

**COMPARATIVE STUDY ON REFUSAL STRATEGIES USED BY
AMERICAN ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS AND INDONESIAN EFL
LEARNERS**

THESIS



By:

SARTIKA

S891508042

**Written as a Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for Graduate Education
Degree of English Language Teaching**

ENGLISH EDUCATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAM

TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY

SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY

2017

APPROVAL
COMPARATIVE STUDY ON REFUSAL STRATEGIES BETWEEN
AMERICAN ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS AND INDONESIAN EFL
LEARNERS

Written by:

SARTIKA
S891508042

This thesis has been approved by the Consultants of Graduate Program of
English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty,
Sebelas Maret University.

Surakarta, August 2017

Consultant I,


Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M. Hum
NIDN 0615035701

Consultant II,


Dr. Sri Marmanto, M.Hum
NIP 195009011986011001

Approved by:

The Head of English Department of Graduate Program
Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Sebelas Maret University


Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd.
NIP 19621231 198803 1009

LEGITIMATION OF THE EXAMINERS

COMPARATIVE STUDY ON REFUSAL STRATEGIES USED BY AMERICAN ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKERS AND INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS

By:
SARTIKA
S891508042

This Thesis has been approved by the Board of Thesis Examiners
of English Education Department of Graduate Program
Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Sebelas Maret University Surakarta
In August 2017

Board of Examiners

1. Chairperson
Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd.
NIP 19621231 198803 1009
2. Secretary
Dr. Abdul Asib, M.Pd.
NIP 19520307 1980031005
3. Examiner 1
Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M. Hum
NIDN 0615035701
4. Examiner 2
Dr. Sri Marmanto, M.Hum
NIP 195009011986011001

Signatures

(.....)

(.....)

(.....)

(.....)

Legalized by

The Dean of Teacher Training and
Education Faculty of Sebelas Maret
University,



Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M.Pd.
NIP 19610124 198702 1001

The Head of English Department of
Graduate Program of Teacher Training
and Education Faculty of Sebelas
Maret University,

Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd.
NIP 19621231 198803 1009

PRONOUNCEMENT

This is to certify that I myself write this thesis entitled "Comparative Study on Refusal Strategies Used By American English Native Speakers And IndonesianEfl Learners". It is not a product of plagiarism or made by others. Anything related to others' works is written in quotation, the sources of which are listed on the list of references.

If then this pronouncement proves false, I am ready to accept any academic punishment including the withdrawl or cancelation of my academic degree.

Surakarta, August 2017



Sartika

MOTTO

“Fighting has been enjoined upon you while it is hateful to you. But perhaps you hate a thing and it is good for you; and perhaps you love a thing and it is bad for you. And Allah knows, while you know not”

Al-Baqarah : 216

DEDICATION

I fully dedicate this thesis to:

- *My beloved emak and bapak (Zohrah and M. Ali Boya) who love and pray for me unconditionally.*
- *My beloved brother (Samsul Hidayat) and all of my sisters (Ka' Cuk, Ka' Lin, Qistina and Salwa) their support and motivation.*
- *All of my nieces (Haddad, Gian and Ar-Razi) and my nephew (Erin)*
- *My beloved Grand ma(Abe Daya)*
- *My best supporters (Ka' Iga, Ka' Rin and Mbak Oning)*
- *My enemy (Pieer)*
- *All Sebelas Maret LPDP squadss*
- *All of wisma kiky's squad for their support and kindness*
- *For someone that always lives in my heart and my head*

ABSTRACT

Sartika. S891508042.2017. *Comparative Study on Refusal Strategies between American English Native Speakers and Indonesian EFL Learners*. A Thesis. First Consultant: Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M.Hum; Second Consultant: Dr. Sri Marmanto, M.Hum. English Education Department, Graduate Program, Sebelas Maret University.

The purpose of this research is to explore types of refusal strategies used by American English Native Speakers and Indonesian EFL Learners. This study is descriptive qualitative research. Twenty participants consisting of American English Native Speakers and Indonesian EFL Learners contributed in this study. The data are gathered from DCT and interview. In order to get trustworthiness of the data, source of triangulation, member checking and external audit are applied. Then, the data are analyzed using Flowchart Model proposed by Miles and Huberman. The results show that: (1) both groups use eleven refusal strategies namely *direct no, inability, avoidance, hedging, excuse, wish, statement of alternative, promise of future acceptance, statement of regret, acceptance that function as refusal and set condition for past acceptance*; (2) it is also found some similarities and differences of refusal strategies between American English Native Speaker and Indonesian EFL Learners. In term of similarities, it is uncovered eight of refusal strategies shared between the groups. Those are *direct no, inability, postponement, excuse, statement of alternative, statement of regret, wish and lack of enthusiasm*. Besides, the differences of refusal strategies between American English Native Speaker and Indonesian EFL Learners are uncovered. Those are *hedging, promise of future acceptance and set condition for past acceptance*; (3) the effect of social status on the choice of refusal strategies between American English Native Speaker and Indonesian EFL Learners are almost the same. Both struggle to show their politeness by extending their utterances when they refuse the speakers' need. Furthermore, they also vary their refusal strategies in their utterances based on the interlocutors level of social status.

Keywords: *refusal strategies, EFL Learners, pragmatic*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillahrabbi'l'amin.

All praise be to Allah, with Him there is nothing impossible. May the peace and blessings of Allah be upon Prophet Muhammad, His last Messenger, the noblest man who taught mankind to never lose hope. I realize that I would never have been able to finish my thesis without the guidance and support from many people. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to:

1. Prof. Dr. JokoNurkamto., as the Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, for his permission write this thesis.
2. Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd., as the Head of English Department of Graduate Program for his support and approval to do the research for this thesis.
3. Prof. Dr. Endang, M. Hum., as the first consultant, for her great guidance, patience, and time to make this thesis better.
4. Dr. Sri Marmanto, M.Hum., as the second consultant, for his great comment, suggestions, and advices in this thesis.
5. LPDP scholarship which has been fully funded of my study for this two years.
6. All the participants contributed in my study especially for Rohmayanti who facilitated me to get the data from American English Native Speakers.
7. All friends of English Department of 2015 for their great support and love.
8. All the writer's friends whose names cannot be mention one by one.

Hopefully, this thesis could be useful and beneficial for all readers. The researchers would accept every comment and suggestion gratefully.

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE	i
APPROVAL	ii
LEGITIMATION	iii
PRONOUNCEMENT	iv
MOTTO	v
DEDICATION	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
TABLE OF CONTENT	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study.....	1
B. Problem of Statement.....	5
C. Objectives of the Study.....	5
D. The benefit of the Study.....	6

CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Related Theories	7
1. Pragmatics	7
2. Speech Situation.....	8
3. Speech Act.....	9
4. Speech Event.....	13
5. Politeness.....	13
6. Speech Act of Refusal	17
7. Refusal Strategies	18
8. Factors Contribute to The Choice of Refusal.....	21
9. Native Speakers of English versus English Foreign Language Learners.....	22
B. Previous Study	23

CHAPTER 3 : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Types of the Study	33
B. Subject of the Study	33
C. Technique of Collecting Data	34
D. Procedure of Data Collection.....	35
E. Trustworthiness	35
F. Technique of Analyzing Data	36

CHAPTER 4 : RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Findings	38
1. Types of Refusal Strategies Used by AENS and IEL	38
2. Similarities and Differences of Refusal Strategies Used by AENS and IEL	52
3. The Effect of Social Status on Choice of Refusal Strategies	63
B. Discussion	65
1. Types of Refusal Strategies Used by AENS and IEL	65
2. Differences and Similarities of Refusal Strategies Used by AENS and IEL	66
3. The Effect of Social Status on Choice of Refusal Strategies Used by AENS and IEL	68

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion	70
B. Pedagogical Implications	71
C. Suggestions	71

REFERENCES	74
-------------------------	----

APPENDICES	76
-------------------------	----

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 DCT	76
Appendix 2 Interview Questions.....	80
Appendix 3a Interview scrip of AENS	81
Appendix 3b Interview scrip of IEL	86
Appendix 4 Respond of AENS and IEL's DCT	94