CHAPTER II

LITERARY REVIEW

This chapter comprises three aspects: previous study, theoretical review and theoretical framework.

A. Previous Study


1. Yamagashira (2001)

Yamagashira (2001) committed refusal strategies by Japanese ESL, Japanese who study in America and American. The aim of this study is to examine whether the time spent in the State affect explicit instruction on pragmatic knowledge of the Japanese speaker. The data were taken from 9 Japanese between 20-30 years who study in America, 8 American graduate students at West Chester University. For collecting data she used DCT and Beebe, et al theory for analyzing the data. She purposed four research questions, (1) is there pragmatic transfer when Japanese speakers make refusals in English? (2) Does Japanese speakers’ refusal is different from those of native English speaker? (3) Does the time spent in US affect pragmatic transfer or not? (4) Does explicit instruction on pragmatic
knowledge affect their behavior?. The result of the study showed that pragmatic transfer from Japanese occurred, especially in a request situation with higher status. JJs and JEs used positive opinion and pause filler. Many AEs started with regret more than positive opinion. In prompt invitation AEs never used nonverbal avoidance. In prompt suggestion JJs used nonverbal avoidance such as “so”, whereas one AE used “tanks anyway”. Second result presented that the highest proficiency male and female subjects were both aware of the differences in appropriate American and Japanese refusal behaviors. The lowest proficiency subject was more influenced by her L1 refusal style. Yamagashira (2001) concluded spent duration in US could cause them to respond more like AEs.


Amarien (2008) investigated refusal by Indonesian speakers speaking English. The aim of the study is to investigate strategies Indonesian Speaker Speaking English (ISSE) use in refusal of offering and requesting initiation acts (IAs). The data were taken from 30 DCT undertaken by five males and females in the following groups: Indonesian speaker speaking Indonesian (ISSI) with the range of ages was 20-24, Indonesian speaker speaking English (ISSE) around 20 – 24 years old and Australian Speakers Speaking English (ASSE) with the range of ages was 20 - 34. All participants had been living in Australia one year minimum.
The result of the study showed that Indonesians are more tend to express their refusals in relatively indirect manner in order to avoid offending the interlocutor. ISSI used adjunct and reason most often, adjunct of gratitude (50%; 31.82% by female and 18.18% by males) in their refusal in offering IAs. Direct refusals in offering were preferred by ASSE (15%) than ISSE (11.69) and ISSI (2.7). Indirect refusal used regret ISSI stand in first grade (41.89%) after that ISSE (37.6), ASSE (38.25%). There are ASSE (25%), ISSE (31.17), ISSI (17.57%) used reason for their indirect speech. Refusal to request ISSE use direct refusal (29.41%), ISSI prefer to use adjunct (36.25%), ASSE (32.94). The total numbers of regret were conducted by ISSI (35%), ISSE (23.54%) and ASSE (28.84%). Amarien (2008) explained that direct refusal who used by ISSE in refusing request was not intended to cause misunderstanding or give offence because adjunct was selected as the next preferred strategy, followed by reason-which were selected in similar portion. In their indirect refusal to offers, male ISSE preferred a short expression to dissuade interlocutors. In contrast, female preferred to use more elaborate explanations to excuse their refusals. The more familiar the speaker and the interlocutors are the more direct in the refusal utterances.


Yang (2008) conducted refusal strategies by five China TV series. The research aim is to examine the refusal strategies and corresponding linguistic forms that can be employed to react to various refusal situations.
in Chinese culture. Yang collected the data from five television series were produced after 1900s which represent modern standard Chinese, she found 160 video clips that contain refusal to request, offer, invitation and suggestion. This research can be benefit for the teacher to provide a rationale to select, organize and present example of refusals in classroom instruction. For learners of Chinese, this study can guide them on differentiating various refusal situations. There are two research questions; (1) what kinds of refusal strategies are used by Chinese native speaker? (2) When, where and to whom are these strategies used?. The study found that, twelve term of Chinese different communicative function. Based on the data 12 subcategories were identified (solicited suggestion, unsolicited suggestion, request for favor, request for permission/acceptance/ agreement, request for information/ advice, request for action, ritual invitation, real invitation, offer of gift/ favor, offer of drink /food, and offer of opportunities) and four adjuncts were identified in the data. Address forms and ritual politeness statement do not appear in the classification by Takashi, Beebe and Uliss-Weltz (1999). In direct refusal, Chinese used denying vocabulary and showing inability. On the other hand, regret, excuse/ reason, statement of alternative, set condition for future, promise of future acceptance, statement of principle, statement of philosophy, attempt to dissuade interlocutor, acceptance that function as a refusal, and avoidance still exist in the term of indirect refusals.

Umale (2008) committed refusal strategies used by British and Omani interlocutors. The aims of this study are to identify and compare refusal strategies made by British and Omani. Umale (2008) used 10 British people and 10 Omanis, also the DCTs was modeled on Beebe et.al (1990). The British were qualified and ranged in age from thirty-five to sixty, five female and five male. All of them were working in Oman. On the other hand, there were nine Omani Arab males and one female the ages of twenty-five to forty five. All were graduate and working in school or colleges. The situations were categorized into three request, three invitation, three suggestion and three offers. Umale (2008) divided his research into three level class namely refusal to an equal status person, a higher status person and a lower status person. Each category resulted in 120 refusals. These refusals were divided into strategies, using a modified version of the coding category developed by Beebe et.al (1990).

The study found that the Omanis used more direct strategies (31 times) than the British (28 times) in refusing request and offer. Both the British and the Omanis also used indirect strategies to refuse request, especially when dealing with higher status people. The British used regret for their indirect refusal especially in request (15 times) and invitation (14 times). On the other hand, Omanis used consideration of interlocutor’s feeling to refuse invitation, suggestion, request and offer (47 times) where the highest number hands by invitation with 19 utterances. The British
used more direct strategies when dealing with lower status people (13 times) while the Omanis used care for interlocutor’s feeling (6 times).

5. **Wannaruk (2008)**

Wannaruk (2008) committed refusal strategies used by American English, Thai EFL, Thai native speaker. The aim of the study has two fold. Those are to investigate the similarities and differences refusals in American English and Thai EFL, to examines whether or not pragmatic transfer from Thai to English is evidents in the English spoken by Thai EFL learner. The data are collected from three different groups using a Discourse Completion Test (DCT), DCT scenarios included refusals to request, refusal to suggestion, refusal to invitation, and refusal to offer. Wannaruk used 40 American (NEs) and 40 Thai native speaker and 40 Thai EFL learner. The subjects are qualified from 22-40 years old and 20 male 20 female for each groups. Thai EFL were categorized in intermediate level.

The result of the study showed that overall all three groups share most of the refusal strategies and that pragmatic transfer exists in the choice and content of refusal strategies. The characteristics of being modest in L1 culture and awareness of a person of a higher status motivate pragmatic transfer. Language proficiency is also an important factor in pragmatic transfer. The main result also found that EFL learner with lower English competence translate their mother tongue (L1) to second language (L2) because of their lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge.
6. **Sahin (2011)**

Sahin (2011) committed refusal strategies used by American English (AE), Turkish (TUR) and Turkish Learner English with advance level (TRE). The goal of the study is to uncover the refusal strategies of young AE, TUR and TRE in conversations between equals and also to uncover if the learners display pragmatic transfer in their refusal strategies. The data are collected from three different groups using a Discourse Completion Test (DCT), which is developed out of the situations in a TV Serial. The analysis of data is done manually and each refusal is coded. The results of the study show that refusals and rapport management orientations while refusing status equal interlocutors are culture and situation specific and they differ both cross-culturally and intra-culturally. Research findings also reveal that TRE often produce pragmatically appropriate refusals because they use correspond to those of AE.

7. **Saragard and Javanmardi (2011)**

Saragard and Javanmardi (2011) investigated the similarities and differences of the speech act of refusal in English made by Iranian EFL. The aim of the study is to examine the strategies used by students at different levels of education at the universities and dependent on gender. Three research question were exist, (1) the strategies used by Iranian EFL learner regarding the speech act of refusal, (2) the strategy used by Iranian EFL learner dependent on gender, (3) does the level of education have any effected on the strategies used by Iranian EFL learner.
They were 48 students randomly selected as participant which are consist of 28 BA students majoring in English literature and 20 MA students majoring in TEFL. DCT was used for collecting data, 12 situations related to the speech act of refusal to request, invitation, offer and suggestion. The allocated time to answer was thirty minutes. The data were analyzed by using taxonomy of refusal strategy by Bee et al (1990). The results show that most of the participants tended to use excuses, explanations, or reasons following or preceding a statement of regret. However, the mostly common strategy used by Iranian learners was the use of the expression of regret followed by an excuse or reason. Regarding offers, many used gratitude to refuse an offer along with an excuse or a reason as well. Concerning requests, learners used an excuse or an explanation in order to refuse a request which were usually followed by a sense of regret. Second results, the researcher cannot draw any definite conclusion regarding gender because the participant was not large and the number of participant is unbalance also the researcher could not find a clear cut boundary between the two groups regarding the strategies they used because both of group is advance learner, in short word there is no differentiate between BA students and MA students pragmatic competence.
8. Wijayanto (2011)

Wijayanto (2011) investigated the similarities and differences between refusal strategies conducted by British native speakers of English (NSE) and Javanese learners of English (JLE). The data were elicited, using discourse completion tasks (DCT), from 20 NSE and 50 JLE. Comparative data concerning refusal strategies in Javanese were elicited from 35 native speakers of Javanese (NJ) to provide a baseline for investigating the extent to which differences between JLE and NSE could be explained by the influence of L1 pragmatics. Wijayanto (2011) used Beebe et al (1990) theory to classify refusal strategies and the data were analyzed into sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic strategies. He provided three research questions. First, what are the similarities and differences in the semantic formulae and adjuncts used by JLE and NSE for making refusal?. What are the similarities in the pragmalinguistic strategies used by JLE and NSE for making refusal?. What extent can the differences be attributed to L1 transfer?.

The main finding of his research is that JLE and NSE tended to use different sequential order, although they also used similar ones. JLE commonly used apology/ regret to decline an invitation to a collocutor of all status level, while NSE commonly used apology/ regret to decline an invitation to those unequal status. To decline a suggestion, JLE used very different sequential order as compared wit NSE. As the two groups used direct refusal strategies, NSE chose for unwillingness while JLE mostly
used direct No. NSE used alternative or excuse/explanation to provide judgments for their unwillingness to accept a suggestion, while JLE commonly used gratitude which was used to redress direct No. Regarding unconventional or idiosyncratic forms, the findings show that there is a gap between the idea of correct grammatical forms and appropriate pragmalinguistic strategies of the target language. The finding showed although the learners have developed universal pragmatic knowledge to express refusal strategies in the target language, they have limited pragmalinguistic resources. JLE Directly translating L1 pragmalinguistics into L2 using lexical that is semantically close to those of the target language pragmalinguistic forms.


Boonkongsaen (2013) investigated refusal used by Filipinos and Thais. The aim of the study was to examine the difference and similarities refusal strategies according to differences in social level. The data were gathered from 12 DCT’s scenarios that consist of four types of eliciting act: three invitation, three suggestion, three offer and three requests. The participants were required to make an English refusal to interlocutors of equal, lower and higher. The participants of the study are 30 Filipino teachers of English and 30 Thai teachers of English. The age of the participants was within the range of 23-45 years old. The data were analyzed by using Beebe et al. (1990) theory about refusal strategies.
The result showed that, both groups tended to be indirect rather than direct ones. However, Filipinos were more direct than Thai when dealing with refusals. Thai were less direct than Filipinos when dealing the interlocutor of higher status. As language and culture are closely related, English refusal strategies used by Filipinos and Thais reflected tendencies in their social norms.


Narges (2013) committed refusal used by Iranian ESL learners and native English. The data were gathered from 50 Iranian ESL learner and native English speaker (NES) Americans using a role play scenario consisting of request, suggestion, invitations, and offers. Each situation was based on two social variables, relative power and social distance. Data were then coded based on the classification of illocutionary acts by Searle (1976). The participants consist of 25 native Persian speaking Iranians and 25 native English speaking Americans, aged between 25 to 35 years old. There are three research questions for his study, how do Persian native speakers refuse invitation, suggestion, offer and request in target language, differences between native English speakers and ESL Persians in using speech act, how do the rates refusal of native English speaker and ESL Persians compare on the eight scenarios.

The results show no significant differences 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. Also,
there is no correlation between the language status and the choice of illocutionary acts for the initial and final parts of refusal, and there is no correlations between the native language and the number of refusal to eliciting act, invitation, suggestions, offers and request, by Persian and English native speaker since the coded data show there are no significant differences at the 95% confidence level. Finally he concludes that second language learner is much more native-like production of refusal strategy.

11. Maros, Shboul and Yasin (2014)

Maros, Shboul and Yasin (2014) investigated the similarities and differences of the speech act of refusals in English between Jordanian English as Foreign Language (EFL) and Malay English as a Second Language (ESL) post graduate students. There are three research study (1) what are the similarities in refusals strategies between Jordanian and Malay participants? (2) What are the differences in refusal strategies between JEFL and MESL? (3) Why are there similarities and differences between JEFL and MESL?. The JEFL participants’ ages range from 25 – 30 years old, 30-40 years old for MESL, all participant are male. Data were collected using a a modified version of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) an interviewer audiotaped and read the situation aloud to enable participants to respond verbally. Data were analyzed in term of semantic formulaic sequences and were categorized by four trained coders based on the classification of refusal strategies established by Beebe et al.
the instrument consisted of 12 situation that require three request, tree invitation, three offers, three suggestion.

The interviews with six Jordanians resulted 143 English refusal strategies. Excuse, reason, explanation were most frequent strategy used by the participants in approximately 29% of the strategies. All Jordanian participants used this strategy in their refusals to an invitation made by a person of higher status. Statement of regret was the second most frequent strategy mentioned by JEFL (28%), using denying vocabulary (10.5%) was the third most frequent strategy. On the other hand, the interviews with six Malays resulted in 149 English refusal strategies. Like JFL, the first rank in MESL is excuse, reason, explanation (25%), statement of regret and denying vocabulary (20%), gratitude (10%). Both groups used similar strategies when making refusals although the MESL refusals were longer than JEFL. The main differences in this study were that JEFL at all social status was more likely to employ indirect strategies (82.5%) than MESL who used direct refusals style in higher and equal status (27.4%). In statement of gratitude the JEFL used it less, which was at 3.5% while the MESL used it more (10%). The Jordan participants differed from Malay in their use of expression of promise of future acceptance at 1.4% compared to none for their Malays counterparts. In contrast, the Malay participants score 0.7% where the use of statement of philosophy was concerned, but none of JEFL used the strategy. Reasons for similarities (third research question) are attributed to religious similarity and collectivist cultural
orientation. Jordan and Malay are typically classified as collectivistic cultures.


Shboul (2015) investigated the perception of Jordanian EFL learners’ (JEFL) pragmatic transfer of refusal strategies in term of contextual and cultural factors. The aim of the study is to help establish a better understanding of the speech act and promote socio-pragmatic awareness in the use of English language among JEFL speakers. There are two research questions that exist in his study (1) what are the similarities and differences in the speaker’s right perception of refusals by JEFL learner compared to AEL 1 and JAL1? (2) Would pragmatic transfer from Arabic to English take place in Jordanian EFL learner’s perception of the right they have to refuse the act?. The data were collected from three different groups. The first group (target group) consists of 30 Jordanian intermediate JEFL learners. The second and third groups were reference group consisting of 15 American English language (AEL1) speakers and 15 Jordanian Arabic language (JAL1) speakers. The participant ages range from 30-40. To elicit perception data from the participants, he used discourse completion test (DCT) and scale response questionnaire (SRQ) to elicit perception data from the participants. The participants were instructed to assess the variable on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = the lowest to 5 = the highest. The prompts are request, invitation, offers and suggestion. Shboul (2015) use status (equal, lower, higher) and distance
The result of the study is the AEL1 (mean 4.51, 4.80, 4.89, 4.77, 4.67) group’s perception of the speaker’s right was relatively higher than that of the JEFL (mean 3.58, 4.35, 4.31, 4.33, 4.43) and JAL1 (mean 3.11, 4.23, 4.22, 3.83, 4.13) groups in five social categories. The JEFL and AEL1 participants demonstrate a culturally specific perception of contextual variables. The reason that both Jordanian groups assessed their right of making the refusals as being weaker than that of the AEL1 participants reflect deeply rooted cultural values. Whereas American culture emphasizes the role of the individual and his or her right and obligation which is a main characteristic of individual culture, the hierarchical structure of Jordanian culture emphasize the group, group harmony, and social hierarchy which are main characteristic of collective culture.

B. Theoretical Review

The theoretical review will include the discussion of Pragmatic Competence, Interlanguage Pragmatic, Speech Act, Speech Act of Refusal, Request, Suggestion, and Politeness.

1. Pragmatic Competence

According to Chomsky’s cited in Fauziati (2014) competence is ‘the speaker hearer’s knowledge of his language’. Chomsky (1965) divided linguistic competence into two, those are speaker and listener’s knowledge of language (competence) and psychological factor involved in the production of utterance (performance). Performance is the way the people actually produce
speech, however incomplete and fragmentary it may be. Performance also deals with how people use their competence in producing and understanding sentences (Srijono, 2010). On the other hand, competence is the knowledge the people have enables them to produce a complete sentence, or know the difference between an ungrammatical and grammatical sentences. Competence is a person’s internalized grammar of language (Richard, et al.: 1985). The focus is to characterize the abstract abilities speaker possess that enable them to produce grammatically correct sentences in a language (Chomsky, 1965).

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speakerlistener, in a completely homogeneousspeechcommunity, who knows its knowledge perfectly and it is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitation, distractions, shift of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristics) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance (Chomsky:1965:3).

Hymes’s (1970) theory of communicative competence deals with what a speaker need to understand in order to be communicatively competence in a speech community. Hymes (1972) reformulate the concept of Chomsky’s linguistic competence as a ‘communicative competence, the acceptability in their context integrated communication and culture,

1. Whether or not something is formally possible (grammatically)
2. Whether or not something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available (natural and easy to understood)
3. Whether or not something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated (appropriate to the context)
4. Whether or not something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails (actually done)

(Hymes, 1972 cited in Fauziati, 2014)

Hymes’s (1972) communicative competence has provided a different perspective on linguistic theory which has been widely applied as a theoretical base to second language acquisition pedagogy. Canale and Swain (1980) divided communicative competence into three major components namely: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. Pragmatic competence is implied in discourse competence which previously constitutes the subcomponent of sociolinguistic competence (Canale, 1983).

Another language theory focused on functional linguistics which is concerned with the description of speech act. This theory purposed by Haldiday in 1970 as follows:

1. Using language to get thing (The instrumental function)
2. Using language to control the behavior of others (the regulatory function)
3. Using language to create interaction with other (the interactional function)
4. Using language to express personal feeling (the personal function)
5. Using language to learn and to discover (the heuristic function)
6. Using language to create a world of the imagination (the imaginative function)
7. Using language to communicate information (the representational function)

(Haliday, 1975 cited in Fauziati 2014)

In 1990, Bachman introduced concept of language competence, strategic competence, and psychophysiological mechanism. Organizational and pragmatics competence are the part of language competence. Pragmatic competence in this conception is independent competence which is knowledge that enables language users to relate linguistic signals and references their relevant context. Illocutionary and sociolinguistic competence are also included in this conception. Watt 2003 cited in Fauziati (2009) explained that Lakoff suggests two rules of pragmatic competence, namely be clear and be polite.

Pragmatic competence entails a variety of abilities concerned with the use and interpretation of language in context (Bulm Kulka, 1993). In foreign language or second language learning, pragmatic competence is the most essential competence. It is claimed that pragmatic failure has more serious consequences than do grammatical errors as native speakers tend to treat pragmatic errors as offensive (Thomas, 1983:97). Furthermore, language learners interacting with speakers of a target language have to be pragmatically appropriate, otherwise they run the risk of appearing uncooperative at the least, or more seriously, rude or insulting (BardoviHarlig et al., 1991:4).
2. Interlanguage Pragmatics

Learners of a second/foreign language build up a system peculiar to themselves which contain elements that are between L1 and L2 in the course of learning the language. This terminology is defined as “the systematic knowledge of the language being learned (L2) which is independent of both these learners’ native language (L1) and the target language” (Ellis, 1994:698). At first, the studies on interlanguage (henceforth IL) were primarily related to the phonological, morphological and syntactic level in second/foreign language learning (Hymes, 1972). However, “problems of miscommunication between people coming from different cultures” (Kasper, 1992:220); the fact that “only interlanguage study of grammar system is not enough and problems involving context cannot be solved” (Huang, 2010: 682) created the need to focus on the pragmatic comprehension and production of second/foreign language learners”, which is called as interlanguage pragmatics.

ILP, as a domain of second language (henceforth L2), is defined by Kasper & Blum-Kulka (1993:3) as “the study of non-native speakers” use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language”. Studies of ILP have focused on illocutionary and politeness dimensions of speech acts and have yielded valuable insights about the acquisition and development of pragmatic competence of non-native speakers. It is of great importance to make learners achieve native-like level of pragmatic competence by acquiring politeness rules of the target culture and developing conversational skills such as how to talk to people with different statuses and role relationships, what
verbal and non-verbal behaviors are appropriate in different contexts (Felix-Brasdefer, 2004).

3. Speech Act

The speech act define as the basic units of linguistic communication purposed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1979). This theory arise when utterances have impact for the people behavior. The people who produce that utterance should do something as the consequences. Jacob L. Mey (1999) explains word that do thing in the world called speech act. Oishi (2006) states “in utilizing linguistic conventions, the speaker with an associated intention performs a linguistic act to the hearer”. In short word, the core of this theory is the assumption that language is used to perform certain action. Utterances like I declare war on Zanzibar and I sentence you to ten years of hard labour are treated as the performance of an act (Austin in Levinson, 1987). Austin (1962) describes these utterances as performatives and contrasted them to statement, assertion and utterances like them which he called constatives. Wardaugh (1992) explains that performatives means an utterance which contains a special type of verb by force of which it performs an action. In short, a person is not just saying something by doing something. We do not just use a language to say thing, but we do things with words (Austin, 1962). This idea will have been lead to illocutionary concept.

Austin produces a typology of condition which performatives must meet if they are to succeed or be ‘happy’ (Austin in Levinson, 1987: 229) and the factor which are necessary to make them so are known as felicity condition
(Chapman, 2000). These felicity conditions correspond to the rules of propositional, preparatory, sincerity, essential that govern speech acts (Searle 1979). Levinson (1983) states that Austin classifies felicity conditions into three categories: (1) the conditions and the people must be suitable to the situation, (2) the procedure need to be performed in the right way, and (3) the people have to possess the necessary thoughts, emotions, and intentions, which would overlap with the sincerity rules of Searle.

Austin (1962) states the necessity to group speech acts into three dimensions (1) locutionary, (2) illocutionary, and (3) perlocutionary. The locutionary act is to produce the utterance physically or to produce meaningful linguistic expression (Yule, 1996). It is then followed with the second category, illocutionary act, the semantic *illocutionary force* of the utterance, which is the intended meaning. The final category, the perlocutionary act is the effect of an illocutionary act on the hearer. However, depending on the circumstances, the intended meaning of a locutionary act can be interpreted in different ways. Yule (1996) elaborates the same utterance can potentially have quite different. Illocutionary force is conventionally linked with explicit performatives and other illocutionary force indicating device (IFID). IFID is an expression of (performative verb) where there is a slot for a verb that explicitly names the illocutionary act being performed (Yule, 1996).

Searle’s (1976) classify speech act into five categories: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.
1) Representative: Those kind of speech act that state what the speaker trusts to be the case or not (Yule, 1996). Levinson (1983) states which commit the speaker to the truth of the express proposition called representatives. Conclusions, descriptions, assertion are the example of representatives.

2) Directives: which are attempts by the speaker to obtain the addressee to do something (Levinson, 1983). Yule (1996) elaborates directives are those kind of speech act that speaker use to get someone else to do something. Directives express what the speaker wants such as command, order, request, suggestions.

3) Commissives: which commit the speaker to some future course of action (Levinson, 1983) for examples: promises, threat, refusals.

4) Expressive: speech acts that state what the speaker feels (Yule, 1996). A psychological state can be express as statement of pleasure, sorrow, pain, dislike, joy, ect.

5) Declaration: Speech acts that change the world via their utterances. The speaker has to have special institutional role and specific context to produced declaration, for example christening, declaring war, ect. (Yule, 1996).

4. Speech Act of Refusal

The speech act of refusal belongs to the category of ‘commissives’ in Searle’s classification of illocutionary acts (1976). “Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future
action. They express what the speaker intends” (Yule, 1996:54). When a speaker uses a commissive, s/he tries to make the world fit the words (Searle, 1969, 1979).

Searle (1975) differentiates between a direct and indirect speech acts depending on the recognition of the intended illocutionary effect of an utterance in a certain case. A direct speech act is performed directly with the illocutionary force of an utterance built on the structure of the sentence (Levinson, 1983). Indirect speech acts are defined as “cases in which illocutionary act is performed indirectly by performing another” (Searle, 1975:60). Yule (1996) states indirect speech act is indirect relationship between a structure and a function. The utterance ‘it’s cold outside’ is declarative. When it is used to make a request the functions change into indirect speech act.

Beebe et al. (1990) classifies refusal strategies regarding the degree of directness. The strategies include two board main classifications namely direct and indirect refusals. Three types of direct refusal and eleven types of indirect refusal will be explained below:

Direct refusal strategy consists of a performative refusal (e.g I refuse) and a non-performative statement expressing inability, unwillingness and ‘no’, for example:

A: would you like to give me 10 dollars?

B: No (no directly)

I can’t (inability)
I don’t want (*unwillingness*)

In the following are the most common types of indirect refusals propose by Beebe et al:

1) Apology/ regret

The speaker used apology to refuse the requester wants by using apology or regret, for examples:

- I am sorry…
- I feel terrible...
- Sorry...

2) Wish

It is conducted by wishing that an interlocutor could do something for the requester wants, for examples:

- Hopefully, I could go to your home
- Wish I can accompany you

3) Excuse

The speaker used excuse/ explanation/ reason to disagree and not complying with the requester wants, for examples:

- My uncle will visits me that night
- I have a lot of homework

4) Statement of an alternative

Statement of alternative can be used as indirect refusal strategy. The speaker looking for an alternative such as suggestion or offer to decline the hearer wants, for example:
- Why don’t you take a taxi?
- I’d reading book instead of watching movie

5) Set condition for future acceptance

The speaker set certain condition to accept the hearer wants in the future, for example:
- If I am not busy, I will…
- If you asked earlier, I would have…
- If I do not have a visitor, I would have…

6) Promise for future acceptance

The speaker conducts a promise for the future acceptance of an invitation, offer and suggestion, for examples:
- I’ll do it next time
- I promise I will take you dinner tomorrow
- I’ll join in other times

7) Statement of principle

It is a statement of interlocutor’s standard rule of personal conduct, for example:
- I never do business with my friends
- I never share my secret to the public

8) Statement of philosophy

It is a statement of an interlocutor’s point of view, for example:
- This kind things happened
- One can’t be too careful
9) Dissuasion

Try to dissuade interlocutor with some strategies such as stating negative consequences to the requester, a criticism of the request, a request for help, empathy, self defense and assistance by dropping or the request. The example of dissuasion can be seen in the following examples:

- That’s a bad idea
- I’m doing my best
- I won’t be any fun to night

10) Acceptance that function as a refusal

Acceptance that functions as a refusal means speaker put acceptance at first hand before he/she decline the requester wants, for examples:

- I will but…
- Okay but…
- Alright I would come but…

11) Avoidance

Avoidance can be expressed with changing the subject, joking or hedging. Non verbal act such as silence, hesitation, or physical departure can be included as avoidance, for example:

*In a restaurant A asking B whether he will comes to the staff meeting on this Saturday or not.*

A: would you come to the staff meeting on this Saturday?

B: Hey, let’s see this menu. It looks delicious.
Beebe et al (1990) identify four adjuncts that might be added in direct or indirect strategies:

1) Positive opinion

   Adjunct of positive opinion/ positive agreement can be said as positive feedback to the requester. It is sometimes added by the speaker in declining a request/ suggestion, for examples:
   - I’d love to…
   - That’s good idea
   - That’s great idea

2) Empathy

   The speaker cares to the requester conditions by giving empathy, for examples:
   - I realize you are in difficult situations
   - I understand you have do everything

3) Fillers

   Sometimes the speaker adds filler to decline a request/suggestion/ offer. Commonly fillers are combined with other refusal strategies, for example:
   - Uhh... I’m not sure I can
   - Uhm... I am sorry.
   - Oh... my son has final examination tomorrow, I can’t come.

4) Gratitude

   Those words which show an appreciation to the requester, for example:
- Thanks
- Thanks for your suggestion
- Thank you very much Jim

5. Request

In oxford dictionary request has a meaning act of politely asking for something or ask for something politely. In Webster’s new world dictionary fifth edition request means the act of asking or expressing a desire for something. Origin of request, come from Old French requeste in Latin requesta (webster’s dictionary). When the speaker asks the hearer to do something, it means that the speaker performs a speech act. He/she certainly wants his/her action to be understood and then the hearer will do what the speaker wants. Searle (1969: 24) explains that language is a part of a theory of actions, and speech acts are those verbal acts, or more precisely illocutionary acts, such as promising, threatening and requesting, that one performs in speaking. Request expression is usually followed by word please such the example bellow:

- Would you mind passing me the salt, please?
- Would you like to borrow me your book, please?
- Could you please take me to the dentist?

There are two kinds of responding the request namely accepting requests and refusing request. Accepting request means that the addressee want to do like the speaker want. This is the example of accepting requests:

- Sure, I’d be glad/ happy to…
Of course/ Certainly
- No problem
- Sure, just a moment

The way people refuse a request may different like they accept a request. Beebe et al. (1990) explain that people tend to use indirect refusal when they want refuse something. An indirect strategy is expressed by means of one or more semantic formulae such as regret, wish, excuse, etc. These are the example of refusing the request:

- I’d loved to, but...
- It sounds great, but...
- I’m/sorry, but...
- Sorry to say that...
- I wish I can, but...

6. Suggestion

In oxford dictionary ‘suggest’ means put forward an idea or plan for consideration or put an idea to somebody’s mind. Suggestion itself has a meaning idea, plan that mention for somebody to think about. These are the examples of giving suggestion;

- You could (might) …
- I suggest/recommend that you …
- You really should/ought to…
- I strongly advise/urge you to …
- You’d better …

The way to accept suggestions can be seen such the example bellow:

- That’s a good/nice/wonderful, idea/suggestion.
- Thank you/Thanks.
- I’ll do/try that.
- Why didn’t I think of that?
- I think you’re right.

Beebe et al. (1990) explain that there are two strategies to refuse something such as suggestion. There are two ways, direct and indirect. Direct refusal means that the addressee directly say ‘No’ or ‘I don’t want’, an indirect strategy is the addressee tend to use other words or use more semantic formulae such as regret, wish, excuse, etc to refuse, for examples:

- I tried that, but …
- Thanks, but that won’t work/help because …
- I don’t want to/can’t do that because …

7. Politeness

The study of politeness is the study of the ways in which these expectations are met (Grundy, 2008). Brown and Levinson (1987) note a growing interest in “the linguistic expression of social relationship”. Politeness phenomena also extend the notion of indexicality because they show that every utterance is uniquely designed for its context (Grundy, 2008). Politeness principle have long been considered to have wide descriptive power in respect
of language use (Lakof, 1972, 1973), to be major determinants of linguistics behavior (Leech, 1983) and to have universal status (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Politeness phenomena are paradigms example of pragmatic usage. Among the aspects of context that are particularly determinate of language choice in the domain of politeness are the power distance relationship of the interactants and the extent to which a speaker imposes on or requires something of their addressee.

(1) You couldn’t let me have a bit of paper by any chance could you?

(2) Give me a sheet of paper fathead

(Grundy, 2008: p189).

Based on those examples, people who do not know the context between speaker-addressee relationship and social level may think in second examples are impolite. On the example number one, the speaker and addressee are equal. The context of second example is an older brother asks to his young brother. In second example the speaker tends to use direct request rather than in the first example. Since these strategies imply the nature of relationship, it is become the heart of linguistics politeness (Grundy, 2008).

Politeness, in an interaction can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face (Yule, 1996). Face means the public self image of person. Face is basic want rather than a norm that is defined as the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) divide face into two
categories namely negative face (freedom of action and freedom from imposition) and positive face (self-image be appreciated and approved of).

In politeness theory, some linguistics gives the rule. First is come from Lakoff (1977). He explains that politeness rules mean human communication, the rule to get people through a cooperative transaction with a minimal amount of wasted effort or friction (Lakoff, 1977: p.88).

1) Formality: don’t impose, remain aloof, the basic Western politeness norm of avoiding imposition on others and a rule to maintain social distance and uphold status between interlocutors.

2) Hesitancy: Allow the addressee his/her options, a strategy to respect addressees own private territory or to restrain impinging on other’ privacy

3) Equality: Act as though you and an addressee were equal, the strategy to show informality in which all attributes regarding to social differences between interlocutors are removed for the sake of communication concord.

Second is come from Leech’s principle of politeness (1983) comprising six maxims. Namely: Tact maxim (minimize cost other, maximize benefit other, Generosity maxim (Minimize benefits to self, Maximize cost to self), Approbation maxim (Minimize dispraise of other, Maximize praise of other), Modesty maxim (minimize praise of self, maximize dispraise of self), Agreement maxim (minimize disagreement between self and other, maximize the agreement), Sympathy maxim (minimize antipathy to other, maximize sympathy to other). In 2005, Leech revises and completes his theory. He said
that speaker expresses or implies meaning which place a high value on what pertains to other speakers or places a low value on what pertains to the speaker (Leech, 2005).

Some speech acts intrinsically threaten positive and negative face of speaker and hearer of face threatening act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Within their everyday social interaction, people generally behave as if their expectation concerning their public self image or their face wants, will be respected. If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectation regarding self image, it is described as face threatening act (Yule, 1996). There are three aspects that can be used to calibrate the strength of face threatening act (FTA) namely; power (P), social distance (D) and degree of imposition (R). The strategies for performing FTAs by Brown and Levinson can be seen in this picture below:

![Figure 1: Strategies for performing FTAs (Brown and Levinson)](image-url)
Bald on record means that speaker intends to do the FTA with maximum efficiency more than he/she wants to satisfy hearer’s face. Bold on record happen usually in urgent situation, when maximum efficiency is very important (Help!, Watch out!), speaker’s want to satisfy hearer’s face is small (Bring me wine, Jeenes), speaker cares about hearer (Careful! He’s dangerous men), granting permission for the hearer and the last is imperative.

Positive politeness is directed to redress the addressee’s positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) give the strategy for doing positive politeness.

1) Strategy 1: Notice/ attend to hearer’s want.

This strategy gives hearer’s want or needs, for example:
- Jim you are really good at solving computer problem.
- What a beautiful dress
- You must be thirsty, what about a cup of ice milk?

2) Strategy 2: Exaggerate interest/ approval

Exaggerate interest means those utterances which is given by the speaker to make exaggerate effect in hearer’s feeling. This strategy commonly use in giving interest, sympathy or approval to the hearer, for example:
- Your house is heaven!
- Good old Jim.
- You are brilliant George!

3) Strategy 3: Intensity interest
Intensity interest means the speaker wants the hearer contribute or take part in the speaker conversation. Commonly this strategy is occurred by making a good story, for example:

Fred : I come down the street…and what?
George : what?
Fred : --a huge mess all over the place

4) Strategy 4: Use in group identity marker.

Some communities, regions or places have identity markers are used in their communication such as jargon, dialects, slang, ect. In English, the address forms usually used are luv, mom, babe, buddy, blondie, honey, dear, sister, sweetheart, guys, ect. In the following examples are group identity marker strategies:

- How are you today mate?, Here’s my old mate George.
- Are you sick luv?
- Let’s take dinner sweetheart.

5) Strategy 5: Seek agreement.

Agreeing with the addressee’s statement is a sign of positive politeness. In this strategy, the speaker seeks agreement from the hearers, for examples:

A: Would you come to my birth day party to night?

B: Yes, but may be I’ll late. Is it okay?

A: Okay
6) Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

The speaker gives a signaling agreement to the hearer, such as say ‘yes’, ‘it’s okay’, ‘I think so’. Although superficially the speaker agrees with the hearer at the level of literary meaning, and signals with agreement marker truthfully the function is to imply something. That agreement marker implies disagreement, for example:

A: Would you come to my birth day party to night?

B: I’ll try

Other examples can be seen in the following examples:

Peter: It’s brilliant this machine isn’t it?

Dean: Yes, it has a mind of its own.

Peter: That’s also true (Grundy, 2008)

7) Strategy 7: Presuppose/ assert common ground.

The speaker uses presuppose utterances to the hearer, for example:

- People like me and you.
- Bill, don’t like being pushed around like that, do we?

8) Strategy 8: Joke

To put the hearer at ease the speaker uses joke, for example:

A: Great and nice summer we’re having. It’s only rained six times a week on average.

B: Yeah, terrible, isn’t it?

9) Strategy 9: Assert knowledge of hearer’s wants
The speakers have knowledge about the hearer such as what the hearer need and what the hearer like or dislike. With this knowledge, the speakers concern for hearer’s wants, for examples:

- I know you don’t like watching movie, but this one will really be good. Let’s join!
- I know you like red rose, so I’ve bought you home a whole bunch of them.
- I know that you are going to use your mobile phone, but can I use it for a minute?

10) Strategy 10: Offer, promise.

The speakers offer alternative or give promise to the hearers, for examples:

- “I’ll take you lunch on Saturday”
- “I’ll give you a special gift tomorrow”.

11) Strategy 11: Be optimistic

Be optimistic means both agents (speaker and hearer) have the same wants, the hearer wants what the speaker wants, for examples:

- I know that you are always glad to get a trip or two on gardening, Fred.
- This coffee is your favorite Jim, you love it since senior high school.
12) Strategy 12: include speaker and hearer in the activity.

In this strategy the speakers commonly used pronoun ‘we’ or ‘our’ and avoid pronoun ‘you’ or ‘I’. This strategy makes both of them include in activity, for examples:

- Let’s have some drink.
- Shall we have dinner now?
- What is our plan Jim?


By giving reasons, the hearers can understand the speaker’s position or the reason why the speakers do thing. Giving reason includes in positive politeness, for example:

- It is difficult because my son is sick and I have to bring him in the hospital.
- In order to promote a better learning environment please do not bring food or drink into this teaching room. (Grundy, 2008)

14) Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

The speaker tries to exchange his need with the hearer wants, for example:

- Dad, if you help me with my math homework I’ll mow the lawn after school tomorrow.
- James, I’ll lend you my car if you help me send this letter.
- If you pick me up to night Katniss, I’ll accompany you to looking for your weeding dress.
15) Strategy 15: Give gifts to hearer

Give hearer sympathy, gratitude, understanding and cooperation include in positive politeness, for example:

- Thank you for your suggestion
- Thanks Jack

Brown and Levinson (1987) also give the strategy for doing on record with redressive action negative politeness. There are ten strategies such as in the following explanations:

1) Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

Be conventionally indirect is used commonly when the speakers need help from the hearer. The speakers use indirect strategies instead of command directly to the hearer for doing something, for examples:

- Can you please pass the sugar?
- Could you tell me how to find minimarket please?

2) Strategy 2: Question, hedge

The speakers assume that hearer’s can not to comply the speaker’s wants, for examples:

- I wonder whether I could just sort of ask you a little questions
- I was wondering could I ask something to you

3) Strategy 3: Be pessimistic

Be pessimistic means assuming the hearer is unlikely to be willing/ able to do any act, the speaker uses the subjunctive for example:
If you had a little time to spare for me this afternoon, I’d like to talk about my paper (Fauziati, 2009).

If you are not busy or maybe if you had free times tomorrow morning, I’d like to invite you to dinner.

4) Strategy 4: Minimize imposition

The speaker tries to minimize the imposition to the hearer, for examples:

- Could I talk to you for just a minute?
- Could my daughter ask you for a moment?

5) Strategy 5: Give deference.

Deference strategy is the tendency to use negative politeness form as emphasizing the hearer’s right freedom, this strategy is called formal politeness (Yule, 1996). For examples:

- Excuse me Sir, could I just…
- Mr. Potter, what would you do if…
- Thanks a lot Mrs. Clinton

6) Strategy 6: Apologize

The speaker uses apologize such as admit impingement, indicate reluctance or beg forgiveness. Apologize include in negative politeness, for examples:

- Sorry to bother you, but…
- I’m sorry to disturb you, but…
- Excuse me…
7) Strategy 7: Impersonalize

Impersonalize means that the speaker unmentioned the hearer names/identity. The speaker can use the word ‘it’ or by not mentioning the hearer, for examples:

- Are there any minimarkets around?
- Do this for me (from ‘I ask you to do this for me’)
- What time I can catch the last bus?

8) Strategy 8: State the imposition as a general rule

State the FTA as some general social rule, regulation or obligation. Rather than mentioning the addressee directly, we can generalize the expression when we ask him to follow what we say.

- Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train
- You will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train
- The canteen will be closed during prayer time

9) Strategy 9: Nominalize

By nominalizing the expression, the speaker makes it on the form of nominal phrase, not on verbal or clause form. Nominalize to distance the actor and add formality include in negative politeness, for examples:

- Participation in an illegal demonstration is punishable by low
- The president take part in socializing the dangerous of HIV
- Your good performance on the examination impressed us favorably
  
  *(compare to: you performed well on the examinations and we were favorably impressed)*

10) Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring a debt

- Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting hearer, for examples:
  - I could easily do it for you
  - I’ll buy you a beer at dinner
  - It wouldn’t be any trouble, I have to go right by there anyway

Off record politeness means the speaker not directly addressed to the hearer/addressee (Yule, 1996). Off record may or may not succeed because the hearer not always able to understands what the speaker’s intentions. There are fifteen strategies to produce off-record politeness in Brown and Levinson theory (1992). Each strategies consists of three addressed to Grice’s maxim of relation, four addressed to the maxim of quantity, three to the maxim of quality, and five to the maxim of manner. Off record strategies can be seen in the following explanation:

1. Give hints. It’s cold in here (c.i Shut the window)
2. Give association clues.
   
   A: Are you going to market tomorrow?... there’s a market.
   
   B: Tomorrow, I suppose (c.i Give me a ride there)
3. Presuppose: I wash the car again. (He presupposes that he has done it before)
4. Understate: That’s house need a touch of paint.

5. Overstate: there were a million people in the Co-op tonight.

6. Use tautologies: War is war. Boys will be boys

7. Use contradiction:
   A: Are you upset about that?
   B: Well, yes and no

8. Be ironic: John’s a real genius (after John has just done twenty stupid thing in a row)

9. Use metaphor: John’s a real fish. c.i He (drinks, swims, is slimy, or is cold-blooded) like a fish.

10. Use rhetorical questions: how many times do I have to tell you?

11. Be ambiguous: John’s a pretty cookie.

12. Be vague: Looks like someone may have had too much to drink.

13. Over generalize: The lawn has got to be mown

14. Displace hearer, speaker may go off record as to who the target for his FTA is, or he may pretend to address the FTA to someone whom it wouldn’t threaten, and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him.

15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis: Well, if one leaves one’s tea on the wobbly table…

   (Brown and Levinson in Fauziati, 2009)
C. Theoretical Framework

Refusal strategies have been conducted by many research (Shboul, 2015; Maros, Shboul and Yasin, 2014; Narges, 2013; Sahragrad and Javanmardi, 2011; Sahin, 2011; Wijayanto, 2011; Umale, 2008; Yang, 2008; Amarien, 2008; Yamagasira, 2001). Comparing English as native language and English as foreign language (Narges, 2008; Sahin, 2011; Wijayanto, 2011; Umale, 2008; Amarien, 2008; Wannaruk, 2008; Yamagasira, 2001) have chosen to investigate how EFL followed different pragmatic patterns to produce speech act of refusal, investigate what the differences between refusal strategies between native and English as foreign language, and does mother tongue affect them in producing refusal strategy. Other researchers tend to observe refusal strategy between EFL people in one country or area (Shboul, 2015; Sahragrad & Javan Mardi, 2011; Yang, 2008). Another researcher prefers to compare English as second language and English as foreign language (Shboul et al., 2014) the aim are focused on the difference refusal strategy made by English as second language users and English as foreign language users, also which user are close as native. Another researcher observed refusal strategies between teacher of English from two different countries such as Thailand and Filipino (Boonkongsaren, 2013). Even though refusal strategies by EFL learner from different country have done by another researcher, a comparison study between refusal strategies made by Indonesia EFL students and Thailand EFL students is rarely done.
Based on the previous study and theoretical framework, the researcher used the theory of refusal strategies purpose by Beebe, et.al to answer research question number one and two about the differences and similarities of refusal strategy made by Indonesian EFL students (ILE) and Thailand EFL students (TLE), and how both groups used refusal strategy in different social level. In answering research question number three the researcher used Brown and Levinson theory (1987) about politeness strategy.