing with higher status people. While in the present study, ILE tended to be direct in declining request to higher status.

Yang (2008) studied refusal strategies by five China TV series. He found new strategies which do not appear in the classification by Takashi, Beebe and Uliss-Weltz (1999). There are address form and ritual politeness statements. He also found Chinese used denying vocabulary in indirect refusal strategy. In the present study, the researcher did not find denying vocabulary in all DCT scenarios. Furthermore, all refusal strategies in the present data are found in Beebe et. al theory (1999).

Amarien (2008) investigated refusal by Indonesian speakers speaking English (ISSE), Indonesian speaker speaking Indonesia (ISSI), American speaker speaking English (ASSE). The result of the study showed Refusal to request ISSE use direct refusal. While in the present study, ILE tended to be indirect in declining request to equal status.