

REFUSALS STRATEGIES ON FACEBOOK AMONG
PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

NARINDER KAUR A/P BAKHTAWAR SINGH

RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

FEBRUARI 2013

**REFUSALS STRATEGIES ON FACEBOOK AMONG
PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN**

NARINDER KAUR A/P BAKHTAWAR SINGH

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

FEBRUARI 2013

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: **Narinder Kaur a/p** (I.C/Passport No: **711108-08-6098**)

Bakhtawar Singh

Registration/Matric No: **TGB080033**

Name of Degree: **Master of English as a Second Language**

Title of Research Report (“this Work”):

Refusals Strategies on Facebook among Primary School Children

Field of Study:

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya (“UM”), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate’s Signature
Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Date

Witness’s Signature
Name: **Dr. Thilagavathi Shanmuganathan**
Designation: **Supervisor**

Date

ABSTRACT

This study investigates refusal strategies on *Facebook* among primary school children. Based on a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) which has twelve situations, thirty school-going children aged between 11 and 12 years old were asked to construct refusals for the various situations given. For this study, a group of 30 students were asked to respond to the situations where refusals to requests, refusals to suggestions, refusals to invitations and refusals to offers were made. The study aims to explore the types of refusal strategies frequently used by primary school children and what strategies are most revealed in the response to refusals used in the situations given within different settings such as family, formal and social. The data were analyzed and categorized according to the refusal taxonomy by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). It is found that these primary school children employed more indirect strategies compared to the direct strategies. The high frequency in the use of indirect strategies demonstrates that the subjects were aware of the fact that the use of indirect strategies lessens the face-threatening effect of the speech act of refusals. In fact the indirect strategies, “statement of alternative” enjoyed the highest frequency in the family settings while the indirect strategies “excuse, reasons and explanation” enjoyed the highest frequency in the formal and social settings. Finally, the possible justifications behind the variations in the productions of refusals are discussed.

Key words: speech act, refusals, family settings, formal setting, social settings

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini mengkaji tindaktutur penolakan melalui *Facebook* oleh kanak-kanak sekolah rendah. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan dua belas situasi dari “Ujian Pelengkapan Wacana” (DCT) di mana seramai tiga puluh orang murid sekolah rendah lingkungan umur 11 dan 12 tahun telah melakukan tindaktutur penolakan berdasarkan situasi-situasi yang berlainan. 30 orang murid ini telah diminta untuk memberi reaksi berkenaan situasi-situasi di mana penolakan terhadap permintaan, cadangan, undangan dan tawaran dilakukan. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menerokai strategi-strategi tindaktutur penolakan yang kerap digunakan oleh murid-murid sekolah rendah dan apakah jenis-jenis strategi yang menonjol dalam reaksi mereka apabila persekitaran berlainan dalam situasi-situasi yang diberi seperti persekitaran bersama keluarga, persekitaran rasmi dan persekitaran sosial. Data yang dikumpulkan, telah dianalisa dan dikategorikan berdasarkan taxonomi penolakan oleh Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990). Didapati murid-murid sekolah rendah ini lebih menggunakan strategi tidak langsung berbanding dengan strategi langsung. Frekuensi tinggi dalam penggunaan strategi tidak langsung mendemonstrasikan bahawa murid-murid ini sedar akan hakikat penggunaan strategi tidak langsung ini dapat mengurangkan kesan pengancaman-muka dalam tindak tutur penolakan. Malahan, strategi tidak langsung, “pernyataan alternatif” juga memperoleh frekuensi tertinggi dalam persekitaran bersama keluarga manakala strategi tidak langsung, “alasan, sebab dan penjelasan” memperoleh frekuensi tertinggi dalam persekitaran rasmi dan persekitaran sosial. Akhirnya, justifikasi yang mungkin di sebalik variasi dalam pengeluaran penolakan adalah dibincangkan.

Kata kunci: tindak tutur, penolakan, persekitaran keluarga, persekitaran rasmi dan persekitaran sosial

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this research report, I would take this opportunity to thank a few people who have helped me and made it possible for me through the numerous challenges faced. Firstly, my gratitude goes to my Supervisor, Dr. Thilagavathi Shanmuganathan for her academic guidance throughout the entire process of writing this research report.

I would also like to acknowledge the help extended by the group of students who were my participants and without their sincere help and cooperation; this work would have never been completed.

Finally, this research report is dedicated to my loving family members especially to my dearest husband, my beloved children and my parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	i
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLES OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Speech Acts	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Purpose of the Study	5
1.5 Research Questions	6
1.6 Significance of the Study	7
1.7 Organization of the Study	8

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Direct Speech Act	10
2.3 Indirect Speech Act	11
2.3.1 Speech Act, Face and Politeness	12
2.4 Methodologies in Speech Act Research	15
2.5 Research on Refusals	17
2.6 Classifications of Refusal Strategies	19
2.6.1 Direct Strategies	20
2.6.2 Indirect Strategies	20
2.7 Family, formal and social domains	26
2.7.1 Family domains	26
2.7.2 Formal domains	27
2.7.3 Social domains	27
2.8 <i>Facebook</i>	28
2.9 Summary	29

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 Participants	31
3.3 Data	31
3.4 Data Collection Procedures	32
3.5 Data Analysis	34
3.6 Types of Refusals and the Strategies	36
3.7 Summary	37

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction	38
4.2 Research Question Number One	38
4.2.1 Types and Frequency of Refusal Strategies	39
4.2.1.1 Direct Strategies	40
4.2.1.2 Indirect Strategies	43
4.2.1.3 Avoidance Strategies to Refusals	46
4.3 Refusal Strategies with respect to their Initiating Acts	48
4.3.1 Number of Refusal Strategies Based on their Initiating Acts	48
4.4 Research Question Number Two	49
4.4.1 Refusal Strategies indifferent Relationship Types	49
4.4.2 The Effects of Family Domain on Refusals	50

4.4.3 The Effects of Formal Domain on Refusals	52
4.4.4 The Effects of Social Domain on Refusals	53
4.5 Summary	55
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
5.1 Introduction	57
5.2 Summary of the Findings	57
5.2.1 Strategies frequently used by Primary School Children (Research Question Number One)	57
5.2.2 Strategies frequently used in different domains (Research Question Two)	58
5.3 Conclusion	60
5.3.1 Implications of the Study	61
5.3.2 Suggestions for Further Research	62
5.4 Limitations	62
REFERENCES	63-67
APPENDECIS	68-88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Types of Refusals and the Strategies	37
Table 4.1: Refusal Frequency	39
Table 4.2: The Types of Refusal Strategies Used In DCT	40
Table 4.3: Direct Refusal Strategies	41
Table 4.4: Types and Frequency of Indirect Refusal Strategies	44
Table 4.5: Avoidance Strategies	46
Table 4.6: Types of Refusals Used	49
Table 4.7: Refusal Strategies used within the Family Domain	50
Table 4.8: Refusal Strategies used within Formal Domain	52
Table 4.9: Refusal Strategies used within Social Domain	54

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

A Speech Act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. Some examples of speech acts are apology, greetings, requests, complaints, invitations, compliments or refusals. A speech act might contain just one word such as ‘*No*’ to perform a refusal or several words or a set of sentences such as: “I’m sorry, I can’t, I have a prior engagement”. It is important to mention that speech acts include real-life interactions and require not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language under appropriate circumstances.

From the list of the various speech acts, the speech act of refusal was selected for the present study. Refusals are of interest due to their typically complex constructions. They are often negotiated over several turns and involve some degree of indirectness. In addition to this, their form and content tends to vary depending on the type of speech act that elicits them (requests, offer, etc.) and the status of the participants (Beebe et al., 1990, p. 56). Refusals have been called a “major cross-cultural ‘sticking point’ for many non-native speakers” Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, (1990). Due to their inherently face threatening nature, refusals are of an especially sensitive nature and a pragmatic breakdown in this act may easily lead to unintended offense and/or breakdown in communication.

Refusals are recognized as face-threatening acts by Brown and Levinson (1987) because the speaker is making an attempt to refuse to engage in an act initiated by the interlocutor, Chen, Ye and Zhang (1995). Refusals are complicated because they are influenced by several social factors including gender, age, and level of education, power and social

distance (Fraser 1990; Smith 1998). The present study also looks into the status of the participants from the scope of three different domains which are based on family, formal and social distance.

1.2 Speech Acts

This study is grounded in the speech act theory since it investigates how L2 speakers perform the speech act of refusal which is divided into four categories: refusals to (1) requests, (2) invitations, (3) offers, and (4) suggestions. Speech act theory developed from the philosophy of language Austin (1962); Searle (1969, 1975, 1979, 1992).

For Austin (1962), speech acts or “doing things with words” are what we do exactly with words. According to Austin (1962), communication refers to a series of communicative/speech acts. People use these communicative/speech acts in daily conversations to achieve a communicative goal. Therefore, when we say something, we automatically perform a communicative act/action (Austin, 1962). Examples of speech acts are apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, requests, refusals, offers, suggestions and many others. Austin (1962) identifies three distinct levels of action beyond the act of utterance itself. He distinguishes the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, and what one does by saying it, and dubs these the 'locutionary', the 'illocutionary' and the 'perlocutionary' act, respectively.

A locutionary act refers to the act of 'saying something' in the full normal sense. “In performing a locutionary act we shall also be performing such an act as: asking or answering a question; giving some information or an assurance or a warning; announcing a verdict or an intention; giving sentence; making an appointment or an appeal or a criticism; making an identification or giving a description” Austin, (1975). For instance, in the

utterance “You should stop drinking”, the referring expression is *you* and the predicating expression is *stop drinking alcohol*.

An illocutionary act refers to an utterance that accomplishes something in the act of speaking. In the speech act theory proposed by Austin (1962), an utterance involves not only the simple ‘locutionary’ act of producing a grammatical sentence, but also an ‘illocutionary force’ of effectiveness either as an affirmation or as a promise, a threat, or a warning.

A perlocutionary act refers to an act performed by saying something, and not in saying something. Persuading, angering, inciting, comforting and inspiring are often perlocutionary acts; but they would never begin an answer to the question ‘What did she say?’ Perlocutionary acts, in contrast with locutionary and illocutionary acts, which are governed by conventions, are not conventional but natural acts Austin (1955). “In the perlocutionary instance, an act is performed by saying something. For example, if someone shouts ‘fire’ and by that act causes people to exit a building which they believe to be on fire, they have performed the perlocutionary act of convincing other people to exit the building.

Locution is the actual words that are uttered, illocution refers to the force that makes it a particular act, and perlocution is the effect of the illocution on the hearer to carry out the particular act. Searle (1979) further developed and systematized Austin’s (1962) theory on speech acts where a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts, indirect speech acts being utterances that are understood from the context without mentioning the act itself .

Searle argues that in order to understand indirect speech acts, the speaker and hearer need to have mutually shared factual background information, and the ability of the hearer to make inferences Searle (1975). Searle’s speech act theory greatly influenced research in

the field of pragmatics. Searle (1975) has set up the following classification of illocutionary speech acts from the speaker's viewpoint. The classification includes:

Assertives: speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, (e.g. reciting a creed)

- 1) Directives: speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, (e.g. requests, commands and advice)
- 2) Commissives: speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, (e.g. promises and oaths)
- 3) Expressives: speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, (e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanks)
- 4) Declarations: speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, (e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone husband and wife)

1.3 Statement of the problem

Refusals are complex speech acts that require not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements, but also "face saving maneuvers to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act (Gass & Houck 1999, Fe'lix-Brasdefer 2006). Various studies relating to refusals in English were research focused on western languages which was carried by Beebe et al, (1990); Chen, (1996) and Fe'lix-Brasdefer, (2006) which has shown refusing a person of higher power is even more difficult than refusing a person of equal or lower power status. This could be due to the statuses and their position.

In this study, the researcher focuses on the refusal strategies that were used mainly by children who are attending their primary education. The researcher would also like to look into the types of refusal strategies frequently used by primary school children and what

strategies are most revealed in the response to refusals used in the situations given within different settings such as family, formal and social.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

This study investigates the speech act of refusals to the initiating acts of requests, suggestions, invitations and offers produced by primary school children using Discourse Completion Test (DCT) through *Facebook*. The reason for choosing these refusals acts to requests, suggestions, invitations and offers are that these responses are commonly used in their daily communication.

The study aims at focusing on the strategies used by primary school children in refusals and whether different situations affect the production of the refusals. This study on refusal strategies is significant as previous studies have focused only on adult interlocutors and little has been done to explore the refusal strategies used by children. The focus on these refusal strategies were carried out because speech acts are difficult to perform in a second language as learners may not know the idiomatic expressions or cultural norms in the second language or they may transfer their first language rules and conventions into the second language, assuming that such rules are universal. Pragmatic transfer here refers to: "[Interlanguage] reflects the learner's evolving system of rules, and results from a variety of processes, including the influence of the first language ('transfer'), contrastive interference from the target language, and the overgeneralization of newly encountered rules." Crystal, (1997).

No doubt the students who were the subjects in this research use English to communicate with their friends but English is a L2 language for them. Therefore these subjects may respond in their own pragmatic understanding which might or could not be understood or accepted by other L2 users or even the English native speakers. "The interlocutor must

know when to use the appropriate form and its function depending on the community and its cultural-linguistic values (Al-Kahtani, 2005).

1.5 Research Questions

The study addresses the following two research questions:

1. What strategies are most revealed in the response to refusals used in the situations given by primary school children?
2. Do family, formal and social settings affect the production of refusals between the interactants?

The first research question is to look into the strategies frequently used when these subjects have to refuse the situations given. This is because from research done, not all languages or cultures refuse in the same way nor do they feel comfortable refusing the same invitation or suggestion. According to Al-Eryani (2007), the speech act of refusal occur when a speaker directly or indirectly says ‘no’ to request or invitation. He states that refusal is a face-threatening act to the listener/ requester/ inviter, because it contradicts his or her expectations, and is often realized through indirect strategies. Thus, it requires a high level of pragmatic competence. Chen (1996) (in Al-Eryani: 2007) used strategies to analyze speech act sets of refusal (refusing requests, invitations, offers and suggestions), and concluded that direct refusal such as “NO” was not a common strategy for any of the subjects, regardless of their language background. For example, an expression of regret, common in Americans’ refusals, was generally produced by the Chinese speakers, which might lead to unpleasant feelings between speakers in an American context.

In this study, the second research question looks into family, formal and social settings between the interactants and how they affect the production of refusals. This research question is related to a research done by Al-Shawali (1997) who studied the semantic

formulas used by Saudi and American male undergraduate students in the speech act of refusal. The findings of his study show that Americans and Saudis use similar refusal formulas except in the use of direct refusals. He found that the two groups adopted similar strategies when addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions. In this case, the subjects rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies. However, when requests are addressed to people in lower positions the Arabic sample shows a marked tendency towards using more direct request strategies in performing their request than the British sample.

In contrast, Americans in these situations make a distinction along the lines of social distance by responding in a brief and unelaborated fashion to both higher and lower unequal status while offering much longer and more detailed responses to peers. In their analysis of strategies for refusing, they classify refusals into direct and indirect refusals. Saudi and Americans also differ in the use of semantic formulas in the content of their refusals; Saudis are found to use avoidance strategies (e.g., postponement and hedge) or they give unspecified answers. This refusal strategy was used according to their social status in the situation, higher, equal or lower and according to the situation itself, a request, an offer, an invitation or a suggestion.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is important as it investigates how refusal strategies are used in interactions occurring in *Facebook* among young children. It has also highlighted the significance of the speech act of refusals and demonstrated that the speech act of refusals is governed by a systematic set of community-specific rules. Violation or ignorance of these rules is bound to create serious communication problems and widen the social distance between the interacting individuals and groups.

Refusals are important because of their communicatively central place in everyday communication. In many cultures, when one answers a direct ‘no’, this is probably more important than the answer itself. Therefore, sending and receiving a message of ‘no’ is a task that needs special skills whereas, according to Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey (1988), the direct/indirect dimension refers to the “extent speakers reveal their intentions through explicit communication. A direct style of communication refers to explicitly stating one’s feelings, wants, and needs; the speaker says what he or she means. An indirect style, on the other hand, refers to verbal messages that camouflage and conceal speakers’ true intentions in terms of their wants, needs, and goals in the discourse situation” Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey (1988).

This study will perhaps provide pragmatic linguists and people in general with useful insights on the type of refusal strategies used by Malaysian children when they refuse the DCT situations given, either in a direct style or in an indirect style via *Facebook*. In this sense, this study will perhaps be an interesting addition to the existing research studies in pragmatic linguistics. This study will justify the strategies and classifications of refusal strategies used by the non-native English speakers among these children. To compare the pragmatic differences in the speech act of refusal between children and their gender would also be very interesting.

1.7 Organization of the study

This research report consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the introduction of this research report, speech acts, the problem of the study, the purpose of the study, the research questions and the significance of the study. The chapter ends with information on the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 reviews previous studies on the speech act of refusal, especially those examining the factors under investigation of the study, i.e. the strategy use in relation to the interlocutor's domains; family, formal and friends. The review helps form the theoretical background for the study.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology used in the study, including the introduction, the research participants, the data, the data collection procedures, the data analysis and the summary of this chapter. The coding framework and data analysis are also presented in this chapter.

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the results of the study with regard to the strategies used by these primary school children and the types of refusals done based on three different domains; family, formal and friends.

Chapter 5 summarizes the major findings of the study, gives implications for refusals in speech acts, points out the limitations of the study and suggests areas for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the literature on speech acts, and refusals with reference to the two different strategies commonly used which are the direct strategy and the indirect strategy reviewed. Besides that, the refusal strategies used in the three different domains of family, formal and social settings are also looked into.

2.2 Direct Speech Act

There are three basic types of direct speech acts, and they correspond to three special syntactic types that seem to occur in most of the world's languages which are assertions, questions and orders. Assertions, questions and orders are fairly universal, and most of the world's languages have separate syntactic constructions that distinguish them, other speech acts (a) *If you cross that line, I'll shoot you!* Threat, (b) *If you get all A's, I'll buy you a car!* Promise, and (c) *If you heat water to 212 degrees Fahrenheit, it will boil.* Stating causality, do not have a syntactic construction that is specific to them. (Searle, 1969).

A consideration of the syntactic means available for expressing the various speech acts leads us to see that even for the three basic speech acts, speakers may choose means of expression other than the basic syntactic type associated with the speech act in question. To some extent, this just reflects the existence of a diversity of means of expression, but a more pervasive reason is that speakers may use indirect rather than direct speech acts. (Searle, 1991)

2.3 Indirect Speech Act

Indirect speech acts are commonly used to reject proposals and to make requests. For example, a speaker asks, "Would you like to meet me for coffee?" and another replies, "I have class." The second speaker used an indirect speech act to reject the proposal. This is indirect because the literal meaning of "I have class" does not entail any sort of rejection.

Searle (1969) has introduced the notion of an 'indirect speech act', which in his account is meant to be, more particularly, an indirect 'illocutionary' act. Applying a conception of such illocutionary acts according to which they are (roughly) acts of saying something with the intention of communicating with an audience, he describes indirect speech acts as follows: "In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer." ((ibid, 180-182)) An account of such act, it follows, will require such things as an analysis of mutually shared background information about the conversation, as well as of rationality and linguistic conventions.

In connection with indirect speech acts, Searle (1969) introduces the notions of 'primary' and 'secondary' illocutionary acts. The primary illocutionary act is the indirect one, which is not literally performed. The secondary illocutionary act is the direct one, performed in the literal utterance of the sentence (Searle 178). In the example:

(1) Speaker X: "We should leave for the show or else we'll be late."

(2) Speaker Y: "I am not ready yet."

Here the primary illocutionary act is Y's rejection of X's suggestion, and the secondary illocutionary act is Y's statement that she is not ready to leave. By dividing the illocutionary act into two subparts, Searle (1975) is able to explain that we can understand

two meanings from the same utterance all the while knowing which the correct meaning to respond to.

2.3.1 Speech Acts, Face and Politeness

Overall, refusals are complex speech acts that require not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements, but also “face saving manoeuvres to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act.” (Gass & Houck, 1999, p.2; Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; p. 2160). Beebe et al. (1990) also commented that the risk of face-threat is so inherent to the speech act of refusal that some degree of indirectness is usually required. Also, refusals are sensitive to context variables such as relative status and distance of the interlocutors. They consist of a sequence of semantic formulae, varying in content, order, and frequency, depending on the eliciting speech act (invitation, request, offer, or suggestion). Communication difficulties occur when conversationalists do not share the same knowledge of the subtle rules governing conversations. Scarcella (1990) ascribes high frequency of such difficulties to the fact that “nonnative speakers, when conversing, often transfer the conversational rules of their first language into the second” (p.338).

Indirect speech act has always been linked with politeness when it comes to Pragmatics. Researches such as Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), Leech (1983), and Searle (1976) have connected indirectness as a feature of politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) refer “Face” (as in “lose face”) to a speaker's sense of linguistic and social identity. Any speech act may impose on this sense, and is therefore face threatening. And speakers have strategies for lessening the threat. Positive politeness means being complimentary and gracious to the addressee (but if this is overdone, the speaker may alienate the other party). Negative politeness is found in ways of mitigating the imposition:

- Hedging: Er, could you, er, perhaps, close the, um , window?
- Pessimism: I don't suppose you could close the window, could you?
- Indicating deference: Excuse me, sir, would you mind if I asked you to close the window?
- Apologizing: I'm terribly sorry to put you out, but could you close the window?
- Impersonalizing: The management requires all windows to be closed. (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 131)

In their theory, communication is seen as potentially dangerous and antagonistic. The strength of their approach over that of Leech (1983) is that they explain politeness by deriving it from more fundamental notions of what it is to be a human being. The basic notion of their model is “face”. This is defined as “the public self-image that every member (of society) wants to claim for himself”. In their framework, face consists of two related aspects.

- One is negative face, or the rights to territories, freedom of action and freedom from imposition - wanting your actions not to be constrained or inhibited by others.
- The other is positive face, the positive consistent self-image that people have and their desire to be appreciated and approved of by at least some other people.

The rational actions people take to preserve both kinds of face, for themselves and the people they interact with, add up to politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) also argue that in human communication, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another's face continuously. The present research, however, takes a deeper look at refusals in strategies used and how different settings between the interactants affect the production of refusals. Indirectly, the researcher also does look into the occurrence of maintaining one

another's face by these primary school children through the refusal responses done in the DCT situations.

In everyday conversation, we adapt our conversation to different situations. Among friends we take liberties or say things that would seem discourteous among strangers. And we avoid over-formality with friends. In both situations we try to avoid making the hearer embarrassed or uncomfortable. Face-threatening acts (FTAs) are acts that infringe on the hearers' need to maintain his/her self-esteem, and be respected. Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTAs.

Brown and Levinson (1987), sum up human politeness behaviour based on four strategies, which correspond to these examples: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record-indirect strategy.

- The bald on-record strategy does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer's "face"
- The positive politeness strategy shows you recognize that your hearer has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity.
- The negative politeness strategy also recognizes the hearer's face. But it also recognizes that you are in some way imposing on them. Some other examples would be to say, "I don't want to bother you but..." or "I was wondering if..."
- Off-record indirect strategies take some of the pressure off of you. You are trying to avoid the direct FTA of asking for a beer. Instead you would rather it be offered to you once your hearer sees that you want one.

These strategies are not universal - they are used more or less frequently in other cultures. For example, in some eastern societies; such as the Saudi communities, the off-record-indirect strategy will place on your hearer a social obligation to give you anything you admire. So speakers learn not to express admiration for expensive and valuable things in homes that they visit.

2.4 Methodologies in Speech Act Research

In pragmatic researches, many different types of method of data collection have been used. Researches related to speech act commonly use different types of questionnaires such as open ended, close ended and many more but yet the very common type of data collection is through the DCT which is the abbreviation for Discourse Completion Test. DCT has been proved to be an effective means of gathering a large amount of data in a relatively short period of time according to researches such as Wolfson, (1989); Beebe et al., (1990); Beebe and Cumming, (1996).

Using the DCT in a research based on the phenomenon of socio cultural transfer and its motivating factors within the realization patterns of the speech act of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners was done by Al-Issa, A. (2003). In this research EFL refusal data were collected using a discourse completion test (DCT), which was designed and further developed based on observational field note data. The DCT was then followed by semi-structured interviews. Using semantic formulas as units of analysis, EFL refusal responses were compared with similar data elicited from native speakers of English responding in English and native speakers of Arabic responding in Arabic. The results showed three areas in which socio cultural transfer appeared to influence the EFL learners' selection of semantic formulas, the length of their responses, and the content of the semantic formulas. The cases of transfer were seen to reflect cultural values transferred from Arabic to

English. On the basis of the interview data, it was determined that the learners pride in their LI, their perceptions of the L2, and their religious values all played a role in the socio-cultural transfer that was found. In this study, the researcher use the DCT questionnaires where 12 refusal situations were given and sent to the subjects *Facebook* message column since the trend of children on *Facebook* seem to be increasing.

Another research administered a discourse completion test (based on Beebe *et al.*, 1990), with 12 items on refusals to requests given to 40 British English speakers was done by Kitao, S. K. (1996). The magnitude of the request (large and small request), status of the interlocutors (higher, equal, and lower than the speaker), and the closeness of the interlocutors (close or distant) was manipulated in the DCT instrument.

A few other researches such as Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002) did a study investigating similarities and differences between Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals using a modified version of the discourse completion test (DCT) developed by Beebe *et al.* (1990). Refusals were selected because they were considered more of a face-threatening act in Arabic because the Egyptians are more status-conscious than Americans. An interviewer read each situation aloud to the subjects and asked them to respond verbally on audiotape. Also, oral data were seen as more consistent with Arab behavior with the distinction between spoken and literary Arabic. The findings, however, suggest that although methods such as the DCT may be appropriate for collecting pragmalinguistic data, they fail to reveal the sociopragmatic complexities of face-threatening acts such as refusals. The Egyptians indicated that they would not make refusals in some of these situations, like refusing an invitation from the boss.

Sadler and Eroz (2001) used the written refusal DCT developed by Beebe *et al.* (1990) as the data collection instrument in an examination of English refusals by NSEs, Laotian and Turkish. Although in this research, all the respondents tended to use excuses, explanations

or reasons with a statement of regret preceding or following the reasons or excuses, the Turkish subjects refused a bit less than the others. The Turkish and American subjects used pause fillers and then statements of gratitude and appreciation, while the Laotian respondents used more statements of regret followed by adjuncts.

The present study uses DCT because some natural situations to which the respondents are expected to respond making refusals could be done using DCT which were sent to them via their *Facebook* message column. The DCT has been proved to be an effective means of gathering a large amount of data in a relatively short period of time according to Wolfson, (1989); Beebe et al., (1990); Beebe and Cumming, (1996). Another reason is also due to the time constraint of the present study, so the DCT is a proper solution.

2.5 Research on Refusals

Refusals, like other speech acts, occur in all languages. A refusal is a negative response to an offer, request, invitation and suggestion. Refusals are important because of their communicatively central place in everyday communication. Rejecting requests appropriately involves not only linguistic knowledge, but also pragmatic knowledge. One may have a wide range of vocabulary and a sound knowledge of grammar, but misunderstandings may still arise if one does not apply pragmatic knowledge appropriately.

To investigate the evidence of pragmatic transfer in Japanese ESL learners' refusals, Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz (1990) compared refusal strategies used by Japanese ESL learners to those used by Americans. They also tested the differences in the order, frequency, and content of semantic formulas used by Japanese and Americans. They found evidence of transfer in all three areas (Beebe et al., 1990). Chen (1996) used semantic formula to analyze speech act sets of refusal (refusing requests, invitations, offers and

suggestions) produced by American and Chinese speakers of English. She found that direct refusal was not a common strategy for any of the subjects, regardless of their language background. When Chinese speakers wanted to refuse requests, they expressed positive opinion (e.g., 'I would like to...') much less frequently than American English since Chinese informants were concerned that if they ever expressed positive opinions, they would be forced to comply (Liao and Bressnahan, 1996).

There are few empirical studies on speech act behavior involving the Arabic language and even native speakers of Arabic. Umar (2004) studied the request strategies as used by Advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language as compared to those strategies used by British native speakers of English. He found that the two groups adopted similar strategies when addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions. In this case, the subjects rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies. However, when requests are addressed to people in lower positions the Arabic sample shows a marked tendency towards using more direct request strategies in performing their request than the British sample.

Another study done by Jia Yang (2008) regarding 'How to Say 'No' in Chinese which was based on 160 video clips collected from five television series also found that refusal is initiated by four types of acts: request, offer, invitation and suggestion in which each type of these acts could be subcategorized in terms of their different communicative functions. Another study done by Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar, Salasih Che Lah and Raja Rozina Suleiman (2010) also used the refusal taxonomy by Beebe et al (1990) to determine the strategies used and the frequencies of their use. The results from their research showed variation in the frequency and the content of semantic formulas used by the group which consisted of 30 Iraqi Arabic native speakers who were studying at University Sains Malaysia in relation to the contextual variables which include the status of interlocutors

(high, equal or lower status) and the most distinguished semantic formula used by the respondent is “explanation”.

According to Beebe (1990), refusals are made up of different selections from these formulas in accordance with the status and power relationship between speaker and hearer. In refusing someone with lower status, Iraqis do not use apology or regret when refusing someone higher in status. In refusing persons with higher status, Iraqis use more mitigation strategies than in addressing persons with lower status. The results of this study seem to reinforce the notion stated by Brown and Levinson (1987) that people cooperate in maintaining face interaction. According to Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990), refusals are intrinsically face-threatening and in natural conversation it often involves a long negotiated sequence.

Beebe et al. (1990) also commented that the risk of face-threat is so inherent to the speech act of refusal that some degree of indirectness is usually required. Also, refusals are sensitive to context variables such as relative status and distance of the interlocutors. They consist of a sequence of semantic formulae, varying in content, order, and frequency, depending on the eliciting speech act (invitation, request, offer, or suggestion). Communication difficulties occur when conversationalists do not share the same knowledge of the subtle rules governing conversations. Scarcella (1990) ascribes high frequency of such difficulties to the fact that “nonnative speakers, when conversing, often transfer the conversational rules of their first language into the second.”

2.6 Classifications of Refusal Strategies

Beebe et al (1990) divided refusal strategies to two main categories: direct and indirect refusals. These strategies are introduced and explained in this section.

2.6.1 Direct Strategies

In this study, the direct strategies used are the direct denial of compliance without reservation which consists of two sub group as ‘No’ and negative willingness/ability.

Examples and explanations are as follows:

1. ‘No’

‘No’ is a strategy stated as a non-performative expression and without any modification

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-weltz (1990). Some examples from the current study are:

‘no’ (B10-Situation 1)

‘No need, I’m fine auntie!’ (B4-Situaiton 8)

2. Negative willingness/ability

Here the refuser uses words to show the negative willingness or ability. Some

examples from the current study are:

‘cannot’(B 5-Situation 8)

‘my parents would not let me’ (B11-Situation 10)

2.6.2 Indirect Strategies

The indirectness continuum consists of fourteen strategies used for the present study. The explanations and examples from this study are presented below.

1. Regret

This strategy is used when utterances that are made in expressing regret. According to Leech (1983), apologies “express regret for some offence committed by s(peaker) against h(earer) – and there is no implication that s(peaker) has benefited from the offence”. The statements that contain the words ‘sorry’, ‘regret’, ‘employing apology, or asking for forgiveness’ will be used. For example ‘I’m sorry’; ‘I feel terrible’. Some examples from the current study are:

‘I am sorry mum I do not like the other tshirt’. (B10 – Situation 2)

‘Sorry, mummy I only like one of the t-shirt’. (G8 – Situation 2)

2. Positive opinion/feeling or agreement

This is a positive opinion/feeling where the speaker expresses positive expressions in response to refuse an invitation, suggestion offer or request before or after the main refusal. (e.g., ‘That’s a good idea’; ‘I wish I could help you but...’). Some examples from the current study are:

‘I like that one but hate the other, maybe we can give it to someone else’. (B4-Situation 2)

‘i would really love to go but my parents do not allow me to’. (G5 – Situation 10)

3. Excuse, reason and explanation

The respondents sometimes refuse an invitation by giving an excuse, an explanation or a reason. The explanations and reasons may be general as in explaining a reason for non-compliance. Some examples from the current study are:

‘teacher-i think i cannot attend the course because i got to do something on the same day’

(B8 – Situation 7)

‘I can't accept the gift as we are not good friends’ (B9 – Situation 12)

4. Statement of alternative

Although the respondents cannot satisfy the inviter’s want, they suggest alternatives in the hope to reduce the negative impact of their refusal. Suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor (e.g., ‘I can do

X instead of Y'; 'Why don't you do X instead of Y?'). Some examples from the current study are:

'Can u just give the other one to my brother'. (B6 - Situation 2)

'dad , I think we should jst rest at home . going out for holidays is tiring'. (G6-Situation 11)

5. Future acceptance

Using the promise to delay acceptance and the refuser does not refuse on the spot, but promises to accept in future which functions as a refusal. (e.g., 'I'll do it next time'; 'I promise I'll...'). Some examples from the current study are:

'I don't think I need tuition dad. I will study harder and I'll focus more at school. I promise to get better marks next time, PROMISE'. (G1-Situation 5)

'I;m sorry teacher i can't come.I have something important to do.Maybe next time'.(B12 – Situation 7)

6. Statement of negative consequences

Using a negative statement to respond to show the consequences of something that has occurred prior to it (e.g., 'It's your grade, not mine'). Some examples from the current study are:

'Sorry, but I am scared u might lose it'. (B6 –Situation 1)

'I'm sorry, I cant help you.I do not want to get in trouble'. (G3 – Situation 1)

7. Criticism

The response is an intention to critic in a harsh manner (e.g., 'That's a terrible idea!').

Some examples from the current study are: None

'i finished my credit already!:(.uhh...use that guy's phone la.' (B2 –Situation 9)

'I'm sorry but I only like one of them and besides maybe we could buy a nicer shirt with the same colour'. (Girl 5 –Situation 2)

8. Letting interlocutor off the hook

With this formula, the refusers show that they sympathize with the inviter and it is not necessary for that person to invite. (e.g., 'Don't worry about me. You go and have fun').

Some examples from the current study are:

'I'll stay at home to continue my studies'. (B9 – Situation 11)

'It's ok.I don't want to trouble you'. (G9 –Situation 8)

9. Self-defence

Making statements or responding to the listener which shows that the speaker wants it in his or her way and prefer the decisions that have been made.

(e.g., 'It is not because I don't want to listen to your opinion'). Some examples from the current study are:

'I don't want to go there, I have no friends there!' (B4 –Situation 5)

'dad i m not interested goin anywhr' (G13 –Situation 11)

10. Acceptance that functions as refusal

This strategy is regarded as unspecific or indefinite reply or lack of enthusiasm. In the former, the refuser's response is unclear, vague uncertain, or undecided. The speaker/refuser in this strategy is trying not to make any commitment thus the response is left open or indefinite. In the latter, the refuser shows lack of interest in complying with the act. (e.g., 'I'll do that when I have time'). Some examples from the current study are:

‘aunt,its okay if there is no coffee left..i’ll just drink plain water only.’ (B3 – Situation 8)

‘Thank you for the gift but I can’t accept it as it is an expensive gift.’ (G9 –Situation 12)

11. Avoidance

Avoiding is a direct response to proposed act. There are six different types of avoidance used in the verbal avoidance strategies are topic switch, hedging, joke, questioning, postponement, and pause fillers.

11.1 Topic switch

To shift, transfer, or divert a subject talked or touched about: switched the conversation to a lighter subject. (e.g., ‘Now let’s go back to Chapter One’). Some examples from the current study are:

‘this is for emergency’ (B5 – Situation 9)

‘sorry but i cant accept this. money... so.. there's no need for tuition.’ (G11 – Situation 12)

11.2 Hedging

Hedging' is linked to politeness phenomena, mitigation, vagueness and modality (e.g., ‘Gee, I don’t know’; ‘I’m not sure’).

11.3 Joke

Joke is something said for the sake of exciting a laugh; something witty or sportive (commonly indicating more of hilarity or humor than jest); a jest; a witticism; as, to crack good-natured jokes. Joke is amusing or ridiculous, especially because of being ludicrously inadequate or a sham; a thing, situation, or person laughed at rather than taken seriously; farce. (e.g., ‘Their pretense of generosity is a joke. An officer with no ability to command is a joke’).

11.4 Questioning

Questioning is a request for information, a statement or demanding an explanation. It is also a method of oral instruction involving question and answer techniques.

(e.g., ‘How do you expect me to answer you?’). Some examples from the current study are:

‘Why?’ (B5 –Situation 5)

‘OMG! why is the price is so high....can you kurangkan the priz’ (B7 – Situation 12)

11.5 Postponement

The respondents sometimes soften their refusals by postponing the invitation without suggesting a specific time. (e.g., ‘I’ll think about it’). Some examples from the current study are:

‘I dun feel like goin anywhere.. I wanna stay at home.’ (G12 –Situation 11)

11.6 Pause fillers

Use of fillers to fill a moment between the end of the interlocutor’s utterance and the beginning of the speaker’s refusal utterance (e.g., ‘well...’; ‘oh...’; ‘wow’). Some examples from the current study are:

‘Ummm....no need lah aunty..ill just have some water.:)’ (B2 – Situation 8)

‘Erm.. it's ok.. Im not reli in the mood for milk.’ (G12 – Situation 8)

12. Gratitude

Thanking or feeling grateful soften the refusals made (e.g., ‘Thank you for inviting me’).

Some examples from the current study are:

‘Thank you , but its okay i am not feeling hungry now.’ (G2 – Situation 4)

‘Thank you auntie , but i am not really a fan of milk . So , i dont think you have to make me it . But thanks again for caring and i would just prefer some cold water if thats alright.’

(G2 – Situation 8)

13. Asking for approval

Asking for approval here refers to the act of approving without any obligation. In other words, to receive approval or affirmation; to be selected and there's a feeling of liking something or someone good; (e.g., 'Although she fussed at them, she secretly viewed all her children with approval').

14. Sarcasm

A sharply ironical taunt; sneering or a cutting remark and the use of unpleasant remarks intended to hurt a person's feelings. Sarcasm also referred to witty language used to convey insults or scorn. (e.g., 'He used sarcasm to upset his opponent'; 'Irony is wasted on the stupid'). Some examples from the current study are:

'The shirt does not fit me' (B9 – Situation 2)

'better i sleep at house' (B5 –Situation 6)

2.7 Family, formal and social domains

In this study, refusals made within the family, formal and social domains are also looked into. Further explanations on family, formal and social domains are explained individually as below:

2.7.1 Family domains

Family domains refer to a unit which within the family, parents and children and they are bound to each other by asymmetrical yet highly intimate affective relations, (Blum-Kulka,1992). The family unit, on the face of it, is focused on solidarity and informality. Such solidarity and informality in family interactions tend to be verbalized by high levels of directness, Blum-Kulka (1990), which in theory decreases perceived levels of politeness. Blum-Kulka (1987) argues that politeness can be viewed as motivated not only

by the need to minimize the threat to face (as in the case of indirect strategies) but also by the need to adhere to pragmatics clarity (as in the case of direct form).

2.7.2 Formal domains

Formal domain in this present study refers to the refusals done by these primary school children to mostly adults whom they have no relationship with personally although they might know the person whom they are talking to in general. The formal domain here refers to doctor, teacher, clerk and a customer. Félix- Brasdefer (2006) examined refusal strategies of native Spanish speakers in Mexico in an attempt to study the degree of formality, the politeness functions of direct and indirect speech acts, as well as the Mexican concept of face. The results from his research show that the informants used a significantly greater number of distinct strategies in formal situations compared to the informal ones. From the informal situations, greater levels of indirectness were observed and greater directness was shown in formal situations. Félix-Brasdefer (2006) notes, "the results of the current study show that the social power and social distance are conditioning factors in the selection of linguistic strategies in this Mexican community," and that "in this community, a preference for direct refusals represents involvement or closeness with an interlocutor". The current study would compare the findings with the research done by Félix-Brasdefer (2006).

2.7.3 Social domains

Social domains here refer to social interactions which can be said to occur if two or more individuals perform mental acts, exhibit behaviour or engage in action in a coordinated way and which collectively has some purpose or function, (Allwood, 1976, 1978, 1982). Interactions are conceptualized as rational agents and as a rational agent, an individual has

a free will and his actions are motivated by a self-defined rational assessment of the best means for accomplishing the ends, (Allwood, 1976).

2.8 Facebook

In this study, *Facebook* was used in which DCT questions were posted to the subjects *Facebook* accounts for them to refuse. Facebook is used because it appears to be the latest trend of communication among the primary school children.

Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007) found that the amount of time college students reported using Facebook was positively correlated with their self-reported face-to-face involvement in the college community; this relationship was held after statistical control of total internet use was established to suggest that the *Facebook* has a unique function to enhance social communication. In a study of a Dutch social networking website, Valkenburg, Peter, and Schouten (2006) found that adolescent who self-reported receiving positive comments from friends posted on their page, also self-reported good adjustment. Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, and Tong (2008) found that participants judged Facebook page owners on the basis of characteristics of the friends on the owners' pages, suggesting that youths view Facebook interactions as reflecting the quality of owners' face-to-face relationships.

The Trend box (2009) statistics show that people are of opinion that the number of real soul mates has remarkably decreased while at the same time the number of contacts online has risen. Facebook is an extremely popular online network that is also controlling teenagers' lives. Today's communication throughout the world has been widely connected through the communication via the facebook. Facebook.com is visited monthly by 540 million people, or slightly more than 35 percent of the Internet population, according to Google data from the search engine.

Originally reserved for college students, *Facebook* widened its membership in stages. In September 2005, it allowed members to invite high school students into their networks. Several months later it opened the rolls to those with e-mail accounts at large employers of recent graduates. In September 2006, shortly after the news feed fiasco, *Facebook* opened membership to anyone with a legitimate e-mail address. It has become increasingly popular in the last few years and also, on *Facebook*, people say things they would not normally say in person and everything becomes public information. Explosive growth has occurred in online social communication, (Madden, 2006) with youths disproportionately affected by this new technology according to Pew Internet and American Life Project, (2009). As online use increases, so too do debates about how internet- based interaction may compare with historical face-to-face ways of communicating, (Bargh & McKenna, 2004; Tyler, 2002). One argument posits that internet interaction is often of lower quality than is face-to-face interaction, because these constraints inherent in the online medium hinder relationships. Furthermore, use of online communication may be positively correlated with adjustment problems because (a) socially inept youths are drawn to online interaction and (b) the almost inevitably poor quality of online communication increases maladjustment. An alternative argument postulates that the internet is merely a new medium for youths to display the same long-standing patterns as they do using modes other than online forms of communication, such that there is correspondence between face-to-face and online interaction styles and friendship quality.

2.9 Summary

Some important factors which emerge from the above reviewed studies inform the present study. All the previous studies reviewed in this chapter generally reported the preference of indirect refusals compared to the direct refusals. Findings from previous studies show that

people from different cultures do not perceive the status of the interlocutor in the same way and therefore they do not always choose the same strategies for the same speech act in general and the speech act of refusal in particular (Kwon, 2004; Nelson et al., 2002; Beebe et al., 1990; Phuong, 2006). Moreover, the literature review also provided the background and theoretical framework for the present study. The specific issues of the study, including the aims, the research questions of the study, the data collection method, the data collection instrument, data collecting procedures and the subjects, the coding framework and data analysis of the study will be presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design of the study. In the first section, the participants of the study were introduced. Next section deals with the data and followed by how the data collection procedures are carried out. Finally is on how the data is analyzed. Then this whole chapter is summarized.

3.2 Participants

This study consists of 30 primary school children, 15 boys and 15 girls. The DCT was sent out to 70 participants, boys and girls between the age of 11 and 12 years old. The criteria for selection of participants was done by sending the DCT to these children who already had the friendship status through the *Facebook* connection. All the participants were from the same school and are students who attended the researcher's class. After the duration of three months, only 30 participants replied the situations given from the DCT. Sending the survey form was done through the *Facebook* where the subjects received them personally through their own message boxes. The participants, however, were given the freedom of filling out their responses through the *Facebook* at home or at a time convenient to them.

3.3 Data

This study is based on refusal strategies through the *Facebook* among primary school children between 11 to 12 years of age where they respond to the DCT in their own words as if they are communicating with someone in a spoken language. The reason *Facebook* was chosen as a research focus to distribute the survey forms is because, (a) *Facebook* has

become a frequently used communication medium, especially among the students where children connect themselves to the latest way of communication, (b) the inbox message through *Facebook* gives the privacy and the responses are strictly confidential between the subject and the researcher and (c) is in a written format similar to DCTs but within a naturally occurring interaction.

The discourse of refusals where the main objective of this research is to demonstrate their strategies of speech acts in all requests, suggestions, invitations and offers. Analysis of these strategies and categorization will indicate the type of refusal being practiced between the children of these ages in an urban school.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

A modified version of the DCT constructed by Beebe et al. (1990) is used for the present study because the DCT of Beebe et al. (1990) had been developed and piloted with status embedded in the situations given such as refusing to a person higher, equal or lower status in the situations. It is, therefore, convenient to collect data for the consideration of the interlocutor's status. All the subjects were asked to fill out a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) (Appendix B). The DCT is a form of some natural situations to which the respondents are expected to respond making refusals.

A DCT is used to collect data in the present study for the following reasons. Firstly, the DCT has been proven to be an effective means of gathering a large amount of data in a relatively short period of time (Wolfson, 1989; Beebe et al., 1990; Beebe and Cumming, 1996). Due to the time constraint of the present study, the DCT is a proper solution. Moreover, it is a useful method to elicit data for cross-cultural comparability (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989). Additionally, it allows the researcher to control variables of the

situations under study, for example, the interlocutor's status. Therefore, the data collected will be consistent, making it easier to achieve the aims of the study.

A modified version of the 12-item discourse completion test (DCT) as in Appendix B developed 12 situations in which participants had to refuse all requests, suggestions, invitations and offers. There were 3 situations for requests, 3 situations for suggestions, 3 situations for invitations and 3 situations for offers which total up to 12 situations. The situations in the DCT were modified to make it more familiar to the life and culture of the subjects. This DCT was sent to all subjects via their *Facebook* account personally through their message column. The subjects responded in written form where once they have answered all the 12-item situations, the subjects resend their responses to the researcher's *Facebook* message column as well. All the situations given in the DCT were only based on two different statuses which were of higher and equal status. The higher status refers to a person who is older to the participants. In this research the higher status refers to a mother, a teacher, a father, a doctor, an aunt and a customer. The equal status refers to those who are of the same age with the participants. In this research the equal statuses were referred to classmates and friends.

The subjects were free to respond to the DCT at their leisure time and there was no time frame given to them. The DCT was sent to almost 70 subjects but only 30 subjects cooperated and responded willingly. This may be due to the lack of interest from the younger age group to respond as they would rather use their time to chat with their friends through this *Facebook*. It took the researcher about three months to gather all the response from the questionnaire received.

3.5 Data Analysis

The present study consists of both quantitative and qualitative method to analyze them. The quantitative method refers to the situations given in the DCT while the qualitative method was used in terms of identifying the responses received, and then categorizing accordingly so the data could be analyzed quantitatively. Data were analyzed in terms of frequency and percentage. The researcher analyzed the data in terms of frequency and percentage mainly focusing on the direct and indirect refusal strategies used and also the classifications of refusal strategies that were used by the subjects. The researcher did not go into much detail in analyzing the data in terms of semantic formula as it would not be focusing to answer the research questions then.

The refusals obtained from the DCT were analyzed and the data were examined according to a modified classification of refusal strategies proposed by Beebe et al. (1990), which included direct and indirect refusal strategies. In the analysis of the data, the researcher coded the frequencies used by both the boys and girls in each situation for the two groups and calculated them in percentages of formulas. The detailed classification with the examples is presented in chapter two, section 2.6. Only a summary of it is reproduced below.

Direct Strategies

Direct denial of compliance without reservation

1. 'No'
2. Negative willingness/ability (e.g., 'I can't'; 'I won't'; 'I don't think so')

Indirect strategies

3. Regret: Utterances expressing regret (e.g., 'I'm sorry'; 'I feel terrible')
4. Positive opinion/feeling or agreement (e.g., 'That's a good idea'; 'I wish I could help

- you but...')
5. Excuse, reason and explanation: Explaining a reason for non-compliance
 6. Statement of alternative: Suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor (e.g., 'I can do X instead of Y'; 'Why don't you do X instead of Y?')
 7. Future acceptance: Using the promise to delay acceptance (e.g., 'I'll do it next time'; 'I promise I'll...')
 8. Statement of negative consequences (e.g., 'It's your grade, not mine')
 9. Criticism (e.g., 'That's a terrible idea!')
 10. Letting interlocutor off the hook (e.g., 'Don't worry about me. You go and have fun')
 11. Self-defence (e.g., 'It is not because I don't want to listen to your opinion')
 12. Acceptance that functions as refusal: Unspecific or indefinite reply or lack of enthusiasm (e.g., 'I'll do that when I have time')
 13. Avoidance: Avoiding direct response to proposed act
 - 13.1 Topic switch (e.g., 'Now let's go back to Chapter One')
 - 13.2 Hedging (e.g., 'Gee, I don't know'; 'I'm not sure')
 - 13.3 Joke (e.g., 'I like walking in the rain')
 - 13.4 Questioning (e.g., 'How do you expect me to answer you?')
 - 13.5 Postponement (e.g., 'I'll think about it')
 - 13.6 Pause fillers: Use of fillers to fill a moment between the end of the interlocutor's utterance and the beginning of the speaker's refusal utterance (e.g., 'well...'; 'oh...'; 'wow')
 14. Gratitude (e.g., 'Thank you for inviting me')
 15. Asking for approval (e.g., 'Is that possible?')

16. Sarcasm (e.g., 'I forgot you almost got "A" last term')

The researcher also carried out an informal interview with another primary school student who was not involved in answering the DCT questionnaires. The reason for this informal interview was just to look into the point of view from this subject as to why certain strategies were used and why certain strategies were not used in the refusal situations based on the responses given by the subjects in their DCT questionnaires through the *Facebook*.

3.6 Types of Refusals and the Strategies

This classification is a widely used classification of refusals strategies in refusal research (Bardavi-Harlig and Hartford, 1991, Gass and Houck, 1999, Nelson et al., 2002, Felix-Brasdefer, 2006). The refusals are divided into two main groups: direct and indirect refusals. The direct refusals consist of only two subdivisions in comparison to indirect which consist of fourteen subdivisions.

Beebe et. al. (1990) states that sometimes, the strategies of the speech acts of refusal might consist of a series of the following discourse patterns or sequences: "pre-refusal", "main refusal" (head act), and "post-refusal". Pre-refusal is considered as the semantic components of the discourse which function as to prepare the addressee for an upcoming refusal. The main refusal (head act) the formulas expresses the main or core part of refusal. The post-refusal (that follows the "head act") was used to emphasize, justify, mitigate, or conclude the refusal response. In this study, the analysis, of the refusals speech acts were categorized as a whole statement of which strategies were used: the direct strategy or the indirect strategy which would be the focus for the first research question. For example the following refusals to requests, refusals to suggestions, refusals to invitations and refusals to offers:

Table 3.1: Types of Refusals and the Strategies

Types of refusals	DCT refusal responses	Strategies
Refusal to requests	No	(Direct) Direct denial of compliance without reservation 'No'
Refusal to suggestions	Can u just give the other one to my brother	(Indirect) Statement of alternative: Suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor
Refusal to invitations	i am sorry-friend-,i can't come to your party because ihave to do something	(Indirect) Excuse, reason and explanation: Explaining a reason for non-compliance
Refusal to offers	I;m sorry teacher i can't come.I have something important to do.Maybe next time.	(Indirect) Future acceptance: Using the promise to delay acceptance

To answer the second research question, the refusal strategies which were identified were examined to see how they were different according to the different domains of family settings, formal settings and social settings. Based on these settings, three equal relationships in terms of power, which are categorized as close, familiar and distant and two unequal relationships which were high and equal status were found. Then the refusals were checked against the type of relationship in which they were contextualized.

3.7 Summary

The present study draws upon the use of DCT responses through *Facebook* which seems to be an increasingly popular among children in the last few years. On *Facebook*, people say things they would not normally say in person and everything becomes public information Madden (2006). The researcher strictly allows privacy to the subjects as the researcher does not discuss about the refusal situations given in the DCT when the researcher meets these children in school during schooling hours as these participants are from the same school. The refusal classification of Beebe et al (1990) is used for the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the analysis of the data will be presented in two sections. Section one will cover the first research question which would be “What strategies are most revealed in the refusals used in the situations given by primary school children?” Then, the second section will cover the second research question which would examine the extent to which family, formal and social settings between the interactants affect the production of refusals?

4.2 Research Question Number One

To answer the first research question, the researcher looked on the strategies most revealed in the respond to refusals based on situations given by primary school children.

The table below shows a total number of 360 frequencies used by all the subjects for the DCT. There were 3 different situations provided for the refusals to requests, 3 different situations for refusals to suggestions, 3 different situations for refusals to invitations and 3 different situations for refusals to offers. These frequencies were then coded and classified according to whether they were ‘direct’ or ‘indirect’ (Beebe, et al., 1990). Each situation consisted of 90 frequencies where 30 subjects gave refusals to each situation. (See table 4.1 below).

Table 4.1: Refusal Frequency

Situations given to subjects	Types of Refusals	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used In DCT (%)
Situations 1, 5 & 9	Requests	90 30 subjects X 3 situations = 90	25%
Situations 2, 6 & 10	Suggestions	90 30 subjects X 3 situations = 90	25%
Situations 3 , 7 & 11	Invitations	90 30 subjects X 3 situations = 90	25%
Situations 4, 8 & 12	Offers	90 30 subjects X 3 situations = 90	25%
	TOTAL		
SITUATIONS given to all the 30 subjects	4 TYPES OF REFUSALS	360 FREQUENCIES	100%

4.2.1 Types and Frequency of Refusal Strategies

From these situations given, the researcher analyzed two research questions (a) what strategies are most revealed in the respond to refusals used in the situations given by the primary school children, either the direct or the indirect strategies from the DCT and (b) the extent to which family, formal and social settings between the interactants affect the production of refusals are investigated.

There were 360 strategies used in the refusals through *Facebook* based on the DCT sent. 180 strategies were used by the boys while 180 strategies were used by the girls. In order to compare the frequency of strategies used by the subjects, the number of each strategy type was counted. From this figure, the researcher analyzed the different strategies used in terms of frequencies (see table 4.2 below) for all the different refusal situations given.

Table 4.2: The Types of Refusal Strategies Used In DCT

TYPE	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used in DCT	Frequency Used in DCT (%)
DIRECT	1-No	6	1.7
DIRECT	2-Negative	14	3.9
INDIRECT	3-Regret	46	12.8
INDIRECT	4-Positive opinion	20	5.6
INDIRECT	5-Excuse, reason & Explanation	97	26.9
INDIRECT	6-Statement of Alternative	36	10.0
INDIRECT	7-Future acceptance	23	6.4
INDIRECT	8-Statement of negative consequences	3	0.8
INDIRECT	9-Criticism	9	2.5
INDIRECT	10-Letting interlocutor off the hook	13	3.6
INDIRECT	11-Self-defense	21	5.8
INDIRECT	12-Acceptance that functions as refusal	23	6.4
INDIRECT	13-Avoidance	31	8.6
INDIRECT	14-Gratitude	14	3.9
INDIRECT	15-Asking for	1	0.3
INDIRECT	16-Sarcasm	3	0.8
	TOTAL	360	100%

4.2.1.1 Direct Strategies

In the direct strategies, which are referred to the direct denial of compliance without reservation, are divided into two different categories which are the direct ‘No’ and the ‘Negative willingness/ability’. These strategies refer to verbal messages that embody and invoke speaker’s true intention in terms of their wants, needs and discourse process. This corresponds to Brown and Levinson’s bald on record strategy (1987) with respect to the precisions and clarity of the communicative intention. In this study, subjects employed the following direct strategies which from the total of 360 frequencies used in DCT refusals,

there were only 20 direct refusals made which consists of only 5.6% overall (See table 4.3 below)

Table 4.3 Direct Refusal Strategies

Type	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used in DCT	Percentage Used in DCT
Direct	1-No	6	1.7%
Direct	2-Negative willingness/ability	14	3.9%
	TOTAL	20	5.6%

From the two different types of direct strategies used, the ‘Negative willingness/ability’ were used more than the ‘No’ refusal where direct strategy ‘No’ was (1.7%) and direct ‘Negative willingness/ability’ was (3.9%). Although the percentage of direct strategies which consist of ‘no’ and ‘negative willingness/ability’ were in a very small percentage of only 5.6% but yet these direct strategies were used by these primary school children.

The direct refusal strategies are used when the interlocutor are very close to each other, like close friends and parents. In fact, the direct refusal strategies are also used with other individuals who are distant such as to a clerk and to a customer. Here, the subjects do not care how the other individual feels. The following example is a direct refusal to a request in Situation 1 where a classmate, who frequently misses classes and asks to borrow the class notes and in Situation 10, refusal to a suggestion to watch a movie; showed refusal of direct ‘No’ with the given responses:

Situation 1- B5: cannot

B10 :no

Situation 10- B6.I cant go.

Here, the direct refusal of ‘No’ and the ‘Negative ability’ were used very directly without feeling that there was a need to help a friend. Meanwhile, in another refusal to requests in

Situation 5, the student was to disagree with the father's decision to get enrolled at a nearby tuition centre as the student's marks were low and also in Situation 11 refusal to invitation by the father to go for a holiday; showed refusal of 'Negative Willingness' with the given responses:

Situation 5- B11: I don't want

G15: I don't want to go to the tuition centre.

Situation 11- B4: I don't want to go anywhere.

G11: i dont really want to go for a holiday.

G13:father,I'm not intrested to go anywhere

Snow et al (2002) also found that the use of directness was pervasive in parent-children interactions. Consistent with previous research, the family members used more direct styles to talk to each other may also show the bound between the family members or the family members are closely related to the familiarity and solidarity inherent in their family relationships. However, it was observed that these direct refusal responses were done only when refusing to a father but very surprising no direct refusals were made to a mother or to a teacher. This can be ascribed to the fact that normally the mothers or the teachers have relatively more power, where they tend to give children instructions, and the seriousness of such forms of communication would have been the factor of the indirect strategy chosen by the subjects.

Direct refusals were also used by the subjects towards a doctor, aunt, school clerk and a customer where the subjects were signaled by direct styles of language, which in theory can be face-threatening. As when the doctor suggests to be admitted into the hospital for further treatment the subject refused by:

G13 I don't wanna stay at the hospital;

When an aunt says that there's no coffee at home and she's going to mix a glass of milk for you, the subject refused by saying:

B4: No need, I'm fine auntie!

Here the direct refusals happen when the relationship is distant and the subjects do not mind offending as for the subject they are being direct over the matter.

4.2.1.2 Indirect Strategies

An indirect strategy is used when the message conveyed in a specific context cannot be directly accessed from the syntactic and lexical content of the utterance. According to Hanks (1996: 266) "meaning arises out of the interaction between language and circumstances, rather than being encapsulated in the language itself." The hearer will have to draw inferences or arrive at a conclusion based on his best guesses on what the speaker is intending to convey beyond what is stated (Lakoff, 1990).

Indirect strategies which are used in this present study are as follows: Regret: Utterances expressing regret (e.g., 'I'm sorry'; 'I feel terrible'), Positive opinion/feeling or agreement (e.g., 'That's a good idea'; 'I wish I could help you but...'), Excuse, reason and explanation: Explaining a reason for non-compliance, Statement of alternative: Suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor (e.g., 'I can do X instead of Y'; 'Why don't you do X instead of Y?'), Future acceptance: Using the promise to delay acceptance (e.g., 'I'll do it next time'; 'I promise I'll...'), Statement of negative consequences (e.g., 'It's your grade, not mine'), Criticism (e.g., 'That's a terrible idea!'), Letting interlocutor off the hook (e.g., 'Don't worry about me. You go and have fun'), Self-defense (e.g., 'It is not because I don't want to listen to your opinion'), Acceptance that functions as refusal: Unspecific or indefinite reply or lack of enthusiasm (e.g., 'I'll do that when I have time'), Avoidance: Avoiding direct response

to proposed act, Topic switch (e.g., ‘Now let’s go back to Chapter One’), Hedging (e.g., ‘Gee, I don’t know’; ‘I’m not sure’), Joke (e.g., ‘I like walking in the rain’), Questioning (e.g., ‘How do you expect me to answer you?’), Postponement (e.g., ‘I’ll think about it’), Pause fillers: Use of fillers to fill a moment between the end of the interlocutor’s utterance and the beginning of the speaker’s refusal utterance (e.g., ‘well...’; ‘oh...’; ‘wow’), Gratitude (e.g., ‘Thank you for inviting me’), Asking for approval (e.g., ‘Is that possible?’) and Sarcasm (e.g., ‘I forgot you almost got “A” last term’). Table 4.4 shows the details of the types and different indirect strategies to refusals both in frequency and percentage (%). (see table 4.4 below)

Table 4.4: Types and Frequency of Indirect Refusal Strategies

TYPE	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used in DCT (%)
INDIRECT	3-Regret	46	12.8%
INDIRECT	4-Positive opinion	20	5.6
INDIRECT	5-Excuse, reason & Explanation	97	26.9
INDIRECT	6-Statement of Alternative	36	10.0
INDIRECT	7-Future acceptance	23	6.4
INDIRECT	8-Statement of negative consequences	3	0.8
INDIRECT	9- Criticism	9	2.5
INDIRECT	10-Letting interlocutor off the hook	13	3.6
INDIRECT	11-Self-defense	21	5.8
INDIRECT	12-Acceptance that functions as refusal	23	6.4
INDIRECT	13-Avoidance	31	8.6
INDIRECT	14-Gratitude	14	3.9

INDIRECT	15-Asking for approval	1	0.3
INDIRECT	16-Sarcasm	3	0.8
	TOTAL	340	94.4%

An overview of the strategies use, generally the subjects in this study preferred the indirect strategies more when it comes to refusals. Out of the total, 340 indirect refusal strategies frequency were obtained with a percentage of 94.4%.

The results show conformity to the findings done by previous studies that among all the indirect strategies used by the participants, the strategy ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ was the most frequent used 26.9% (Beebe, et al., 1990; Bardovi-Harlig, 1991; Kwon, 2003; Felix Brasdefer, 2004, 2006; Wannaruk, 2008). The second highest frequency was found in ‘regret’ strategy at 12.8% followed by the ‘Statement of alternative’ where this strategy is at 10.0%. The fourth strategy is ‘Avoidance’ where this strategy consists of: Topic switch, Hedging, Joke, Questioning, Postponement and Pause fillers with 8.6%.

The fifth strategy is ‘future acceptance’ and ‘Acceptance that functions as refusal’ with both having the same percentage of 6.4%. The other indirect strategies used by the subjects of the present study are in order; ‘self-defense’ (5.8%), positive opinion’ (5.6%), ‘gratitude’ (3.9%), ‘letting interlocutor off the hook’ (3.6%), ‘criticism’ (2.5%), both ‘statement of negative consequences’ and ‘sarcasm’ (0.8%). The lowest strategy used in the indirect strategy is ‘asking for approval’ (0.3%).

Based on the data obtained, the researcher found that all the indirect strategies were used regardless of the different percentage of them. Certain strategies were used to soften the way they respond to refusals such as the ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ strategy, the ‘regret’ strategy and the ‘avoidance’ strategy whilst there were strategies used which were

more of the FTA; face-threatening act such as the ‘criticism’, ‘sarcasm’ and ‘self-defense’ strategies.

4.2.1.3 Avoidance Strategies to Refusals

The avoidance strategy consists of topic switch, hedging, joke, questioning, and postponement and pause fillers. From all these avoidance used, the highest strategy used was the avoidance with pause fillers (4.7%) followed by avoidance with topic switch (1.9%), avoidance by questioning (1.7%) and avoidance by postponement (0.3%). Avoidance with hedging and joke were not used at all. (See table 4.5 below)

Table 4.5: Avoidance Strategies

Avoidance Strategies	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used In DCT (%)
Topic Switch	7	1.9
Hedging	-	-
Joke	-	-
Questioning	6	1.7
Postponement	1	0.3
Pause Fillers	17	4.7
Results – Avoidance	31	8.6%

An example of topic switch used in this study is when the father asked his child where he/she intends to go for a holiday and the refusal respond given by the subject was:

Situation 11-B7: father i dont like this school. can i choose sekoah pilihan saya (teacher i don't know).

The example for questioning used in this study when the father said that the examination marks were low, so he requested you to enroll yourself at a nearby tuition centre and the refusal respond given by the subject was: ‘Why?’ (B5 –Situation 5)

For postponement example used in this study when the situation given was regarding the year end school holidays around the corner and the father invites the subject to go for a holiday but the subject is not interested to go anywhere and the refusal respond given was:

‘I dun feel like goin anywhere.. I wanna stay at home.’ (G12 –Situation 11)

Lastly, an example from the pause fillers used in this study as when the subject prefers to drink coffee but an aunt of the subject says that there’s no coffee at home and she’s going to mix a glass of milk and the refusal respond given was:

‘Erm.. it's ok.. Im not reli in the mood for milk.’ (G12 – Situation 8)

The researcher also carried out an informal interview with another primary school student who was not involved in answering the DCT questionnaires. The reason for this informal interview was just to look into the point of view from this subject as to why certain strategies were used and why certain strategies were not used in the refusal situations based on the responses given by the subjects in their DCT questionnaires through the *Facebook*. This subject commented on ‘Avoidance Strategies’ which included strategies used in it were; ‘Topic switch’, ‘Questioning’, ‘Pause fillers’ and ‘Postponement’. Based on ‘Topic switch’ strategy, the subject commented that normally the students of his age would prefer to use this strategy as children of these ages do not like to be questioned directly and with ‘Topic switch’ itself the subjects were actually trying to cut short the communication. The ‘Questioning’ strategy was used by the subjects as one of the strategy showed that some students of this age tend to have a habit of answering a question by questioning back to the person they are communicating to. It may seem to be unusual but this was how the students from the primary school react to situations given based on the responses from the DCT. The ‘Pause fillers’ strategy which is similar to oral speech was the most common strategy of all as students of primary school may not be certain of on how to response, thus pause fillers were used to fill a moment between the end of the interlocutor’s utterance and the

beginning of the speaker's refusal utterance. Normally, the use of 'well...'; 'oh...'; 'wow' and etc. are commonly used. Although the 'Postponement' strategy was the least used here but this showed that being children, they know how to apply this strategy as well. However, the 'Joke' and 'Hedging' strategies, were not used by these primary students, could be related to being uncertain. In the matter of 'Joke', these children don't regard answering in a joking manner. According to this subject, a 'Joke' is meant to be a statement or situation given and the listener are supposed to laugh at. For example, a riddle is told as a joke. 'Hedging' is linked to politeness phenomena, mitigation, vagueness and modality; (e.g., 'Gee, I don't know'; 'I'm not sure'). These children did not use this strategy as normally children would respond in their own simple words and seldom respond with this type of strategy.

4.3 Refusal Strategies with respect to their Initiating Acts

In this study, there are four different situations used to carry to the refusal acts. The situations used were refusals to requests, refusals to offers, refusals to invitations and refusals to suggestions. The refusals elicited were responses to 91 requests, 90 offers, 89 invitations and 90 suggestions. The analysis of 360 refusals revealed a considerable variation in the realization of refusal speech acts, influenced by their initiating acts. These variations were observed both at the level of frequency and type of strategies.

4.3.1 Number of Refusal Strategies Based on their Initiating Acts

In this study, there were four different types of refusals used which were refusals to requests, refusals to suggestions, refusals to invitations and refusals to offers. From all these four types of refusals, the subjects had used indirect strategies compared to the direct

strategies. Refusals to requests and refusals to offers both had 6.7%, 4.4% refusals were recorded for refusals to invitations and also refusals to suggestions. (See Table 4.6 below)

Table 4.6: Types of Refusals Used

Types of Refusals Used	D	%	ID	%
Requests	6	6.7	84	93.3
Suggestions	4	4.4	86	95.6
Invitations	4	4.4	86	95.6
Offers	6	6.7	84	93.3

D – Direct strategy

ID – Indirect strategy

4.4 Research Question Number Two

In this section, the researcher would answer the second research question. The different relationship types are categorized based on the situations provided in the DCT which were sent to these subjects through their *Facebook*. First, the use of refusals within the family settings, second the use of refusals within the formal settings and third the use of refusals within the social settings.

4.4.1 Refusal Strategies indifferent Relationship Types

Generally, there were three different types of domains investigated by the researcher. The first type of relationship requires the subject to refuse a family member such as their mother, father and aunt. This was categorized as the ‘Family Domain’. The second type of relationship involves communication with non-family members such as a teacher, a doctor and a customer. (cf. Felix-Brasdefer, 2006) This was categorized as the ‘Formal Domain’. In this research, a customer was used in the DCT situation and this is not relevant to these primary school children. Yet, the researcher included a customer in the DCT situation was

to looks into how these primary school children would react if they ever come across this situation. The researcher chose a customer instead of a stranger because if it was a stranger then they may not give any response as these primary school children are often taught by their parents and teachers never to talk to a stranger. Choosing a customer was more relevant as these children do role play characters of being a customer in other subjects that they learn in school. The third type of relationship is the ‘Social Domain’ which involves communication between classmates or friends.

4.4.2 The Effects of Family Domain on Refusals

A family discourse exhibits different dimensions of politeness because of the power and solidarity dimensions involved: “Within the family, parents and children are bound to each other by asymmetrical yet highly intimate affective relations...” (Blum-Kulka, 1992: p.275). Therefore, how the subjects constructed refusals and the strategies used most by these primary school children are investigated. (See table 4.7: below)

Table 4.7: Refusal Strategies used within the Family Domain

TYPE	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used In DCT (%)
DIRECT	1-No	2	1.7%
DIRECT	2-Negative	8	6.7%
INDIRECT	3-Regret	9	7.5%
INDIRECT	4-Positive opinion	11	9.2%
INDIRECT	5-Excuse, reason & Explanation	14	11.7%
INDIRECT	6-Statement of Alternative	17	14.0%
INDIRECT	7-Future acceptance	14	11.7%
INDIRECT	8-Statement of negative	0	0%
INDIRECT	9-Criticism	3	2.5%

INDIRECT	10-Letting interlocutor off the hook	6	5.0%
INDIRECT	11-Self-defense	9	7.5%
INDIRECT	12-Acceptance that functions as refusal	8	6.7%
INDIRECT	13-Avoidance	10	8.3%
INDIRECT	14-Gratitude	8	6.7%
INDIRECT	15-Asking for approval	0	0%
INDIRECT	16-Sarcasm	1	0.8%
	TOTAL	120	100%

Based on the DCT data collected, the researcher could find a clear pattern from the refusal strategies table above where these data were obtained from the DCT questionnaires sent through the *Facebook*. The subjects had to refuse to a family member and the highest percentage showed indirect refusal strategy in ‘Statement of alternative’ which gave the total of 14.0%. This strategy refers to suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the family member. The second highest refusal strategy used towards the family domain consists of two different types of strategies which were excuse, reason and explanation and future acceptance which make up 11.7%. of the total number of refusals. Both of these strategies are under the indirect strategy. The ‘Sarcasm’ indirect refusal strategy was the least used strategy with only 0.8% occurrence. There were two other strategies that were completely not used in refusal in the family domain which were the indirect strategies of ‘Statement of negative consequences’ and ‘Asking for approval’. The reason for not using ‘Statement of negative consequences’ by these subjects towards their family members could be due to the closeness and trust within the family domain. Meanwhile, “Asking for approval’ was not used due to the unsuitability of this strategy by these primary school children towards their family members.

In fact, even indirect strategies can be used to realize power or to increase the force of the message (Brumark, 2006). Thus, while indirectness could be used to increase politeness

and to minimize imposition whilst mitigating FTA by attending to addressees' and/or addressers' positive or negative faces (Tannen, 1989), it may actually provide the addressee with only "a theoretical option" to accept or reject the request (Brumark, 2006: 1211). In other words, the power to impose on another is actually inherent in the indirect style used.

4.4.3 The Effects of Formal Domain on Refusals

Formal domain in this present study refers to the refusals done by these primary school children to mostly adults whom they have no relationship with personally although they might know the person whom they are talking to in general. The formal domain here refers to doctor, teacher, aunt and a customer. Based on the DCT data collected, the researcher could find another pattern from the refusal strategies table above where these data were obtained from the DCT questionnaires sent through the *Facebook*. (see table 4.8 below)

Table 4.8: Refusal Strategies used within Formal Domain

TYPE	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used In DCT (%)
DIRECT	1-No	3	2.5%
DIRECT	2-Negative	4	3.3%
INDIRECT	3-Regret	18	15.0%
INDIRECT	4-Positive opinion	2	1.7%
INDIRECT	5-Excuse, reason & Explanation	38	31.7%
INDIRECT	6-Statement of Alternative	9	7.5%
INDIRECT	7-Future acceptance	2	1.7%
INDIRECT	8-Statement of negative Consequences	0	0%
INDIRECT	9-Criticism	6	5.0%
INDIRECT	10-Letting interlocutor off the hook	3	2.5%
INDIRECT	11-Self-defense	7	5.8%

INDIRECT	12-Acceptance that functions as refusal	11	9.2%
INDIRECT	13-Avoidance	12	10.0%
INDIRECT	14-Gratitude	4	3.3%
INDIRECT	15-Asking for approval	0	0%
INDIRECT	16-Sarcasm	1	0.8%
	TOTAL	120	100%

The subjects had to refuse to non-family members in the formal domain category; the highest percentage of them had used the indirect refusal strategy in ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ which gave the total of 31.7%. The second highest refusal strategy used towards the formal domain consists of regret which brings up to 15.0% and this strategy too comes under the indirect strategy. The least used strategy here was the ‘Sarcasm’ strategy with only 0.8%. There were two other strategies that were completely not used in refusal towards the formal domain which were the indirect strategies of ‘Statement of negative consequences’ and ‘Asking for approval’ which seem to be the same as the family domain. Here, the subjects did not use ‘Statement of negative consequences’ which showed that they have respect when communicating to someone who is a non-family person and they also seem not important to have approval from them when refusing which showed the reason for not using the ‘Asking for approval’ strategy.

4.4.4 The Effects of Social Domain on Refusals

The social domain on refusals may differ in terms of the upbringing, exposure and beliefs inculcated in the subjects as seen in the data. Being direct or indirect is linked with politeness where it appears to be not only culture specific but also based on experience or habitus as argued by Watts (2003).

Based on the DCT data collected, the researcher could find another pattern from the refusal strategies table above where these data were obtained from the DCT questionnaires sent through the *Facebook*. (see table 4.9 below)

Table 4.9: Refusal Strategies used within Social Domain

TYPE	Refusal Strategies	Frequency Used In DCT	Percentage Used In DCT (%)
DIRECT	1-No	1	0.8%
DIRECT	2-Negative	4	3.3%
INDIRECT	3-Regret	18	15.0%
INDIRECT	4-Positive opinion	7	5.8%
INDIRECT	5-Excuse, reason & Explanation	45	37.5%
INDIRECT	6-Statement of Alternative	10	8.3%
INDIRECT	7-Future acceptance	7	5.8%
INDIRECT	8-Statement of negative Consequences	3	2.5%
INDIRECT	9-Criticism	0	0%
INDIRECT	10-Letting interlocutor off the hook	4	3.3%
INDIRECT	11-Self-defense	5	4.2%
INDIRECT	12-Acceptance that functions as refusal	4	3.3%
INDIRECT	13-Avoidance	8	6.7%
INDIRECT	14-Gratitude	2	1.7%
INDIRECT	15-Asking for approval	1	0.8%
INDIRECT	16-Sarcasm	1	0.8%
	TOTAL	120	100%

The subject had to refuse to a person in the social domain category; the highest percentage of them had used the indirect refusal strategy in ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ which gave the total of 37.5%. This showed that when communicating with someone such as their own friends, who are of equal statuses, these children tend to keep their relationship with their friends and hoping that with these excuses or reasons given with some

explanations would be accepted without hurting one's feelings. The second highest refusal strategy used towards the formal domain consists of 'regret' which brings up to 15.0% and this strategy too comes under the indirect strategy. The least used strategy in this domain is the direct strategy of 'No' and the indirect strategy of 'Asking for approval' and 'Sarcasm' where all three strategies were 0.8% each. There was one strategy which was not used completely which was the 'Criticism'. Here, this strategy was not used as these subjects were primary school children who are considered still at a young age and they may have not acquired this part of the communication which is considered as quite a rude way to respond.

4.5 Summary

This study had addressed two questions: (1) What strategies are most revealed in the respond to refusals used in the situations given by the primary school children? and (2) How the family, formal and social settings between the interactants affect the production of refusals?

The findings show that generally these primary school children have high tendency to use indirect strategies. As refusals are known to be face threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1978), many different strategies were used by these children to soften the way they responded to each refusal such as by using 'reasoning with long explanations' and 'thanking'. At this age, children refuse by giving lengthy explanations because they are also very much influenced by television programs, peer influence and by observing how the elders around them response to situations, just to get their way out by refusing. Meanwhile, 'thanking' was also used which showed the researcher the values that these children have obtained either from home or from school, is being practiced.

Referring to the second research question, it was found that the indirect strategy of 'statement of alternative' was used most frequently when they face their family members. Here, the priority of responding to a family member was done in a very gentle way but giving other alternatives in which would favour the subjects themselves. These indirect strategies of giving 'excuse, reason and explanation' were used more often by participants in formal and social situations. Here, these strategies can be used to realize power or to increase the force of the message used by participants in formal situations and to maintain a good relationship with friends in the social situations.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings are summarized and discussed. This includes the refusal strategies used by these primary school children; direct or indirect and the refusal strategies used by the three different domains; family, formal and social.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The findings of the study are summarized based on the two research questions.

5.2.1 Strategies frequently used by primary school children (Research Question One)

The findings suggest that the number of indirect strategies were far greater than the direct ones which were used by these primary school children. Since these children are young and in their primary school age, hence they still use more indirect compared to the direct strategy. These children still have the values of showing respect and being obedient with the elders and these values are very much related to their upbringing as well. The strategy 'excuse, reason and explanation' was the most frequently used strategy in all the types of refusals but the highest was used in refusals to requests and refusals to offers which then followed by refusals to invitations and refusals to suggestions. Refusals to requests and refusals to offers were used more as they appear to be not keen and not interested with the requests or offers given. Refusals to invitations and refusals to suggestions were used lesser as it is the culture and upbringing of these children to refuse in a more polite way which helps to soften the refusal made. This gives the impact of the refusals made and this strategy may appear to be more persuasive and enables the listener to comprehend the

refusal made. However, some participants gave vague or unclear explanations or excuses in some situations, for example: “I am sorry, I have something to do”. More explicit and acceptable explanations were given in other situations ‘My friend, i'm so sorry. i can't give my notes, because i have left it at my aunt's house’. These two different types of responses given were based on the subject’s way of reasoning. ‘Regret’ was the second most frequent in refusals. According to Olshtain (1983), “The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to ‘set things right’. In the case of refusals, apologizing or expressing regret functions as an indirect refusal that politely mitigates the refusal.

‘Statement of alternative’ was the third most frequent used strategy in refusals. Chen (1995) observed that alternatives are used to soften the threatening power of refusals. According to the results obtained from Chen’ (1995), it seems that when students are faced with situations, in which they have to refuse, they try to avoid refusing directly so as to avoid overt confrontation and arousing the feelings of discomfort in the other party; preferring to use formulas such as the ‘alternatives’.

5.2.2 Strategies frequently used in different domains (Research Question Two)

There were three different domains in this present study which are the family, formal and social domains. When it comes to the family domains, the strategy of ‘Statement of alternative’ was the most frequently used where the suggesting of other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the family members. This was then followed by the strategy of ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ and ‘future acceptance’. The ‘Sarcasm’ indirect refusal strategy was the least used strategy while two other strategies that were completely not used in refusal in the family domain which were the indirect strategies of ‘Statement of negative consequences’ and ‘Asking for approval’.

From the findings of this present study, the pattern showed that parents and children begin to learn each other's modes of behaviour through communication and reinforce the actions of one another (Baron, Byrne and Branscombe, 2006) which could be seen similar in the family domain for this current study.

Based on the formal domains, the strategy of 'excuse, reason and explanation' was the most frequently used and this followed with the strategy of regret. These were the same strategies used in the social domains as well. The least used strategy in the formal domain was the 'Sarcasm' strategy and two other strategies that were completely not used in refusal towards the formal domain which were the indirect strategies of 'Statement of negative consequences' and 'Asking for approval' which has the similarities with the family domains. In social domains the direct strategy of 'No' and the indirect strategy of 'Asking for approval' and 'Sarcasm' were the least used strategies while 'Criticism' was completely not used. Interaction and communication amongst family members allow children to develop and experiment social behaviour (Baron, Byrne and Branscombe, 2006). These acquired social skills can be applied when interacting with other people outside the home domain. An important social skill is the art of politeness. Siblings acquire 'social' survival and communicative skills which enables them to socialize with other children. Kitmann, Cohen and Lockwood (2002) discovered that siblings provide useful interpersonal learning experience that enhances their interpersonal intelligence (c.f. Gardner, 2005). According to Maros (2006) the rules of speaking in a society are related to the cultural values of the society. Traditionally, using indirectness in speaking in order to save the face of others and maintaining good relationships between interlocutors and within society as a whole seem to be very much related to these subjects in this study as well. In other words, being cultured and refined is part of the effort to preserve "face" which is important in establishing good relationships and maintaining social harmony. It is,

as indicated by Al-Kahtani (2005), attributable to their background cultural norms which have not been discussed here as it is beyond the scope of the present study. However, it can be hypothesized that the interference of the background cultures of the non-native speakers may contribute to their “vague” excuses. The participants adjust their refusal strategies depending on how distant they are to each other and how distant they want to be from each other. Usually, it is easier for them to refuse to someone whom they are close and have an ongoing relationship and it is usually very difficult to refuse to the person whom they are related to as a family than refusing to whom they do not know and are not connected to them in any way.

5.3 Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to analyze the refusal responses which were elicited from 12 different situations that were classified into four different types of refusal speech acts which were three situations of refusals to requests, three situations of refusals to suggestions, three situations of refusals to invitations and three situations of refusals to offers by using DCT. Although the evidence is quite interesting, at this point it should not be considered conclusive. One of the reasons why the researcher considered this evidence to be preliminary has to do with the fact that a relatively small number of subjects were considered in this study. In this research, the DCT data have been used based on the Beebe et al.'s (1990) classification system. This study has been an attempt to outline the preferred type of refusal strategies frequently used by these primary school children between the ages of 11 to 12 years old. The type of refusal strategies used, either the direct and the most frequently used strategy was investigated within the family, formal and social settings in the production of refusals was investigated. Besides that, the most responses used in the DCT based from the classifications of refusal strategies which were categorized according

to the refusal taxonomy by Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz (1990), were also revealed. While this study have some very important findings that have greatly enlightened the understanding of the DCT technique, it is difficult to draw general conclusions from these DCTs responses. Therefore, these responses cannot truly reflect the subjects' everyday speech.

5.3.1 Implications of the Study

The results of this study seem to reinforce the notion stated by Brown and Levinson (1987) that people cooperate in maintaining face interactions. Refusals are intrinsically face-threatening, and in natural conversation often involve a long negotiated sequence (Beebe et al., 1990). Thus, the primary school children employed some preferred types of indirect refusal patterns when they refuse to the situations given.

Excuse, reason and explanation, was the type of indirect refusal strategies most frequently used by these children and they occurred in their responses to all the four types of refusals in the DCT situations and this was also followed by the use of the regret (apology) strategy. According to Olshtain (1983), "The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to 'set things right'". This refusal strategy of excuse, reason and explanation and regret functions as indirect refusals that politely mitigates the refusal that had to be done in the DCT situations given. These responses indicated that when refusing, an excuse or reasoning or explanation is needed, and even a regret, which indicates their willingness to mitigate the refusal by suggesting alternatives. All these indicate the influence of the Asian culture in which Asians are brought up specifically to respect those who are elder to them. It was found that the indirect strategy of 'statement of alternative' was used most frequent when they face their family members but when it came

towards formal situations or social situations, then the strategy of ‘excuse, reason and explanation’ was used the most.

5.3.2 Suggestions for Further Research

The present study relied on refusals which occurred by using the DCT which were sent through the *Facebook* for these primary school children as its data. Ideally, in the future the researcher would like to increase the number of subjects in order to determine if the results obtained can be generalized to a much larger population. Future studies may study data from a corpus of natural spoken language or employ ethnographic methodology so as to broaden our understanding of refusal behavior in natural settings. Although the researcher acknowledged these problems, it would appear that the evidence obtained in this study is of significant value and that pragmatic transfer in the frequency, order and content of refusals merits further study. The researcher also believes that the difference observed between girls and boys in their refusals are also of great interest and could prove to be an exciting and illuminating area of future research.

5.4 Limitations

In this study, the researcher identified some limitations especially the comparisons of data obtained according to the gender of the subjects. Looking into their responses would be an additional source of data to look into in the future.

References

- Al-Eryani, A.A. (2007). *Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners*. In the Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 9 (2), 19-34.
- Al-Issa, A. (2003). *Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behaviors: Evidence and motivating factors*. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27(5), 581-601.
- Al-Kahtani, W. (2005). *Refusals realizations in three different cultures: A Speech Act Theoretically-based Cross-cultural Study* Journal of King Saud univ., 18., 35-57.
- Allwood, J. (1976). *Linguistic Communication as Action and Cooperation*. Göteborg: Department of Linguistics.
- Al-Shawali, H. (1997). *Refusal strategies in Saudi and American culture*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Michigan: Michigan University.
- Anne Barron. (2003) *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things With Words in a Study-Abroad Context*. John Benjamins.
- Asa Brumark. (2006). Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 'Rhetoric and Language' in *The Pragmatics*.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1975). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (second edition)
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1991). Saying "no" in English: Native and normative rejections. In L. F. Bouton, & Y. Kachru, (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (monograph series vol. 2, pp. 41-57). Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Bargh JA, McKenna KYA. (2004). *The internet and social life*. Annual Review of Psychology.
- Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz R. (1990). "Pragmatic transfer in ESL Refusals". In: R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (Eds), *On the Developing of Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Beebe, L. Cummings, M.C. (1996). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. M. Gass, & J. Neu, (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 65-86). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Billmyer, Kristine & Varghese, Manka, (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: *Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests*. Applied Linguistics, 21(4), pp. 517-552.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). *Learning how to say what you mean in a second language*. Applied Linguistics 3, 29-59.
- Blum-Kulka S. (1987). *Indirectness and politeness in requests: same or different?* Journal of Pragmatics. 11(2), 131-146.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: *Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ, Ablex Pub.
- Blum-Kulka, S., (1990): "You don't touch lettuce with your fingers: *parental politeness in family discourse*", in Journal of Pragmatics 14, 259-88.
- Bodman, Jean and Miriam Eisentein, (1988). May God increase your bounty: *The expression of gratitude in English by native and non-native speakers*. Cross Currents 15(1): 1-21.
- Bresnahan, M. J., Ohashi, R, Liu, W. Y., Nebashi, R. & Liao, C. (1999). A comparison of response styles in Singapore and Taiwan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(3), 342-358.
- Brown, P., & S. Levinson.(1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge
- Chen, X., L. Ye and Y. Zhang. (1995) "Refusing in Chinese", in G. Kasper (ed.), Pragmatics of Chinese as a Native and Target Language (Technical Report #. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre; Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press): 119-63.
- Chen, H. J. (1996). *Cross-cultural comparison of English and Chinese metapragmatics in refusal*. Indiana University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408860)
- Crystal, David. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 4th edition. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. 426 pages.
- Ellis, Rod, (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 824pp.
- Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., and Lampe, C. (2007). Spatially bounded online social networks

and social capital: *The role of Facebook*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International communication Association, June 19-23, 2006, Dresden, Germany.

Félix-Bradesfer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: *Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(12), 2158-2187.

Fraser, B. (1990). 'Perspective on Politeness', *Journal of Pragmatics* 4: 219-36.

Gardner, E.S., Jr., & Koehler, A.B. (2005). *Comments on a patented forecasting method for intermittent demand*, *International Journal of Forecasting*.

Gass, M.S., & Houck, N. (1999). *Interlanguage Refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese English*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey (1988). *Communication in personal relationship across cultures*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Hartford, Beberly and Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig, (1992). *Experimental and observational data in the study of interlanguage pragmatics*. In: L. Bouton and Y. Kachru, eds., *Pragmatics and language learning*, monograph 3, 33-50. Urbana-Champaign, IL: DEIL. (Bargh & McKenna, 2004; Tyler, 2002).

Hanks. W.F. (1996: 266). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar, Salasiah Che Lah and Raja Rozina Suleiman, (2010). *A Study on Strategies Used in Iraqi Arabic to Refuse Suggestions*. *International Journal of Language Society and Culture*.

Kasper, Gabriele & Dahl, Marete and Dahl, (1991). *Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, pp. 215-247.

Kasper, G., Blum-Kulka, S. & House, J. (1992): *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kawate-Mierzejewska, M. (2002). *Request-refusal interactions in telephone conversation*. Unpublished manuscript. Fourth Annual Conference of the Japanese Society for Language Sciences, Nagoya University, Japan.

- King, K.A. & Silver, R.E. (1993). Sticking points: *Effects of instructions on NNS refusal strategies*. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 9, 47-82.
- Kitao, S. K. (1996). *Communicative competence, preference organization, and refusals in British English*. *Sougou Bunka Kenkyujo Kiyou*, 13, 47-58.
- Kitzmann, K., Cohen, R., & Lockwood, R. (2002). "Are only children missing out? ... *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. (19): 299–316.
- Kwon, J. (2003). *Pragmatic transfer and proficiency in refusals of Korean EFL learners*, Ed.D. dissertation, Boston University, United States, Massachusetts. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3069266).
- Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and American English, *Multilingua: Journal of cross cultural and interlanguage communication*, 23(4), 339-364.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: *Or minding your P's and Q's*. CLAS 9, Proceedings of the Chicago linguistics society. Lampert, M. (1990).
- Laohaburanakit, K. (1995). Refusal in Japanese: *A comparison of Japanese textbooks and actual conversation data*. *Nihongo Kyouiku (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching)*, 87, 25-39.
- Leech, G. (1983). *The principles of pragmatics*, London: Longman.
- Liao, C., & Bresnahan, M. (1996). *A contrastive pragmatic study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies*. *Language Sciences*, 18, (3-4), 703-727.
- Madden M.(2006)- *Internet penetration and impact*. Retrieved from <http://pewinternet.org>
- Maros. (2006) "*Pragmatics and Bilingual Education*" Summer School of the Journal "Intercultural Pragmatics" Centro Mediterraneo Universidad de Granada
- Morrow, C. K. (1995). *The pragmatic effects of instruction on ESL learners' production of complaint and refusal speech acts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, NY. UMI Microform, UMI Number: 9603629.
- Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: *Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals*. *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), 163-189.
- Olshain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: *A speech act set*. In N. Wolfson, & E. Judd, (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Pew Internet and American Life Project. (2009). www.pewinternet.org/Reports/Social-Networking-Sites.aspx.
- Phuong. (2006). *Pragmatics transfer in the speech act of refusal in Japanese as a second language*.
- Robert A. Baron, Donn Byrne and Nyla R. Branscombe. (2006). *Mastering Social Psychology* (Paperback)
- Sadler, R.W., & Eroz, B. (2001). I refuse you! *An examination of English refusals by native speakers of English, Lao, and Turkish*. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT*, 9, 53-80.
- Scarcella, Robin C. (1990). *Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom*. Prentice Hall Regents (Englewood Cliffs, NJ)
- Searle, John R. (1969, 1975, 1979, 1992). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, C. (1998). 'Can Adults "Just Say No?": *How Gender, Status and Social Goals Affect Refusals*' (Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of South Florida).
- Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking Voices : Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge
- Turnbull, William. (1997). *An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the study of talk*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada.
- Tyler TR. (2002). *Is the internet changing social life?* It seems the more things change, the more they stay the same. *Journal of Social Issues*;58:195–205.
- Umar, A. (2004). *Request strategies as used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language*. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Education & Social Sciences & Humanities*. 16(1).
- Valkenburg, Peter, and Schouten (2006). *In a study of a Dutch social networking website*, in PubMed Central
- Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, and Tong (2008). Walther JB, Van Der Heide B, Kim SY, Westerman D, Tong ST. The role of friends' appearance and behavior on evaluations of individuals on Facebook: Are we known by the company we keep? *Human Communication Research*. 2008;34:28-49.

- Wannaruk, A. (2008). *Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals*. RELC Journal. 39 (30, 318-337).
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Yang, Jia. (2008). How to say 'No' in Chinese: *A pragmatic Study of Refusal Strategies in Five TV Series*. Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-20). 2008. Volume 2, Pages 1041-1058.
- Yuan, Yi (2000). An inquiry into empirical pragmatics data-gathering methods: *Written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations*. Journal of Pragmatics 33, pp. 271-292.

APPENDECIS

APPENDIX A

Classifications of Refusal Strategies

(Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz 1990)

a. Direct strategies: Direct denial of compliance without reservation

1. 'No'
2. Negative willingness/ability (e.g., 'I can't; 'I won't; 'I don't think so')

b. Indirect strategies

3. Regret: Utterances expressing regret (e.g., 'I'm sorry'; 'I feel terrible')
4. Positive opinion/feeling or agreement (e.g., 'That's a good idea'; 'I wish I could help you but...')
5. Excuse, reason and explanation: Explaining a reason for non-compliance
6. Statement of alternative: Suggesting other alternatives or possibilities in order to maintain a positive relationship with the interlocutor (e.g., 'I can do X instead of Y'; 'Why don't you do X instead of Y?')
7. Future acceptance: Using the promise to delay acceptance (e.g., 'I'll do it next time'; 'I promise I'll...')
8. Statement of negative consequences (e.g., 'It's your grade, not mine')
9. Criticism (e.g., 'That's a terrible idea!')
10. Letting interlocutor off the hook (e.g., 'Don't worry about me. You go and have fun')
11. Self-defence (e.g., 'It is not because I don't want to listen to your opinion')

12. Acceptance that functions as refusal: Unspecific or indefinite reply or lack of enthusiasm (e.g., 'I'll do that when I have time')
13. Avoidance: Avoiding direct response to proposed act
 - 13.1 Topic switch (e.g., 'Now let's go back to Chapter One')
 - 13.2 Hedging (e.g., 'Gee, I don't know'; 'I'm not sure')
 - 13.3 Joke (e.g., 'I like walking in the rain')
 - 13.4 Questioning (e.g., 'How do you expect me to answer you?')
 - 13.5 Postponement (e.g., 'I'll think about it')
 - 13.6 Pause fillers: Use of fillers to fill a moment between the end of the interlocutor's utterance and the beginning of the speaker's refusal utterance (e.g., 'well...'; 'oh...'; 'wow')
14. Gratitude (e.g., 'Thank you for inviting me')
15. Asking for approval (e.g., 'Is that possible?')
16. Sarcasm (e.g., 'I forgot you almost got "A" last term')

APPENDIX B

DCT situations

Hi I'm doing a survey regarding the different types of way that people refuse. I really need your favour to just refuse the situation that I'll be giving in your very own words.

In this questionnaire, you will find several communication situations in which you interact with someone. Pretend you are the person in the situation. You must refuse all requests, suggestions, invitations and offers. Write down your response. Respond as you would in an actual situation.

Situation 1: (Refusal to requests)

A classmate, who frequently misses classes, asks to borrow your class notes, but you do not want to give them to him/her.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 2: (Refusal to suggestions)

Your mother bought two T-shirts of different colours but you only liked one of them and dislike the other.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 3: (Refusal to invitations)

Your class teacher invites you to a motivational talk for school students in school the coming week but you cannot attend.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 4: (Refusal to offers)

You are at your friend's house watching television and your friend offers you some snack but you don't want to eat them as you are afraid of gaining the weight that you had lost.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 5: (Refusal to requests)

Your examination marks were low, so your father requested you to enroll yourself at a nearby tuition centre.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 6: (Refusal to suggestions)

You are sick and the doctor suggest you to be admitted into the hospital for further treatment.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 7: (Refusal to invitations)

A close friend of yours is having a party and has invited you but you have other plans.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 8: (Refusal to offers)

You prefer to drink coffee but an aunt of yours says that there's no coffee at home and she's going to mix a glass of milk for you.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 9: (Refusal to requests)

A friend of yours wants to use your cell phone to call to another friend but your credit in it is just good enough if there's an emergency for you to use it.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 10: (Refusal to suggestions)

A very good movie is playing at the cinema and a friend of yours has suggested you to watch the movie with him/her but you know your parents wouldn't allow you to go.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 11: (Refusal to invitations)

The year end school holidays are just around the corner and your father invites you to go for a holiday but you are not interested to go anywhere.

You refuse by saying:

Situation 12: (Refusal to offers)

You are given an expensive gift by a customer but its not even your birthday or any other special occasion.

You refuse by saying:

APPENDIX C

(REFUSALS DATA) (GROUPED ACCORDING TO SITUATIONS)

Situation 1: (Refusal to requests)

A classmate, who frequently misses classes, asks to borrow your class notes, but you do not want to give them to him/her.

You refuse by saying:

B1: I am really sorry, I am too stressed, I can't give my notes to you. Please understand~

B2: Uhh...i cant laa.im borrowing it to my other friend(says friend's name.)

B3: My friend,i'm so sorry.i can't give my notes,because i have left it at my aunt's house.

B4: Can you lend someone else's, my handwriting is ugly.

B5: cannot

B6. Sorry,but I am scared u might lose it

B7: sorry but i want to make revision using the book

B8- i am sorry,i can't borrow you my book

B9 : I can't cause i just gave it to teacher

B10 :no

B11: Sorry but no

B12: I am sorry i can't borrow you them.you have to ask someone else

B13- i also din"t attend 2 class

B14: i'm sorry ,but i left it at homesituation

B 15: sorry i have borrowed my fren

G1: I'm sorry but you can't borrow it. I still need to use it. But I do know someone who is willing to give it to you. You can ask her if you want.

G2 : I am so sorry , but i cant give you these notes as i am still reading them , but you can ask from someone else for them .

G3 : I'm sorry, I cant help you.I do not want to get in trouble"

G4 : Sorry. i cant help you fwen..i encourage you to come school more often.. i am truly sorry.

G5: I'm sorry but I need these notes for my revision today. Maybe you could ask another person for it.

G6 : um , I'm sorry , but I have to copy down some notes from the textbook . teacher wants the class notes by next week . I might get in trouble if I don't pass it up on time .

G7: Sry fren, I hav to do my own revision for our upcoming exams... So if it's possible, can you ask some other of our clazmates

G8:I could not borrow you my book because I has to do some revision.

G9: I'm sorry but I can't give you this notes because I need these notes for my revision.

G10: i'm extremely sorry la....i can't give u the notes..because because...i have to read those notes because i haven't ...im rely sorry!!!!

G11: sorry, but i really need it for today

G12: Sry.. but i lent it to someone else today..

G13: I'm sorry I can't give you the note

G14 :I'm very sorry....But I left it at home....

G15 : I have some problems giving you my book.

Situation 2: (Refusal to suggestions)

Your mother bought two T-shirts of different colours but you only liked one of them and dislike the other.

You refuse by saying:

B1: Mom, I prefer the black T-shirt, but not the yellow T-shirt.

B2: Ummm...Ma, this one (points at the nice one) is nice. this one (points to the other one), i don't think it'll fit me.

B3: Mom, this one is nicer than this one. So I'll take this one.

B4: I like that one but hate the other, maybe we can give it to someone else.

B5: (I don't like the other one)

B6: Can you just give the other one to my brother

B7: Mom, I like only this shirt so the other shirt you can keep for my smaller brother

B8: Mummy, I like this t-shirt only

B9: The shirt does not fit me

B10: I am sorry Mum, I do not like the other t-shirt.

B11: Mummy, I only like these shirts

B12: Mum, I do not like these two shirts. I'm terribly sorry. But I can keep them. I appreciate that and you are the best MUM IN THE WORLD!!!

B13: I will give it to my cousin

B14: Sorry Mum, but I prefer this one.

B15: Sorry, I don't like the other one because I hate the color

G1: Thanks for the t-shirts, Mum. Although I only like the red one by the way. But I will find a way to wear the blue one, PROMISE.

G2: Thank you Mum for buying me these T-shirts, but unfortunately I only like one of them as I don't like the colour on the other shirt.

G3: Mum, I want the pink shirt because I never had pink colour T-shirt"

G4: Mum, thank you so much for buying the t-shirts but, I'm not really attracted to the other ones..am sorry Mum.

G5: I'm sorry but I only like one of them and besides maybe we could buy a nicer shirt with the same colour

G6: Mum, I think I need a T-shirt in this colour *showing the t-shirt* I don't have any t-shirt in this colour. The other colour I already have one in my wardrobe.

G7: Mom, couldn't you get me another colour? I can give this to my sister right? :)

G8: Sorry, Mummy, I only like one of the t-shirts.

G9: I really like this one as it is my favourite colour.

G10: Mummy, why didn't you just buy one t-shirt....I guess one is enough already. I also have something similar like this (the dislike one)at least you can save some money (:p).....

G11: Mum, I don't really like that t-shirt. Maybe you can give it to my sister.

G12: I only like this one... you can give the other one to the neighbour or something...

G13: Mom, I don't like the other t-shirt maybe you can give someone else

G14: As I said Mum, I only like that one....

G15: I only like this T-Shirt. You can give the other one to someone else.

Situation 3: (Refusal to invitations)

A close friend of yours is having a party and has invited you but you have other plans.

You refuse by saying:

B1: I'm sorry, I hope I can join your party, but too bad I can't. I'm afraid my schedule is already packed with other plans.

B2: AHHHH! i got to go somewhere weih.:(i cant goooo.so sorry.

B3: i'm sorry,i cant come to ur party because,i've some other things to do.

B4: I'm sorry i have a wedding to attend.

B5: sorry i cannot go

B6: Sorry,I cant come

B7: sorry laaa but i can't come... I will come on the other day

B8-i am sorry-friend-,i can't come to your party because ihave to do something

B9: I can't attend your party because i have some inportant things to do

B10: iam sorry but i have to go out on the specific day.

B11: sorry next time

B12:I;m sorry i can't come.i have something else to do.Maybe next time.

B13-sry i can"attend.

B14 :I'm sorry,but i have to study for the mid-term exam.

B15:sorry i cant cum because i have to attend my football practice

G1: I'm sorry but I can't attend your party cause I have some other plans. I will make up for it though, or I will try as hard as possible to make it even if it means I'll come late.

G2 : I am really sorry that i cant make it to your party as i have somewhere important to be on that day, yet i hope you have a great time and i promise i will make it up to you

G3: I am truely sorry !!! I cant come to your party !!! i have other plan with my cousin "

G4 : I am sorry buddy..but i have family business on that day..i promised i will get u something nice.

G5: I'm very sorry because I have to be at somewhere important on that day and would not be able to make it yet i hope you enjoy the party

G6 : I hv a plan with my fmily on the same day . I'm so sorry . mayb some other day .

G7: Fren :(Sory ah, coz i can't make it to ur party, i hav to attend my uncle's wedding, sory ah...

G8: Sorry my friend,I can't go to your party because my mum is planning something else for my family.

G9: I'm very sorry because on that day,I have some important things to do.

G10: i'm extremely...rely rely rely sorry...tat i can't come to ur party because i have some plans with my family and im forced to attend soo im rely sorry tat i can't attend ur party.!! :(

G11: sorry, but i cant come. i have already made plans on that day.

G12: situation 3: Sry.. I kinda busy with stuff now... im really sry.. i'll make it up 2 u..

G13: I'm sorry i can't go to your party i have another plan on that day

G14:Sorry I can't come to your party.I'm very busy on that day.

G15 : Sorry ,I cannot come to your birthday party .

Situation 4: (Refusal to offers)

You are at your friend's house watching television and your friend offers you some snack but you don't want to eat them as you are afraid of gaining the weight that you had lost.

You refuse by saying:

B1: It's okay, maybe some time later.

B2: Hmm...snacks? nahh. i dont wanna get fat again. look at these muscles man! (shows muscles)

B3: did u have another type of food for me to eat..? i dont to get fat again, just because of these snacks

B4: No food for me, I'm on a diet program.

B5: im diet

B6: Oh, nevermind, I'm trying to stick to my diet

B7: no thanks.....i am scared that my weight will bertambah

B8: i don't to eat the snack because i afraid that my weight will increase

B9 : I'm on a diet so i wont take the snacks you gave me

B10: sorry iam afraid iwould gain some weight

B11: You refuse by saying: I am sorry I cant eat that snack

B12: No, I do not want to eat them. i am sorry because i do not want to gain weights.

B13: sry i m on diet.

B14: Its ok, i'm on a diet. Sit

B15: sorry i cant eat snacks because i will get fat

G1: I would LOVE to have some, I really would, but I'm kind of weight conscious now. But don't be offended, please don't. I mean, I know they taste AMAZING.

G2 : Thank you , but its okay i am not feeling hungry now .

G3: I'm sorry my best friend. I want to keep my health with healthy food and do not want my weight gain.

G4 : No thanks ..i looks yummy..but i promised myself that i will stay out of junk food.

G5: No thank you. I am on a diet and i can't eat that.

G6 : no , thanks :) I hv eaten them everyday at home anddd I am getting sick of eating them .

G7: No thanks, i'm already full

G8: Sorry friend I can't eat the snack because I am afraid of gaining the weight.

G9: No, thank you. I'm training myself from eating junk food.

G10 : oh..no thanks...i dun take snacksbut thx for ur request.....

G11: no thanks. im trying to stay fit.

G12: It's ok.. I'm eating less these days.., on diet..

G13: No thanks

G14: It's ok i've just eaten it at home...

G15 : I'm not eating the snack to keep my weight .

Situation 5: (Refusal to requests)

Your examination marks were low, so your father requested you to enroll yourself at a nearby tuition centre.

You refuse by saying:

B1: Dad, I'll promise you high marks again. Besides, tuition centres sometimes give pupils leaked-out questions..

B2:Urrm....no need lah dad.i will study!you see the next exam's results la.:D

B3: father,dont send to the tuition centre..i promis that i'll study hard,but please dont send me there.

B4: I don't want to go there, I have no friends there!

B5: why ?

B6. Nevermindlah

B7: father i dont want to go to the tuition centre...i will study mora harder to get higher marks

B8-dad,i don't want to go to the tuition centerand i will promised that i will get a good marks in the next exam

B9 : I think i will do better if i study at home alone

B10:dad i know ive got low marks for my examination but i do not to attend a tution class and i promise to study harder.

B11: I don't want

B12:no,I do not want to.I will prove to you,dad that i am capable to study alone and improve my studies from now on.

B13-I wil do better in the next examination.

B14 :Dad i don't want to attend any tution but i promise to study hardand get good results ib the next exam.sit

B15:sorry dad i feel that i could study better at home

G1: I don't think I need tuition dad. I will study harder and I'll focus more at school. I promise to get better marks next time, PROMISE.

G2 : I know my marks are low , and i truly am very sorry . But i seriously dont want to go for tuition . So , i promise that i will work and study harder for the next examination .

G3:I'm sorry father. Although my mark low,but I still can study very hard to improve my mark.

G4 : Dad, i know i dissapointed you..i will study hard..this time.i will keep my promise.

G5: please don't send me. I will try harder for my next examination.

G6 : Dad , it's such a waste of money . I can just make a study group with my friends at home . it's safer . I don't need to go out of the hse . besides , it's free . you don't hv to spend ur money.

G7: Dad, you don't have send me for tuition clzez, i will try harder to improve my marks by the next exam.

G8:Father,I don't want to go to the nearby tuition because I prefer to study at home.

G9:please don't send me there.I promise I will study harder for the next examination.

G10 : dad!!! i dun wanna go! i dun like this tuition centre ...its soo not nice!! i dun wan...*sad*

G11: never mind la dad. i rather study at home.

G12: I think i can study myself.. I did bad for this exam because I wasn't serious.. I will try harder.. also.. the tuition money is kinda expensive and we are alredi short of money... so.. there's no need for tuition..

G13:I'm ok for my exam father i don't need to go tuisyen

G14:Dad i promise i will study hard for the coming examination...pretty please...

G15: I don't want to go to the tuition centre.

Situation 6: (Refusal to suggestions)

You are sick and the doctor suggest you to be admitted into the hospital for further treatment. *You refuse by saying:*

B1: Doctor, I prefer to take treatments here. I'm not comfortable with hospitals.

B2: Urmm....okay..ill think about it.(doesnt go to the hospital)

B3: doctor,i dont wan to go to the hospital,because i hate the smell of the medicine.

B4:I do not want them to poke me!

B5: better i sleep at house

B6.I think i can cure by just taking medicene from home

B7: doctor i cant go to the further hospital because i am very sick

B8- doctor,i don"t think i should go to the hospital because i got a certain reason.

B9 : I have to take care of my younger brother as my parents are not at home

B10: doctor iam not realy in the mod of admiting me.

B11: what I must go to the hospital ,I cannot doctor

B12: No sir,its okay.I don't want to get admitted to the hospital.I am really sorry and i really appreciate that.

B13- SRY DOC I HAVE SOMETHING 2 DO.

B14 : I'm sorry doctor,but i promised my brother i'll attend my brothers birthday party tommorow

B15: sorry i cant stay because i have 2 attend my tuition class

G1: Sorry doc, I don't think I would want to do this treatment and stuff. I 'll just leave it all to the almighty God.

G2 : Doctor , i understand that i have to be admitted to the hospital for further treatment but as you know i am feeling rather well lately , so i dont think its nessesary for me to be further treated .

G3:Doctor I'm sorry.I want to treat at home.My family will take good care for me

G4 : Thank you for your advice,doctor..i will stay home and take care of myself.

G5: I'm sorry doctor but i really can't stay at the hospital. could you perhaps give me some medicine to help with the sickness

G6 : doctor , I think i'm just goin to take a rest at home . I am goin to sit for an examination at school nxt week . I hv to do a lot of revision . my prents are always there for me . they can take care of me .

G7: Doctor, I cannot b admitted, i hav an exam coming soon and i hav to attend skul for any notes...

G8:I am sorry doctor,I can't be admitted in the hospital because I don't has enough money to pay the bill.

G9:I'm sorry doctor but I'm not comfortable to be admitted in hospital!!

G10 : *sad face* i dun want.....pls...i dun want to be admitted...pls...

G11: its ok. i feel it would be if i just rest at home and take my medicine there.

G12: I think i'll try my best to cure it first.. if im not cured by a week then i'll go to the hospital.. is tht alrite?..

G13 I don't wanna stay at the hospital

G14: Doctor can't i just eat your medicine???

G15 : I don't want to go to the hospital for treatment .I can take the treatment here.

Situation 7: (Refusal to invitations)

Your class teacher invites you for a motivational talk for school students in school the coming week but you cannot attend.

You refuse by saying:

B1: Teacher, I'm so sorry that I can't come for the talk. I hope you can understand.

B2: Ummm...teacher, that day I have to go somewhere with my family.

B3: Umm..teacher, that day I need to go to somewhere else. Could you change the date?

B4: I'm so sorry teacher, I can't come. Maybe I can get the notes from my friends.

B5: sorry I cannot go

B6: Sorry, I can't come

B7: teacher I can't attend for the motivational talk because I am out with my family.....I am so sorry teacher

B8: teacher- I think I cannot attend the course because I got to do something on the same day

B9 : Teacher I cannot attend the motivational talk next week because I have to visit my grandparents

B10: teacher I am busy so I cannot attend the motivational talk.

B11: Sorry teacher I cannot come to school on that day

B12: I'm sorry teacher I can't come. I have something important to do. Maybe next time.

B13- I am going out

B14 : I'm sorry, but I must spend the rest of the month taking care of my grandmother who's ill.

B15: sorry I can't because I have to visit my grandparents who are sick

G1: I'm sorry teacher, I can't make it to the talk today because of some reasons. I will ask my friends on what happened at the talk, though. That way I won't leave out on anything

G2 : Thank you teacher for informing me about the motivational talk that is going on in school, but unfortunately I am not able to attend it as I have somewhere to be at that time . G3 :Teacher I can't go to the motivational talk next week. I have to follow my parents

send my brother to the airport. He is going to England.

G4 : Teacher, I am very sorry I cannot attend the talk..my youngest brother is really sick this past week, I need to take good care of him since my parents aren't home.

G5: Thank you for informing teacher but I won't be able to attend the motivational talk at school.

G6 : Teacher , I can't go to the motivational talk next week. I have to follow my sister sending my presents to the airport . they're going to Umrah .

G7: Teacher, I cannot come for the motivational talk next week because I will be having my tuition class on that day.

G8: Teacher, I am very sorry I can't attend the motivational talk because I am sick.

G9: thank you for informing teacher but I am not free on that day. besides, my mother won't let me go.

G10: teacher I'm sorry teacher...I can't attend the motivational talk because I'm forced to go out with my family...I'm sorry!!

G11: sorry, but I can't come.

G12: Teacher.. I'm sorry.. I cannot come for the motivational talk.. I'm busy on that day...

G13: I'm sorry teacher I can't attend the motivational talk

G14: Teacher I can't come because I have to attend a tuition class...

G15 : Very sorry teacher I could not attend the motivational talk .

Situation 8: (Refusal to offers)

You prefer to drink coffee but an aunt of yours says that there's no coffee at home and she's going to mix a glass of milk for you.

You refuse by saying:

B1: Aunt, that's so nice of you. But no thanks, don't burden yourself okay...

B2:Ummm....no need lah aunty.ill just have some water.:)

B3: aunt,its okay if there is no coffee left..i'll just drink plain water only.

B4: No need, I'm fine auntie!

B5: no thanks

B6.Then if thats the case,nevermind.

B7: never mind ... i would prefer to drink plane water than milk

B8-i don"t want the milk becausei already had it this morning

B9: Auntie...I don't drink milk I will have a glass of water instead

B10: aunty iam sorry because i do not like milk and i am afraid that i donot want the ,milk

B11: I don't want

B12:It's okay aunty.Please don't do milk for me .I am sorry i can't drink.But I really appreciate of you hhave done for me.

B13-it is okay however i have drank a cup cofee.

B14 :Nevermind aunty,i'll rather drink sky juice. sit

B15:sorry i dont like milk

G1: No thank you, auntie.

G2 : Thank you auntie , but i am not really a fan of milk . So , i dont think you have to make me it . But thanks again for caring and i would just prefer some cold water if thats alright .

G3:I'm sorry aunt.I do not like to drink a glass of milk.

G4 : Aunt don't really like milk it tastes funny..am sorry.

G5: oh no thank you. i would not want to trouble you.

G6 : aunt , it's okay . I can make myself a glass of milk later .

G7:Then, it's okay aunt.

G8:Thank you aunt you don't need to make me some milk.

G9:It's ok.I don't want to trouble you.

G10 : no thx..its k aunt.....im full....its k...

G11: if thats the case then nevermind aunty.

G12: Erm.. it's ok.. Im not reli in the mood for milk..

G13: Auntie I don't want maybe i will have some water

G14:No coffee???It's ok i'll drink something else...

G15 : Eem ... I prefer plain water instead.

Situation 9: (Refusal to requests)

A friend of yours wants to use your cell phone to call another friend but your credit in it is just enough if there's an emergency. *You refuse by saying:*

B1: I'm sorry, but my credit is running low lah.

B2: i finished my credit already!:(.uhh...use that guy's phone la.

B3: u wanna use my phone phone?..i'm sorry i cant give it to you..because my father dont let me to do so.

B4: I have no credit, sorry.

B5: this is for emergency

B6. Can u just borrow from someone else,I have only a little credit left

B7: sorry i cant lent you my phone..... you can use the public phone that is nearby

B8-.i am sorry because the credit of my phone is just enough for an emergency call only

B9 : my Phone is out of credit

B10:i am sorry because ive got use this phone during emergency

B11: no

B12:I'm sorry can't.I can only use my credits for emergency calls only

B13-i haven top up my cellphone.

B14 :I'm sorry,there's no credit in my cell phone.sit

B15:sorry i cant borrow my phone because the credit is good enough for emergency

G1: I'm sorry but I don't really have enough credit for your call. SORRY.

G2 : I am so sorry , but my phone has just enough credit for me to call anyone if there is an emergency . But i can give you some coins for you to call your friend at the payphone , if thats alright with you .

G3:I'm sorry.I can't let you use my handphone because my credit is enough to emergency call only .

G4 : i'm sorry but..i really need those extra credits..just in case u can go to the public phones nearby.

G5: I'm sorry but my phone can't be in use. I could lend you some coins to use the public phone

G6 : I'm rilly sorry . not like I don't let you to make any call using my cell phone , but my credit is just enough to make an emergency call if sumthing happens to me .

G7: Can you please use the house phone, my battery is low at the moment.

G8:I am very sorry I can't lend you my cellphone because my credit is low.

G9:I'm sorry but I have not enough credit to call my parents if there's emergency.I can lend you some coins to call your friends at public phone.

G10: sorry...my phone is out of credit....im sorry!]

G11: can you use somebody else phone. i have just enough credit in case there is an emergency.

G12: sry but my fon credit not enuf money... I need to use it incase of emergency...

G13: I'm sorry i have to use it when emergency

G14:Sorry not that i don't want to use my cell phone...my credit in it is just enough for me to use it just in case my mom didn't come yet...

G15: Sorry , I'm using my cell phone for emergency calls only .

Situation 10: (Refusal to suggestions)

A very good movie is playing at the cinema and a friend of yours has suggested you to join him/her to watch that movie but you know your parents wouldn't allow you to go.

You refuse by saying:

B1: I am sorry, my parents don't let me join you all lah..

B2: My parents don't let me go out.:(

B3: I can't go lah..because nobody wants to send me there

B4: Sorry, I can't go. My mom wouldn't let me.

B5: can I go to cinema

B6: I can't go.

B7: I really want to watch the movie with you but my parent does not let me join you

....you can invite the other friends

B8: I am sorry friend, I can't follow you to the cinema because my parents won't allow me

B9: I can't go as I have no transport

B10: I would love to but I can't follow you because my parents will not allow me.

B11: my parents would not let me

B12: Sorry I can't. My parents do not let me come with you guys. Maybe next time before you guys ask me out, I will ask my parents first.

B13: sorry I can't come because my parents don't allow me.

B14: I'm sorry, but there's a Depavali celebration this whole month. sit

B15: sorry I can't come because my parents don't allow me to go cinema with my friends

G1: Although I want to watch that movie I can't. My parents won't let me and I think I'll go with their advice. After all, it should be for my own good.

G2: I am really sorry, but I don't think I can join you for the movie as both of my parents aren't allowing me.

G3: I'm very sorry dear friend. I can't come because my parents won't allow me.

G4: Fwen, that movie is very interesting but my parents won't allow me to follow you along, they want to make sure of my safety.

G5: I would really love to go but my parents do not allow me to.

G6: I'm sorry, but I've just watched the movie with my family yesterday. I don't want to watch it twice.

G7: It's okay, I can get the DVD later, right now I have to go home.

G8: I am sorry friend I can't go with you because my parents will not allow me to go.

G9: I am very sorry but I know my parents did not allow me to go there. Maybe next time.

G10: sorry I can't come with you for the movie and I know it is gonna be awesome but I just can't come cause as usual my parents don't allow me...I'm sorry...

G11: sorry, but I can't go. my mum and dad wouldn't allow it.

G12: Sorry... my parents won't let me out.. they're worried about me...

G13: I'm sorry I can't join you

G14: Sorry I can't join you...Not that I don't want to join you. My parents won't let me join you cuz my parents are worried about my safety...

G15: Sorry, I could not go to the cinema with you.

Situation 11: (Refusal to invitations)

The year end school holidays are just around the corner and your father invites you to go for a holiday but you are not interested to go anywhere.

You refuse by saying:

B1: Well Dad, I guess I'll just hang out at home..

B2:Dadddd.lets stay at home la.more fun.:D

B3: father, isn't it better if we dont go anywhere this holiday..cuz i dont want to..i just want to stay at home..

B4: I don't want to go anywhere.

B5: im tired

B6.I dont want to go anywhere,can we just stay at home

B7: father i dont like this school. can i choose sekoah pilihan saya (teacher i don't know how to write in english)

B8-dad,i don't want to go anywhere because i want t rest at home

B9 : I'll stay at home to continue my studies

B10:dad iam sorry i donot want to give any suggestion as iam not interested to go out for a holiday.

B11: You refuse by saying: sorry but I do not want to go any where for these holidays

B12:I am sorry dad.I don't want to go anywhere.i want to spend time with you at home.I am sorry about this.But i relly appreciate of what you have done for me.I love you dad.

B13-dad i m not interested goin anywhr.

B14 :I don't want to go anywhere dad,i want to spend my holidays at home sit

B15:sorry dad i prefer staying at home because i dont like 2 go anywhere

G1: Sorry dad, I'd rather stay at home. :)

G2 : Dad , i know that you would want me to go somewhere for the holidays , but im sorry i just dont feel like going anywhere .

G3:I'm sorry father.I prefer stay at home.

G4 : Dad, i rather stay home am planning to go outings or play the laptop.

G5: Maybe you could talk to mummy about it because i don't really have any suggestions.

G6 : dad , I think we should jst rest at home . going out for holidays is tiring .

G7: Dad, can't we just stay at home and do something? I prefer to stay at home and relax.

G8:I don't have mood to go anywhere.

G9:I don't really have some suggestions for you.Perhaps,I don't want to go anywhere.

G10: dad, im not rely interested to go for any holidays la...im tired and lazy...

G11: i dont really want to go for a holiday.

G12: I dun feel like goin anywhere.. I wanna stay at home..

G13:father,I'm not intrested to go anywhere

G14:Dad it's not that i don't like to go anywhere but the place is just not interesting...

G15: I'm not interested to go anywhere .

Situation 12: (Refusal to offers)

You are given an expensive gift by a customer but its not even your birthday or any other special occasion.

You refuse by saying:

B1: You look very suspicious. That's why I just can't take expensive prizes such as this..

B2:Ohhh...whats this?i cant take thiss.i dont deserve this!:P

B3: this gift is for what..i dont to take it.i dont deserve it.

B4: No need for presents. Our company does not accept gifts.

B5: thank you

B6.I cant accept this

B7: OMG! why is the price is so high....can you kurangkan the prize

B8-i am afraid of receiving this present because

B9 : I can't accept the gift as we are not good friends

B10:i am sorry i do not want the present as there is no any special occasion today.

B11: no

B12:i am sorry i can't have this present.It is not my birthday.But i really appreciate that.

B13-NO THX.

B14 :Its ok,its not my birthday.

B15:sorry its not my bufday or any other occasion

G1: Thank you, this is amazing but I can't. So sorry I had to waste your money and time. Soooo sorry.

G2 : Thank you so much , but today is not my birthday . So you dont have to give me it . You can still give it to someone though .

G3:I'm very sorry.I just cant except the gift.It also not my birthday yet".

G4 : Thank you very much..but it is too expensive to accept...am sorry.

G5: thank you but you could give me on a special occasion? I don't feel uncomfortable accepting it. sorry.

G6: thanks for this :) but , I better not take this . this give is rllly expensive andd it's not even my birthday today .

G7: Sorry, but i just can except this

G8:Thank you but I don't want the gift because it is not my birthday or anything else.

G9:Thank you for the gift but I can accept it as it is an expensive gift.

G10 : ahh.....i guess u're mistaken becoz today isn't my birthday or any other

G11: sorry but i cant accept this.money... so.. there's no need for tuition..

G12: No thanks.. It's not even my b.day yet.. nor is it a special day.. why not giving it to someone special to u instead?..

G13: it is ok i can't take it

G14:It's ok i can't take them...

G15 : I could not accept your gift without any reason.

APPENDIX D

BOYS DATA

Table (1): Direct and Indirect Strategies By Boys

DCT - BOYS	B														
Situation 1 (Refusal	ID	ID	ID	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	D	D	ID	ID	ID	ID	ID
Situation 2 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 3 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 4 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 5 (Refusal	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	ID									
Situation 6 (Refusal	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	ID									
Situation 7 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 8 (Refusal	ID	ID	ID	D	D	ID	ID	ID	ID	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	ID
Situation 9 (Refusal	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	ID									
Situation 10 (Refusal	ID	ID	ID	ID	ID	D	ID								
Situation 11 (Refusal	ID	ID	ID	D	ID										
Situation 12 (Refusal	ID	ID	ID	ID	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	ID	D	ID	D	ID	ID

Note: D – refers to direct strategy ID– refers to indirect strategy

Table (2): Classification of Refusal Strategies By Boys

DCT BOYS	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	B11	B12	B13	B14	B15
Situation 1 (Refusal to requests)	3	13.6	4	5	2	8	7	3	2	1	3	6	16	5	10
Situation 2 (Refusal to suggestions)	6	13.6	4	4	9	6	4	4	1 6	3	12	4	10	3	5
Situation 3 (Refusal to invitations)	3	13.6	13.6	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	3	7	13. 1	5	5
Situation 4 (Refusal to offers)	7	13.6	6	5	13.1	13 .6	14	5	1 2	3	3	5	3	4	5
Situation 5 (Refusal to requests)	7	13.6	7	11	13.4	10	5	7	1 2	7	2	7	7	7	11
Situation 6 (Refusal to suggestions)	6	13.6	5	13.1	16	12	5	5	5	9	2	5	3	5	5
Situation 7 (Refusal to invitations)	5	13.6	15	6	3	3	5	5	5	11	3	7	5	3	5
Situation 8 (Refusal to offers)	12	13.6	12	1	1	10	6	5	6	5	2	12	6	6	3
Situation 9 (Refusal to requests)	3	13.6	5	3	13.1	6	6	5	9	5	1	3	9	5	5
Situation 10 (Refusal to suggestions)	3	10	5	3	13.4	2	4	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	5

Situation 11 (Refusal to invitations)	13.6	6	6	2	13.1	6	13. 1	5	1 0	5	3	3	9	6	5
Situation 12 (Refusal to offers)	9	13	9	9	14	2	13. 4	5	5	5	1	12	1	12	3

GIRLS DATA

Table (3): Direct and Indirect Strategies By Girls

DCT - GIRLS	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Situation 1 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 2 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 3 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 4 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 5 (Refusal	ID	D													
Situation 6 (Refusal	ID	D	ID	ID	D	ID	ID								
Situation 7 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 8 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 9 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 10 (Refusal	ID														
Situation 11 (Refusal	ID	D	ID	ID	ID	D	D	ID	D						
Situation 12 (Refusal	ID														

Note: D – refers to direct strategy ID– refers to indirect strategy

Table (4): Classification of Refusal Strategies By Girls

DCT - GIRLS	G 1	G 2	G 3	G 4	G 5	G6	G7	G 8	G 9	G1 0	G1 1	G1 2	G1 3	G1 4	G1 5
Situation 1 (Refusal to requests)	6	6	8	8	6	13. 6	6	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	10
Situation 2 (Refusal to suggestions)	14	14	5	4	4	11	13. 4	3	4	13. 4	11	4	12	9	12
Situation 3 (Refusal to invitations)	5	7	5	5	14	5	5	5	14	5	3	5	3	5	3
Situation 4 (Refusal to offers)	4	14	5	7	5	5	11	5	11	4	11	12	11	12	5
Situation 5 (Refusal to requests)	7	7	5	7	4	11	11	5	7	5	11	5	4	7	2
Situation 6 (Refusal to suggestions)	5	4	3	14	3	6	5	5	3	2	4	6	2	13. 4	6
Situation 7 (Refusal to invitations)	5	5	5	5	5	6	13. 6	5	5	5	6	7	6	5	3
Situation 8 (Refusal to offers)	14	14	3	3	14	7	14	14	10	14	12	13. 6	6	6	13. 6

Situation 9 (Refusal to requests)	5	5	5	11	6	11	10	5	6	3	6	11	11	11	11
Situation 10 (Refusal to suggestions)	4	3	5	5	4	10	12	5	7	5	3	5	3	5	3
Situation 11 (Refusal to invitations)	6	5	6	6	10	6	6	2	11	11	3	13. 5	2	5	2
Situation 12 (Refusal to offers)	11	12	3	12	12	12	3	12	12	13. 6	13. 1	10	12	12	10

TYPES OF REFUSALS USED

Table (5): Direct and Indirect Strategies

Types of Refusals Used	D	%	ID	%
Requests	6	6.7	84	93.3
Suggestions	4	4.4	86	95.6
Invitations	4	4.4	86	95.6
Offers	6	6.7	84	93.3

FAMILY, FORMAL AND SOCIAL DOMAINS

Table (6): Refusals by Boys and Girls

FAMILY DOMAIN	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	B11	B12	B13	B14	B15
Situation 2 (Refusal to suggestions)	6	13.6	4	4	9	6	4	4	16	3	12	4	10	3	5
Situation 5 (Refusal to requests)	7	13.6	7	11	13.4	10	5	7	12	7	2	7	7	7	11
Situation 8 (Refusal to offers)	12	13.6	12	1	1	10	6	5	6	5	2	12	6	6	3
Situation 11 (Refusal to invitations)	13.6	6	6	2	13.1	6	13.1	5	10	5	3	3	9	6	5
	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G9	G10	G11	G12	G13	G14	G15
Situation 2 (Refusal to suggestions)	14	14	5	4	4	11	13.4	3	4	13.4	11	4	12	9	12
Situation 5 (Refusal to requests)	7	7	5	7	4	11	11	5	7	5	11	5	4	7	2
Situation 8 (Refusal to offers)	14	14	3	3	14	7	14	14	10	14	12	13.6	6	6	13.6
Situation 11 (Refusal to invitations)	6	5	6	6	10	6	6	2	11	11	3	13.5	2	5	2

FORMAL DOMAIN	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	B11	B12	B13	B14	B15
Situation 3 (Refusal to invitations)	3	13.6	13.6	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	3	7	13.1	5	5
Situation 6 (Refusal to suggestions)	6	13.6	5	13.1	16	12	5	5	5	9	2	5	3	5	5
Situation 9 (Refusal to requests)	3	13.6	5	3	13.1	6	6	5	9	5	1	3	9	5	5

Situation 12 (Refusal to offers)	9	13	9	9	14	2	13.4	5	5	5	1	12	1	12	3
	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G9	G10	G11	G12	G13	G14	G15
Situation 3 (Refusal to invitations)	5	7	5	5	14	5	5	5	14	5	5	5	3	5	3
Situation 6 (Refusal to suggestions)	5	4	3	14	3	6	5	5	3	2	4	6	2	13.4	6
Situation 9 (Refusal to requests)	5	5	5	11	6	11	10	5	6	3	6	11	11	11	11
Situation 12 (Refusal to offers)	11	12	3	12	12	12	3	12	12	13.6	13.1	10	12	12	10

FRIENDS DOMAIN	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	B11	B12	B13	B14	B15
Situation 1 (Refusal to requests)	3	13.6	4	5	2	8	7	3	2	1	3	6	16	5	10
Situation 4 (Refusal to offers)	7	13.6	6	5	13.1	13.6	14	5	12	3	3	5	3	4	5
Situation 7 (Refusal to invitations)	5	13.6	15	6	3	3	5	5	5	11	3	7	5	3	5
Situation 10 (Refusal to suggestions)	3	10	5	3	13.4	2	4	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	5
	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G9	G10	G11	G12	G13	G14	G15
Situation 1 (Refusal to requests)	6	6	8	8	6	13.6	6	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	10
Situation 4 (Refusal to offers)	4	14	5	7	5	5	11	5	11	4	11	12	11	12	5
Situation 7 (Refusal to invitations)	5	5	5	5	5	6	13.6	5	5	5	6	7	6	5	3
Situation 10 (Refusal to suggestions)	4	3	5	5	4	10	12	5	7	5	3	5	3	5	3
<p>Legend: Numbers 1- 16: Based on Classifications of Refusal Strategies Appendix A B1-B15: Boy Respondents G1-G15: Girl Respondents</p>															