

A STUDY OF REFUSAL STRATEGY USED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS IN MADIUN REGENCY IN DECLINING AN INVITATION, AN OFFER AND A SUGGESTION

Maya Hartuti

Graduate Program of Language Study
Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta
Jl. A. Yani Tromol Pos I Pabelan Kartasura, Surakarta (57127)
Email: mayahartuti@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menginvestigasi strategi dan kesantunan dalam penolakan terhadap undangan, tawaran, dan saran oleh guru bahasa Inggris di Kabupaten Madiun. Penelitian ini menggunakan kerangka teori dari Takahashi, Beebe dan Uliss - Weltz. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan Teknik Penyempurnaan Wacana (Discourse Completion Technique). Sumber data adalah 38 guru bahasa Inggris, 14 laki-laki dan 24 perempuan yang mengajar di sekolah-sekolah SMP di Kabupaten Madiun. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan sebagai berikut: (1) Para guru Bahasa Inggris SMP di Kabupaten Madiun menerapkan dua formula semantik strategi langsung dan tidak langsung pada tiga tindak penolakan (undangan, penawaran, dan saran). (2) Strategi tidak langsung dalam penolakan yang dominan adalah dalam penawaran dan saran sedangkan strategi langsung yang dominan digunakan dalam penolakan terhadap undangan.

Kata Kunci: strategi penolakan, undangan, tawaran, saran.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate strategies and politeness in rejection of the invitation, offer, and suggestions by English teacher in Madison County. This study uses the theoretical framework of Takahashi, Beebe and Uliss - Weltz. Data was collected using Mechanical Completion of Discourse (Discourse Completion Technique). The data source is the 38 English teachers, 14 men and 24 women who teach in junior high schools in Madison County. The results showed as follows: (1) The English teacher at junior high school in Madison County implemented two semantic formula of direct and indirect strategies in three acts of rejection (invitations, offers and suggestions). (2) Indirect strategy in the rejection of the dominant is the supply and advice directly while the dominant strategy used in the rejection of the invitation.

Keywords: strategy of denial, invitation, offers, suggestions.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, language becomes the most fundamental factor in supporting the learners' success in learning and studying all fields of study and in the enlargement of learners' intellectual, social, and emotional. As an international language, English becomes crucial means of international communication and it is a must for the learners to master it. However, many Indonesian students have not been successful in communication yet as many of them still fail to express exactly what they want to socially and culturally acceptable.

Celce Murcia (1995) stated that language is communication and the objective of foreign language teaching is to develop communicative competence. According to Celce Murcia, Dornyei and Thurnell's (1995), communicative competence contains interconnected components of discourse, linguistic, actional, sociocultural, and strategic competence. In this model, discourse competence is set as the core competence which includes cohesion, deixis, coherence, generic structure, and conversational structures inherent in a turn taking in conversations.

According to Thomas (1983: 97) pragmatic competence is the most crucial competence in foreign language or second language learning as it is claimed that pragmatic failure has more serious consequences than do grammatical errors as native speakers tend to treat pragmatic errors as offensive.

According to Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No 22 (2006: 277-278) the goal of teaching and learning the lessons group A (English) at SMP/MTs is that students can achieve the functional level to communicate orally and in writing to resolve everyday problems, whereas SMA/MA students are expected to reach the level of informational as they are prepared to continue their education to university/college. Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No 58 (2014: 3) states that the goal of teaching and learning English at SMP/MTs is to develop the students' attitude, knowledge, and skill competences as a foundation and reinforcement capabilities in social, civic and state.

Thus, it is very crucial for English teachers to master pragmatic and Sociolinguistic competence and then teach the students about what to say and how to say it in English in a certain situation. Ideally, teachers should skilfully introduce appropriate utterances in a way that language functions and forms are paid attention.

Nevertheless, the English teachers in Madiun Regency who are said to be "fluent" in English due to their mastery of the grammar and vocabulary of that language may still have not enough pragmatic and Sociolinguistic competence as they are non native speakers. The English teachers may still have problem to produce language that is socially and culturally appropriate. Their ability in using English correctly in specific social situations may still weak.

Refusals are a pragmatic breakdown which may certainly trigger unintended offence and/or fail in communication. It is even hard to refuse in a foreign language due to the fact that misunderstandings may happen if one does not use pragmatic knowledge properly. According to Ramos (1991) as cited in Al-Kahtani (2005), it is very crucial for refusing others' invitation, offer and suggestion without hurting their feelings since the "incapability to say 'no' clearly has led many non-native speakers to offend their interlocutors". There are also some varieties in refusal, but most the English teachers in Madiun regency, as non native speakers have limited variety in refusal. Therefore, the researcher is attracted in conducting a study in pragmatic competence of English teachers in Madiun Regency, especially the refusal strategies used in declining invitation, offer and suggestion.

The objective of this research is: to explain the refusal strategies used by the English teachers in Madiun Regency in declining invitation, offer and suggestion.

According to Sadler & Eroz (2001), refusal is negative responses to requests, invitations, suggestions, offers, and the like which are frequently used in our daily lives. It is one of the speech acts in which communication problems commonly occur. It is harder to refuse invitations, offers, and suggestions in a foreign language due to the fact that misunderstandings may arise if one does not use pragmatic knowledge appropriately. Fraser (1990) and Smith (1998) stated that refusals are complicated due to the fact that they are influenced by some social factors, namely, age, gender, level of education, social distance, and power. Refusals also require sequences of negotiation.

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) highlight that refusal, as a complex speech act requires a high level of pragmatic competence to be performed successfully. They classify refusals into two main categories and subcategories of refusal strategies. Two main categories are direct refusals and indirect refusals which refusal responses are segmented into *semantic formulae*: utterances to perform refusals and *adjuncts* to refusals: remarks which by themselves do not express refusals but they go with semantic formulae to provide particular effects to the given refusals. Direct refusals relate to the fact that the speaker expresses his/her inability to conform using negative propositions. Indirect refusals indicate the fact that an invitation, an offer, or a suggestion is indirectly declined.

RESEARCH METHOD

Thirty eighty eight English teachers of Junior high school in Madiun Regency, fourteen males and twenty four females took part as participants in this study. The ages of the teachers ranged between 27 to 50 years old who all of them are strata 1, graduated from state and private universities in East and Central Java. There are 2 teachers have graduated from Postgraduate Program of Language Study.

The data comprise of refusal strategies in declining invitation, offer and suggestion used by the English teachers of Junior high school in Madiun regency, East Java. To know the English teachers' refusal strategies in declining invitation, offer and suggestion, the researcher used questionnaire as an instrument to collect the data. The questionnaire which made up of situations is analyzed to find out the kinds of refusal strategies used by the English teachers in Madiun Regency based on the classification of refusal strategies of Beebe *et al.* (1990). To collect differences strategies used, the researcher gave the situations of refusal by means of a series of discourse completion tasks (DCTs) based on Beebe *et al.* (1990).

The data of refusals in this research were classified into two broad categories and subcategories of refusal strategies based on the taxonomy of refusal proposed by Beebe *et al.* (1990). Two refusal categories are direct and indirect refusal strategies which refusal responses are segmented into *semantic formulae*: utterances to perform refusals and *adjuncts* to refusals: remarks which by themselves do not express refusals but they go with semantic formulae to provide particular effects to the given refusals.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research aimed to probe the issue of refusal to invitations, offers, and suggestions conducted by the English teachers in Madiun regency. Based on the research conducted, the English teachers in Madiun regency applied two semantic formulae *indirect* and *direct strategies* in con-

junction to adjunct identified by Beebe *et al.* (1990) across three refusals acts (invitations, offers and suggestions) to collocutors of higher, equal and lower status. There were also *wish of good time (wig)* found in refusals to invitations and uncategorised strategy in refusals to suggestions.

1. Refusal Strategy in Invitations

In conducting refusal an invitation to a higher status, the participants used *direct strategy* (57.9%) more frequently than *indirect strategies* (42.1%). In conducting *direct strategies*, all participants used inability in which 72.7% consisted of three components of semantic formula and 27.3% four components of semantic formula. The participants (26.1%) more likely to apply [**pos+ apo+ ina± exc**], for example:

- I'd love to, but sorry I can't go. [pos+ apo+ ina](1/m27)*
- I'd love to, but I can't I am very busy [pos+ ina+ exc] (1/f/11)*
- I'd love to, but sorry I can't go I am very busy.[pos+ apo+ ina+exc] (1/f/15)*

Inability was usually preceded by *positive opinion (I'd love to)* (54.6%) as stated in the example above, while some others are preceded by *apology* and by *gratitude*:

- I'm sorry I can't come to your party because next Saturday is my son's birthday. [apo+ ina+ exc](1/f/160)*
- Thanks but I'm sorry I cannot [gra+ apo+ ina] (1/m/30)*

When the participants used *indirect strategy*, all of them used *excuse* as the head act in which 75% of them were preceded by *positive opinion*. The choice of adjuncts *positive opinion/feeling/agreement* were expressed in different wordings, for example:

- It must be a nice party (1/f/2)*
- I'd love to (1/f/4)*
- Sounds interesting (1/m/37)*
- That's great (1/m/38)*

The researcher also found *Wishing have a good time* in declining the invitation to higher status, but in low frequency (2,4%), for example:

- Sounds great, but I have other arrangement. Have fun and do let me know next time you go. [pos+ exc+ wig+ fut] (1/f/8)*

Table 1. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Invitation to a Collocutor of Higher Status on DTC 1

Strategy	Sequential Order			
	1	2	3	4
Direct	Positive	apology	Inability	± Excuse/ ± future
	Positive	Inability	Excuse	± future
Indirect	Positive	Excuse	±Wishing good	± future
	Positive	Apology/±Gratitude	Excuse	

To show the unwillingness to accept an invitation to an equal status, participants used *direct strategy* (62.2%) more often than *indirect strategy* (37.8%). All *direct strategies* were *inability* and 52.2% of them consisted of four components of semantic formula. Most participants (43.5%) used the combination of adjunct [**pos+ apo+ ina+ exc**]. Most *direct strategies* were initiated by *positive opinion* (56.5%), for example:

It sounds nice but sorry, my dear friend, I can't join you because I'm very busy. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc] (2/f/1)

It sounds nice but sorry; I can't join you because I'm very busy. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc] (2/f/4)

While 30.4% of *direct strategy* was preceded by *statement of apology*; 8.7% by *gratitude*; and 4.3% by *pause filler*, for example:

I am sorry my friend, I can't go with you, maybe next time. [apo+ ina+ fut] (2/m/34)

Thank you, but I am sorry. I won't be able to come go with you. [gra+ apo+ ina] (2/f/12)

Oh, it sounds nice, but so sorry, I can't join, I have promised to my children to accompany them to swimming pool, may be next time, ok? [fil+ apo+ ina+ exc+ fut] (2/f/13)

Most the *indirect strategies* were initiated by *positive opinion* (71.4%) in which 50% of them were consisted of two components of semantic formula **pos+ exc**. The *indirect strategy* was mostly *excuses* (85.7%), for example:

Sounds great! But I have to see a dentist. [pos+ exc] (2/f/19)

I'd love to, but I have an appointment with my friend [pos+ exc] (2/f/21)

The researcher found *Wishing have a good time* in declining the invitation to equal status but in low frequency, only 5.1%.

Sound great, but I have other arrangement, we have to attended to weeding party. Have fun! [pos+ exc+ wig] (2/m/31)

Sounds great, but I have visited Sarangan last week. Have fun! [pos+ exc+ wig](2/m/35)

Table 2. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Invitation to a Collocutor of Equal Status on DTC 2

Strategy	Sequential Order				
	1	2	3	4	5
Direct	Positive	apology	Inability	Excuse/± Future	±Future
Indirect	Positive	Excuse	±Wish good time/ ±apology	±Future	-

To refuse the invitation to lower status, participants used *direct strategy* (54.1%) more often than *indirect strategy* (45.9%). All *direct strategy* was *inability* which 45% of them were initiated by *adjunct Positive Opinion*. The dominant sequential order of the *direct strategies* used the combination of adjunct [**pos+ apo+ ina+ exc**] (28.6%), for example:

It is a nice program but sorry I can't go, I am very busy. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc] (2/f/3)
It is a nice program but sorry I can't join with you because I will be busy next month. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc] (3/f/3)

There were 52.9% of *indirect strategies* to decline the invitation to lower status were in conjunction with *positive opinion*. Most of *indirect strategy* (52.9%) consisted of two components of semantic formula in which 33.3% the sequential order of those two components used the combination of *adjunct [pos+ exc]*, for example:

Sounds great! But I have other arrangement. Have fun. [pos+ exc] (3/f/8)
Good idea, but I have to go to Surabaya [pos+ exc] (3/m/28)

The other *indirect strategy* consisted of three components of semantic formula (47.1%) in which 87.5% of those three components had the sequential order **[pos+ apo+ exc]**, for example:

That's great, but I am so sorry, I am busy. [pos+ apo+ exc] (3/f/5)
It would be nice I think, but I'm very sorry I have to prepare my daughter's wedding. [pos+ apo+ exc] (3/f/9)

Only 5.9% of *indirect strategy* consisted of four components of semantic formula with the sequential order **[fill+ pos+ exc+ apo]**:

Well, it's nice but I'm going out of town next month. I'm sorry. [fill+ pos+ exc+ apo] (3/m/29)

Table 3. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Invitation to a Collocutor of lower Status on DTC 3

Strategy	1	2	3	4	5
Direct	Positive	apology	Inability	Excuse/ ±Future	-
	Positive	Excuse	± Wish good time	-	-
Indirect	Positive	apology	Excuse	-	-
	Apology	Excuse	-	-	-

2. Refusal Strategies in Offers

In declining an offer to higher status, the participants used *indirect strategies* (71.1%) highly more frequently than *direct strategies* (28.9%). Most *indirect strategies* were preceded by *gratitude strategy* (74.1%) and mostly used *dissuade* (60.6%). Participants expressed *gratitude* mostly in conventional forms (44.4%): “*Thank you*” and the others modified *gratitude* internally and externally producing more varied strategies of showing appreciation.

There were 66.7% of the *indirect strategies* consisted of two components of semantic formula, 22.2% consisted of three components and 11.1% four components. The participants likely used the sequential order **[gra+ dis]** (40%) and **[gra+ alt]** (35%), for example:

Thank you Sir, but I think I can handle it myself. [gra+ dis](4/f/6)
Thank you Sir, it is not serious. [gra+ dis] (4/f/10)
Thank you very much Sir. I would call a mechanic soon. [gra+ alt](4/f/14)

Thanks for your kindness; I think I call the mechanic.[gra+ alt](4/f/20)

There were only 22.2% of the *indirect strategies* consisted of three components of semantic formula and 11.1% four components of semantic formula, for example:

Thank you very much Sir, but I think I can do it by myself or will bring it to the mechanic.
[gra+ dis+ alt] (4/f/21)

Thanks for your help, but don't worry it will be fine in few minutes. [gra+ dis+ dis](4/f/12)

Oh thanks for your help. I will repair my car at once and I will call my brother. [fil+ gra+ dis+ alt](4/m/25)

To express *direct refusal strategies*, most participants used *no directly strategy* (63.6%) in which 42.9% of them in the preceding position, for example:

No, thank you, I can do it by myself. [no+ gra+ dis] (4/f/24)

No thank. [no+ gra] (4/m/26)

The *inability strategy* was 36.4% of *direct refusal strategy*, for example:

I don't think so, thank you, I would like to call my mechanic. [ina+ gra+ alt] (4/f/7)

Oh thank you for your suggestion Sir, but I don't think so, I would call mechanic soon.
[fil+ gra+ ina](4/f/18)

Table 4. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Offer to a Collocutor of Higher Status on DTC 4

Strategy	Sequential Order		
	1	2	3
Direct	No	No	Gratitude/± Dissuade
	Inability	Inability/filler	Gratitude
Indirect	Gratitude	Dissuade	± Dissuade/±alternative/ ±empathy
	Gratitude	alternative	-

In declining an offer to a collocutor of equal status, the participants used *indirect strategy* more frequently (78.9%) than *direct strategy* (21.1%). The most frequently of the *indirect strategy* used by the participants was *alternative* (58.5%). Most the *indirect strategies* (83.3%) were preceded by adjunct (*gratitude*) in which 33.3% of them had the sequential order [gra+ alt], for example:

Thanks for your kindness. I think I can print it at the computer rental.[gra+ alt](5/f/1)

Thanks for your kindness. I think I can print it at the rental. [gra+ alt](5/f/4)

Half of the *indirect strategies* consisted of three strategies in which 46.7% of them initiated by adjunct (*gratitude*) and ended by indirect (*alternative*), for example:

Thanks for the offer, but I don't want to disturb you. I would rather go to "rental". [gra+ dis+ alt] (5/m/35)

Thank you for your offer, but I am sorry I will use my brother's. [gra+ apo+ alt](5/f/11)

The *indirect strategy* which consisted of four components of semantic formula were Only 6.7% in which all of them had the same sequential order [**fil+ gra+ dis+ alt**], for example:

Oh, thanks, but I don't want to disturb you. I would rather go to rental. [fil+ gra+ dis+ alt](5/f/17)

The *direct strategy* consisted of *no directly strategy* (87.5%) and *inability*. There were 42.9% of *no directly strategy* had the sequential order: [**gra+no+ fut**], for example:

Thank you very much, very kind of you. But not now, next time may be. [gra+ no+ fut] (5/f/2)

Thank you, but not now, next time may be. [gra+ no+ fut] (5/f/)

Most *no directly strategies* were initiated by *no directly* (42.9%) for example:

No thank, anytime [no+ gra+ alt](5/m/26)

Nothing, thanks [no+ gra] (5/m/30)

Only 12.5% of *indirect strategies* were *inability* (ina):

That's very kind of you, but not now perhaps later. [pos+ ina+ fut](5/f/8)

Table 5. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Offer to a Collocutor of Equal Status on DTC 5

Strategy		Sequential Order			
		1	2	3	4
Direct	No	Gratitude	No	Future/ alternative	-
		No	Gratitude/ Dissuade	±Alternative	-
	Inability	Positive	Inability	Future	-
Indirect		Gratitude	Alternative/ Dissuade	±Alternative	-

In declining an offer to those of lower status, *direct strategy* was the most prevalent strategy used by participants (59.5%) in which 95.5% of them was *directly no* strategy. More than half of *direct strategy* consisted of three strategies (54.5%) in which 90.9% of them initiated by *no directly strategy* and 75% of the three strategies had the sequential order [**no+ gra+ dis**], for example:

No thanks, I can manage myself. [no+ gra+ dis] (6/f/5)

No thanks, that's ok. [no+ gra+ dis] (6/f/6)

No thanks, I can manage myself. [no+ gra+ dis] (6/f/7)

The *direct strategies* which consisted of two components of semantic formula were 27.3% in which 50% of them had the sequential order [**Gratitude+No**] and 50% [**No +Gratitude**], for example:

Thank you for your offer, but no. [gra+ no] (6/f/18)

Thank you for your offer, but no. [gra+ no] (6/m/25)

No, thank you [no+ gra] (6/m/27)

Nothing, thanks [no+ gra](6/m/30)

There were only 4.5% of *direct strategy* was *inability* and all *inability* was in conjunction to adjunct *filler and gratitude*:

Owh, thank you, maybe I can't do it by myself. [fil+ gra+ ina](6/f/23)

The participants used *indirect strategy* only 40.5% in declining an offer to lower status in which mostly used *dissuade* (70%), for example:

Thanks, I'll manage it by myself. [gra+ dis] (6/f/9)

Oh thanks dear, I can do it by myself. [fil+ gra+ dis] (6/f/21)

The other *indirect strategies* used by participants in declining an offer to those of lower status were *promise of future acceptance* (10%), *apology* (10%), *excuse* (5%), and *alternative* (5%), for example:

Thank you, but I can bring it by myself, may be next time you can help me. [gra+ dis+ fut] (6/f/3)

Thank a lot; I have finished [gra+ exc] (6/m/28)

Thank you, but I can carry itself. [gra+ alt](6/f/2)

There were 60% of *indirect strategy* consisted of two components of semantic formula and 40% consisted of three components of semantic formula. Most of two components semantic formula (66.7%) were initiated by adjunct (*gratitude*), for example:

Thanks, I'll manage it by myself. [gra+ dis] (6/f/9)

Thank a lot; I have finished [gra+ exc] (6/m/28)

Thank you, but I can carry itself. [gra+ alt](6/f/2)

Table 6. The use of Refusal Strategy in an Offer to a Collocutor of Lower Status on DTC no 6

Strategy	Sequential Order				
	1	2	3	4	
Direct	No	No	Gratitude	Dissuade/±Alternative	-
	Inability	Filler	Gratitude	Inability	-
Direct	Gratitude/ Filler/apology	Gratitude/ ±Dissuade	Dissuade/ Gratitude/Dissuade	-	-

3. Refuse Strategies in Suggestions

Indirect strategy was the most prevalent strategy used by participants to decline a suggestion of higher status (92.1%) in which 42.9% of them consisted of two components of semantic formula and 40% of those two components of semantic formula used the sequential order [**gra+ dis**] and 26.7% [**gra+ alt**], for example:

Thank you Sir, but I think I can fix it soon. [gra+ dis](7/f/6)

Thank you for your suggestion but I will try it again. [gra+ dis] (7/f/22)

Thank you for your attention Sir, but be better I bring my motor bike to the workshop. [gra+ alt](7/f/5)

Thank you for attention Sir; but be better I bring my motor bike to the workshop. [gra+ alt](7/f/7)

There were 45.7% of *indirect strategy* consisted of three components of semantic formula in which 31.3% of them had the sequential order [**gra+ dis+ alt**] and other three components of semantic formula preceded by *dissuade* (25%), 25% by *filler*, 12.5% by *positive opinion*, and 6.3% by *acceptance* for example:

Thanks for your suggestion, but I don't think so. I will call a mechanic home. [gra+ dis+ alt] (7/f/2)

Oh thanks for your suggestion Sir, but I don't think so, I would call a mechanic soon [fil+ dis+ alt] (7/m/32)

That's good idea Sir, but I'm sorry I am still use it tomorrow. [pos+ apo+ exc](7/f/15)

Yes Sir, that's great idea but maybe I can ask Wawan to pick me up.[acc+ pos+ alt](7/f/23)

The direct strategy was only 7.9% in which 66.7% of them were inability and 33.3% were directly no strategies, for example:

I think I will not, I am sorry I can't leave my motorcycle here. [ina+ apo+ dis] (7/f/18)

I think I will not, I am sorry; I have called my mechanic [ina+ apo+ alt] (7/m/35)

No Sir; I will repair it. [no+ dis] (7/f/10)

Table 7. The use of Refusal Strategy in a Suggestion to a Collocutor of Equal Status on DTC 7

Strategy	Sequential Order			
	1	2	3	4
Direct	No	No	Dissuade	-
	Inability	Inability	Apology/ Dissuade	Alternative
Indirect		Gratitude	Dissuade/ Alternative	-
		Gratitude	Dissuade	Alternative

In declining a Suggestion of an equal status, the researcher found that participants employed *indirect strategy* (86.8%) more often than *direct strategy* (13.2%). Most of *indirect* refusal strategies were dominated by *excuse* (68.2%) and 63.6% of *indirect* strategies consisted of two components of semantic formula, for example:

Good suggestion, but this must be finished soon. [pos+ exc] 8/m/34

That's good, but unfortunately this must be finished this week. [pos+ exc] (8/m/36)

The *direct strategy* consisted of *directly no* (60%) and *inability* (40%). Most of *directly no* strategies (66.7%) were in the last slot, for example:

That's a good idea, but no. [pos+ no] (8/f/18)

Thank you for your suggestion, but no. [gra+ no] (8/m/25)

The *inability* was used in conjunction to *adjunct: positive opinion* and also *indirect strategies: apology* (14.3%) and *excuses* (14.3%), for example:

It's very nice, but sorry my dear friend. I can't do it because I have to finished it quickly. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc](8/f/1)

It's very nice, but sorry friend. I can't do it because I have to finish it quickly. [pos+ apo+ ina+ exc](8/f/4)

Table 8. The use of Refusal Strategies in a Suggestion to a Collocutor of Equal Status on DTC 8

Strategy	Sequential Order				
	1	2	3	4	
Direct	No	Positive/Gratitude	No	-	-
	Inability	Positive	Apology	Inability	Excuse
Indirect		Positive/Gratitude	Excuse/Future		-
		Positive	Excuse	Excuse/ Future	-

To express refusal to suggestion of lower status, participants mostly employed *indirect strategy* (67.6%) more frequently than *direct strategy* (32.4%). The *indirect strategies* which consisted of two components of semantic formula were 64% in which 75% of them initiated by *gratitude* and 37.5% had the sequential order [gra+ dis], for example:

Thanks, but I'll just get this done. [gra+ dis] (9/f/5)

Thanks, but I'll just get this done. [gra+ dis] (9/f/7)

There were 28% of *indirect strategies* consisted of three components of semantic formula in which 16% were preceded by *positive opinion* and 8% one component of semantic formula, for example:

That's good idea but I could fix it, thank. [pos+ dis+ gra] (9/f/11)

That's good idea but I could fix it, thank. [pos+ dis+ gra](9/f/15)

I used to apply this on my laptop. [dis](9/f/10)

The *direct strategy* was consisted of *directly no strategy* (75%) and *inability strategy* (25%). Most of *directly no strategies* (66.7%) were in initiated position. The most dominant sequential order of *directly no strategy* were [no+ gra+ alt] (33.3%) and [no+ gra+ dis± alt] (33.3%), for example:

No thanks, I think I could fix it. [no+ gra+ dis] (9/f/8)

No, thanks I will take my laptop to a mechanic. [no+ gra+ alt] (9/f/24)

all of the *inability* had the sequential order [gra+ ina]:

Thanks, but I can't try it now. [gra+ ina] (9/f/2)

Thanks, but I can't try it now. [gra+ ina] (9/f/3)

Table 9. The use of Refusal Strategy in a Suggestion to a Collocutor of Lower Status on DTC 9

Strategy		Sequential Order			
		1	2	3	4
Direct	No	No	Gratitude	Dissuade/ ±Alternative	±Alternative
	Inability	Gratitude	Inability	-	-
Indirect		Gratitude	Dissuade/Apology	-	-
		Positive	Dissuade	Gratitude	

CONCLUSION

The researcher found that the differences and the similarities of refusal strategies conducted by the English teachers of junior high school in Madiun regency in three acts of refusals were not too significant. The English teachers applied two semantic formulae *indirect* and *direct strategies* in conjunction to adjunct identified by Beebe *et al.* (1990) across three refusals acts (invitations, offers and suggestions) to collocutors of higher, equal and lower status. There were also *wish of good time (wig)* found in refusals to invitations and uncategorised strategy in refusals to suggestions. On the whole, the *indirect strategy* was used more frequently than the *direct* one and the dominant *indirect strategy was excuse* but most of refusals strategies were initiated by adjunct *gratitude*. It ensures the researcher that most teachers refused the invitations, offers, and suggestions to three status levels indirectly to be polite, and to show appreciation most of refusals were initiated by adjunct *gratitude*. The *indirect strategy* was the prominent refusal strategy especially in declining offers and suggestions. The *direct strategy* was the highest strategy used in declining invitations.

In declining invitations, the English teachers used a noticeably higher proportion of *direct* refusal strategies than *indirect* ones due to the influence of L1 (negative pragmatic transfer) or simply deviation/ difference (idiosyncratic usage). They did not use *no directly strategy* but they applied *inability* in all *direct strategies*. The most common sequence order of *direct strategies* was *pos+ apo+ ina+ exc/±fut*. *Wishing have a good time (wig)* was also used but in low frequency.

In declining offers, the *indirect strategies* were more frequent used by the English teachers than *direct strategies*. The most frequent adjunct used in declining offers was *gratitude*. The teachers expressed gratitude mostly in conventional forms 'Thank you' and some teachers modified *gratitude* internally and externally producing more varied strategies of showing appreciation.

REFERENCES

- Al-Kahtani, S. W. (2005). Refusals realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University*, 18, 35-57.
- Beebe, L. M., et.al. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

- CelceMurcia, M., Dornyei, Z. and Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6: 535.
- Fraser B, 1990. 'Perspectives on Politeness.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2),219–236. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037821669090081N>.
- Kasper, G. and Rose, K.R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching, in K.R Rose and G.Kasper (eds.). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 112.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional, No: 22 tahun 2006. *Standar Kompetensi Lulusan untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*. Jakarta: 2 Mei 2006. P. 277-278.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, No: 58 tahun 2014. *Kurikulum 2013 Sekolah Menengah Pertama/ Madrasah Tsanawiyah*. Jakarta: 11 Juli 2014. P 3.
- Ramos, J. (1991). *Pragmatic transfer in refusals among Puerto Rican teenagers speaking English*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Sadler, R. & Eröz, B. (2001). "I refuse you: An examination of English refusals by native speakers of English, Lao, and Turkish." University of Minnesota: CARLA.
- Smith, C., 1998. *Can adults 'Just Say No?': how gender, status and social goals affect refusals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida. Downloaded on June 4, 2011 from <http://psychology.usf.edu>.
- Thomas, Jenny. (1983). Crosscultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4: 91112.