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MOTTO

Dream, then God will embrace those dreams

[Ilmiani]

The way to conquer the world is trying,
But the way to conquer the universe is praying.

[Ilmiani]

Then which of the blessings of your Lord will you both deny?

[QS. Ar-Rahman 55:13]
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ABSTRACT

This study investigates refusal strategies in English by Indonesian EFL learner (ILE) and Thailand EFL learner (TLE). The aims of this study are (1) to analyze the differences and the similarities between refusal strategies made by both groups, (2) to analyze whether the two groups used similar or difference refusal strategies in social level, (3) and to analyze whether the two groups of speaker use the same or different politeness strategies in their refusals. The subjects of the research are 15 Indonesian EFL students and 15 Thailand EFL students who study at UMS. Refusal strategies to request and suggestion made by the two of groups became the object of this research. The type of this research is descriptive qualitative research. The data for this study were elicited from the students through the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) which consisted of six situations with different status level. The data were analyzed by Beebe et al (1990) refusal strategy and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategy. The finding of the study showed that ILE tended to be direct in declining requests and suggestions for examples they commonly used inability, unwillingness and direct ‘no’ while TLE tended to employ ‘excuse’ almost in all DCT scenarios. It is also found that most of group participants used combination strategies of politeness in their groups.

Key words: interlanguage pragmatic, refusal strategies, politeness strategies
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ABSTRAK


Kata kunci: pragmatik antar bahasa, strategi penolakan, strategi kesantunan