

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

A linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction. In order to make sense of what is said in an interaction, between the speaker and the hearer should be aware of social distance and closeness factors (Yule, 1996). Social distance tied to such things as age and power, closeness factors involve the relative status of the participant. The degrees of friendliness (internal factors) are typically more relevant to participants whose social relationships are actually in the process of being worked out within the interaction (Yule, 1996). On the other hand, relative status of participant is different, the gap between lower, equal and higher may appear, influence the way they speak. For example: Speakers who see themselves as lower status in English speaking context tend to mark social distance between themselves and higher status speakers by using address form that include a title a last name, but not for the first name such as Dr. Dang, Mrs Clinton, ect. (Yule, 1996).

Beebe *et al* (1990) explains that there are two refusal strategies namely direct and indirect. In the following example, a student uses indirect refusal strategy, utterances to perform refusals and adjuncts to refusal; remark by his selves do not express refusals but they go with semantic formulae to provide particular effect to the given refusal. This is the example of indirect refusal made by Indonesian EFL learner.

Example 1: at 10 a.m the students want to process free letter administration in PESMA. For processing the letter, the staff asks the students for waiting a moment. On the other hand, the student has a class at 10.20

Staff: Have a sit, wait 10 – 15 minutes for processing.

Student: I'm sorry sir, could I left it firs? Because I still have class at 10.20.

After I finish my class as soon as possible I will come here.

Staff: Ok then.

On the example 1, the students used apology / regret in her semantic formula (say *I'm sorry sir*). After that, the students continued by giving excuse and explanation for not complying. The word 'sir' in example 1 showed difference social level between them.

Example 2: The librarian ask Thailand student to pray Ashar. She told them that they can go back to the library after Ashar praying.

Librarian	: Brother, it's time to pray Ashar. The library will close for awhile.
Student	: (Silent)
Librarian	: Brother, the library will close.
Student	: <u>Yes Miss (continue typing)</u>
Librarian	: Brother.....Common. Pray first.
Student	: <u>Yes Miss, after this paragraph.</u>
Librarian	: excuseme....brother time is over.

Based on the example 2, the student at the beginning kept silent and showed a lack of enthusiasm to the staff request. After that, he delayed by saying "Yes Miss" but he continued his typing and negotiates, "after this paragraph". Rubin (1983) explains that the non-accept responses are usually used by interlocutors who do not concur to the initiating act, which may result in further discussion

or negotiation. The example below was refusal strategies made by a staff when she refused her Thailand EFL students:

Example 3: In international Islamic boarding school, at 10pm the staff asks students to go back in their room and leave the hall. On the other side, the students need additional time for finishing their assignment.

Staff	: Sister, time is over. Leave the hall and back to your room.
Student	: Miss, may I stay here for around 20 minutes more? I almost finish my assignment.
Staff	: <u>Umm..I am not sure you can, dear.</u>
Student	: please Miss...
Staff	: <u>I know you are need it but that's the rule.</u>

On the example 3, the staff used indirect refusal. '*Umm..I am not sure you can dear*'. Based on Beebe et al. (1990) the staff used avoidance with adjunct filler '*umm*', and continued by using indirect refusal '*I am not sure you can dear*'. In the last, the staff also used empathy '*I know you are need it*' and indicated reluctant '*but that's the rule*'. In the following example, Indonesian EFL learner used positive agreement to refuse a staff invitation to join an English club.

Example 4: The staff ask student to join in English Club at 1pm, unfortunately, at the same time the student have a class.

Staff	: <u>luv</u> , join in English club yuk..
Student	: when <u>Miss</u> ?
Staff	: today, at 1 pm.
Student	: <u>I want Miss, but I have a class in campus 1.</u>

Brown and Levinson (1996) explain that power usually tied up with age and job can influence the way speaker's say. On the example 4, the staff used

group identity marker (positive politeness), 'luv'. The student gave deference by using word 'Miss'. In the end of the conversation, the student used adjunct positive agreement, 'I want Miss, but..'. In declining request to the staff (higher level), the student used deference as politeness strategy. He applied adjunct positive agreement as the main refusal strategy instead of using inability or unwillingness.

The same problem raise when producing and/or interpreting refusals. Rather than directly saying 'no', people might prefer to use indirect conventions to reject. The reason not only to show how those people is polite but also to keep their face, their feeling and as an honor for people who was invite / suggest them. The fact that face need may changes from one place to the other, pragmatic failures in realizing refusals may lead to the stereotypes and labeling of groups/ nations/ cultures (Austin, 1962). On the one hand, they want to be a part of a society, to be accepted and apricieted by the other members of the society. They also want to be on their own and to do whatever they want to and they even want to use their right to say 'no', (Hatipoğlu, 2010) when they hear something that is not suitable with their principle or their mood but they think about the consequences. Because as a part of society they should preserve their face and avoid clash so that the interaction and relationship among them in society can be saved.

Refusal strategies have been conducted by many researchers (e.g Shboul, 2015; Shboul et al., 2014; Narges, 2013; Sahragrad and Javanmardi, 2011; Sahin, 2011; Wijayanto, 2011; Umale, 2008; Yang, 2008; Amarien, 2008;

Yamagasira, 2001). However, they commonly compared English as native language and English as foreign language. The comparison between EFL learner in difference country is rarely done. For this reason the present study intents to explore this area by comparing refusal strategies in English between Indonesian EFL students and Thailand EFL students.

B. Problem Statement

Based on the background and limitation of the study, the researcher decides three problem statement, those are:

1. What are the differences and similarities of refusal strategies made by Indonesian EFL students and Thailand EFL students?
2. How do both group use refusal strategies according to differences in social level?
3. How do both group use politeness strategies in their refusals?

C. Objective of the Study

Based on the problem statement, the researcher formulates four objectives of the studies as below:

1. To analyze the differences between refusal strategies made by Indonesian EFL students and Thailand EFL students.
2. To analyze the similarities between refusal strategies made by Indonesian EFL students and Thailand EFL students.
3. To analyze whether the two groups used similar or difference refusal strategies in social level.

4. To analyze whether the two groups of speaker use the same or different politeness strategies in their refusals

D. Limitation of the Study

In this study the researcher limits the discussion on the refusal strategies in English produced by Indonesian EFL students and Thailand EFL students who study at UMS. The researcher limits 15 participants of Indonesian EFL students and 15 Thailand EFL students. The prom of this study is just focused on refusal strategy in suggestion and request.

E. The benefit of the Study

This research has two benefits of the study. Firts is theoritical benefit and second is practical benefit. For theoritical benefit, this research will be benefit in the literature for study English and as the reference theory.

On the other hand, practical benefit from this research has three benefits of the study. First, this research can help EFL students to know the expression of refusal that is match with the context. And also, this research can give inspiration and role mode when they want to refuse some invitation politely. Second for teacher, it will be useful for teacher to make good strategies in teaching learning process and how to introduce pragmatic competence to their student. Third for other researcher, other researcher gets al lot of benefit from this research, this research can help them to find the theory, previous study and also this research finding can be improve in their research.

F. Research Paper Organization

The outline of the research paper is arranged systematically. This research paper organization consists of five chapters and it is divided into further divisions. The research paper arranged as follows:

Chapter I is introduction. It consists of the background of the study, limitation of the study, problem statement, objective of the study and benefit of the study.

Chapter II is underlying theory. It deals with previous study, theoretical review consist of pragmatic competence, interlanguage pragmatic, speech act, speech act of refusal, request, suggestion and politeness.

Chapter III is research method. In this chapter, the researcher presents type of research, object of research, subject of research, data and data source, technique of collecting data, and technique of analyzing data.

Chapter IV is research finding and discussion. The research finding will be elaborated into four main part. They are the differences between refusal strategy, the similarities between refusal strategies between Indonesian EFL learner and Thailand EFL learner, the difference refusal strategy based on social level, and politeness that the two groups of speaker use.

Chapter V is conclusion, pedagogical implication and suggestion.