REFUSAL STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH BY MALAYSIAN INDIAN UNDERGRADUATES

JESSICA RAMAN A/P RAMAN

SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

2016

REFUSAL STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH BY MALAYSIAN INDIAN UNDERGRADUATES

JESSICA RAMAN A/P RAMAN

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

2016

ABSTRACT

Refusal is a face threatening act because it contradicts with the expectations of the speaker and therefore, is not a preferred speech act. However, the speech act of refusal cannot be avoided as it is a part of our daily communication. Therefore, this study was carried out to find out how Indian undergraduates, one of the majority races in Malaysia, handle refusal. The present study investigates the strategies used by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English as well as the influences of power on the choice of refusal strategies made by them in an academic context. These objectives were expressed through two research questions. The data, gained from a DCT was analysed and coded according to an adapted framework of refusal strategies that was developed from a combination of the frameworks proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003).

ABSTRAK

Penolakan adalah lakuan tutur yang kurang disukai dan mengancam wajah kerana ia bercanggah dengan harapan atau keinginan penutur. Walau bagaimanapun, lakuan tutur penolakan tidak boleh dielakkan kerana ia merupakan sebahagian kecil daripada komunikasi harian kita. Oleh kerana itu, objektif/tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengenalpasti bagaimana mahasiswa/mahasiswi India, antara salah satu kaum yang penting di Malaysia, mengendalikan lakuan tutur penolakan. Kajian ini mengkaji strategi penolakan yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa/mahasiswi India di Malaysia apabila membuat penolakan dalam bahasa Inggeris serta kesan kuasa pada pilihan strategi penolakan yang dibuat oleh mahasiswa/mahasiswi India ini dalam konteks akademik. Objektif ini dinyatakan melalui dua persoalan kajian. Data kajian yang diambil daripada suatu ujian yang dipanggil sebagai DCT telah dianalisis/diteliti dan dikodkan mengikut rangka kerja strategi penolakan yang telah diubahsuaikan berdasarkan rangka kerja yang dicadangkan oleh Beebe et al. (1990) dan Al-Issa (2003).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I am very much in debt and would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Veronica Lowe, who has been so cooperative and patient with me throughout the process of getting this research report completed. Her meticulous evaluation of my work, constructive suggestions as well as comments were really beneficial and helped me in producing a better piece of research. Her continuous encouragement despite the short time frame I had to complete this research report, also gave me the motivation I needed in getting my work done as fast as possible.

Besides that, I would also like to express my gratitude to the staffs and lecturers of the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics who helped me in gaining the linguistic knowledge needed for this study and also the procedures involved in getting a research report completed in this faculty.

My sincere thanks also go to the participants of this study who were willing to be a part of this research by permitting me to take their refusal expressions as the data. Without their cooperation, this study would not have been a success.

Last but not least, I would also like to express my appreciation to the people close to my heart; my family and friends for their continuous and unconditional support, prayers, motivation and encouragement during the whole time taken to complete this research report, especially during crucial and stress-filled moments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. DCT – Discourse Completion Test

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Lightbown and Spada, (1999); Gass and Selinker, (2001) mentioned that communicative competence is the ability of speakers to use a variety of language forms, involving both the relationship between the speakers and the social and cultural context of the situation. Though one may already have a vast vocabulary range and perfect grammar knowledge in a second language, yet misunderstandings might still take place in communication if one does not use the appropriate pragmatic knowledge (Tanck, 2002).

Tanck (2002) also stated that speakers use a range of speech acts to attain their goals in communication, including the broad seminal categories – commissives, declarations, directives, expressives, and representatives (Searle, 1969) – and also the specific acts like apologies, requests, complaints, and refusals (Kasper and Rose, 2001).

Studies have proven that speech acts are not easy to be carried out in second language situations usually because speakers of first language have the tendency to do a direct translation from his/her first language to the second language resulting in different message interpretation by the hearer. Situations like this create misunderstandings between the interlocutors as the hearer could not understand the message as it was

intended by the speaker. This is because an expression that works in one language may not work in another language. For example, in a study conducted by Al-Kahtani (2005), he said that second language learners would normally encounter problems in carrying out a speech act mainly because of the differences in cultural background.

Refusals take place in all sorts of language and types of communication, regardless of one's nationality or ethnicity. It could be refusing a request, an offer, and a suggestion and so on. Refusals are a face threatening act (FTA) because of its face-threatening nature to both interlocutors in communication. Brown and Levinson (1978) stated that a refusal might offend the listener; hence getting messages across clearly without offending the listener becomes difficult. That is why the speaker has to make the conversation longer in order not to offend the other person. From the perspective of sociolinguistic, refusals are crucial as they vary according to social variables like gender, age, level of education, power, and social distance (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Smith, 1998).

This study aims to find out the strategies Malaysian Indian undergraduates use to make refusals in English and how the power variable influences their choice of the refusal strategies.

1.1 Statement of Problem

Refusal is a face-threatening act for it contradicts the listener's expectations. The face of the speaker or listener is threatened when a refusal is carried out. Across cultures, to say "No" can be very difficult. Therefore, special skill is needed to get the "No" message

across in which the interlocutor needs to be aware of the correct language form and its functions of the culture or ethnic and its values.

Malaysians, as a whole are a face conscious society therefore; they are prone to avoid face-threatening situations as much as possible. To support this, Farnia et al. has said that, "Malaysia is an eastern non-egalitarian society where keeping face is acceptable" (2010, p.22). Nevertheless, refusals are parts of our daily conversations and cannot be avoided. Refusal expressions differ from one person to the other depending on variables like situations, surroundings, power and the age gap between interlocutors.

In view of that, in the setting of the current study, refusing a request or an offer was also face threatening as the speaker refusing ran the risk of offending the listener. Moreover, the situations were also created in a way where the addressees who have different power with the participants and also familiar to the participants in an academic environment were involved. Hence, by gathering the refusal expressions to the requests and offers of this study as data, the important question raised in this study was how the power between the two parties affected or influenced the choice of refusal strategies made by Malaysian Indian undergraduates in the academic context.

1.2 Significance of the study

In Malaysia, English is a second language and to some ethnic groups in Malaysia like Chinese, the Bumiputeras etc. it might even be a third or fourth language. For example, the participants in this study, the Indian undergraduates, English comes only after their mother tongue which could be Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam or Hindi and Bahasa Malaysia. Hence, this study can be an interest of ESL learners. They can learn how

3

Malaysian Indian undergraduates refuse in both request and offer type situations and improve the interaction quality by learning how to use the refusal strategies appropriately. Besides that, teachers and lecturers also can benefit from the results of this study in which they can teach their students on how to use the speech act of refusal by preparing materials, notes and suitable exercises in class.

It was hoped that the findings of this study provide new insights and information about how Malaysians, in this case, the Indian undergraduates refuse in English when different power was involved in a communication. As there are many ethnic groups in Malaysia, understanding their cultural practices and values is very important to avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication. Fewer studies have been conducted on the speech act of refusals by Malaysians, especially the Indians in Malaysia. Hence, readers will get a better understanding of how Malaysian Indians communicate with one another and what are the reasons that cause them to communicate in a particular way. The findings of this study most probably could contribute to the field of pragmatics study especially studies related to the speech act of refusal focusing on monocultural communication and also in the growth of communicative competence.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The aims of this study are to identify the refusal strategies used by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and to analyse whether power has the influence on the choice of their refusal strategies or not.

1.4 Research Questions

Based on the objectives mentioned above, the following research questions are created:

1. What are the strategies employed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English in academic context?

2. What is the influence of power on the choice of refusal strategies made by Malaysian Indian undergraduates in an academic context?

1.5 Limitations

There are few limitations in this study. One of them is that the findings might only be applicable to a small group of people due to the limited number of participants in this study, which are 40. There are possibilities for results to vary when studies are conducted in a bigger scale with more participants. Not only that, this study focused mainly on Indian undergraduates age ranged from 26 to 36. These undergraduates were a special group that was allowed by the government to do a Bachelor Degree course in Teaching after years of experience in the teaching field. Hence, the findings might not be applicable to the entire ethnic group.

Moreover, the participants of this study came from a rural background in which the exposure to English took place only in schools. Findings might not be the same if a similar study is conducted using participants from the urban area, where they are exposed to the use of English around them frequently. There is also a possibility that participants from urban area use English as their first language.

In this study, only limited variables are used such as power and familiarity between the interlocutors. Thus, there might be a variation in findings in the future if closer attention is given to other variables like age, gender, occupation, and environment and so on. Only refusals to requests and offers are focused in this study and there could be differences in findings if refusals to suggestions and invitations are also looked into in future.

Furthermore, this study utilises DCT in which I am aware that a written response in a single dialogue turn may provide only a partial dimension of what might take place in an actual interaction and the responses could vary if the study is carried out in a natural setting. Future researchers may explore the topic and make the research more comprehensive, wide-ranging and applicable to a wider range of population within the same ethnic group or across different ethnic groups in Malaysia.

1.6 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the important features that needed to be highlighted in this study. The background knowledge of the study gives understanding on the nature of the issue being studied. Hence, it was hoped that this study could provide a beneficial understanding on the speech act of refusal performed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to future researchers.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter briefly summarises a number of studies that has been done on the speech acts of refusals included the related theories, instruments and frameworks that have been employed in these studies. A concise account on how these previous studies aided the methodology of the current study is also given at the end of the chapter.

Every part of speech acts has been looked into but it is never enough as how people see speech acts and what people understand as the correct use of speech acts changes across cultures and time. According to Shaozhong (n.d), lots of studies have been done in the area of cross-cultural and contrastive pragmatics because people from different countries may look at pragmatic principles differently.

Most studies that have been done previously on the speech act of refusal consisted of contrastive studies. These studies compared the refusal strategies used by people of different cultures, values and practices which verify that refusal strategies changes across cultures. According to Wolfson (1981, p.123), "Speech acts differ cross culturally not only in the way they are realized but also in their distribution, their frequency of occurrence, and in the functions they serve."

2.1 Speech act of Refusals

According to Campillo (2009), the act of refusing is very complex, in which a speaker has to refuse his/her listener's invitation, suggestion or request directly or indirectly. Due to its face threatening nature towards the addressee's face, speaker's choice of words or actions are constrained. Face threatening acts (FTAs) are acts that challenge the face wants of an interlocutor (Brown and Levinson, 1987) and they may threaten either positive or negative face. Threatening positive face means threatening the speakers or hearers self-image include apologies, compliment acceptance, physical breakdown etc. meanwhile threatening negative face means threatening the speakers or hearers personal freedom include the expression of thanks, apologies, excuses etc. Thus, a high level of pragmatic competence is needed to make refusals through indirect strategies (Chen, 1996).

Refusal does not rely just in long responses of negotiation and mutual achievements in communication, but also in "face-saving manoeuvres to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act" (Gass and Houck, 1999, p.2). It is also represented as "a major cross-cultural 'sticking point' for many non-native speakers' (Beebe et al., 1990). Refusal is a sophisticated act which is influenced by several factors like gender, age, and level of education, power, and social status (Fraser, 1990; Smith, 1998).

In politeness theory, refusal is described as a face-threatening act as it goes against the listener's expectations in the communication and is carried out through indirect strategies (Tanck, 2002). People can be differentiated by the language terms they use in their respected speech community in cross-linguistic or cross-cultural communication. Thus, a failure in pragmatic may arise here when a face-threatening act is used by the

speaker. Beebe and Takahashi (1987, p.133) has stated that "the inability to say 'no' clearly and politely …has led many non-native speakers to offend their interlocutors". On the whole, the speech act of refusal can be described as a universal phenomenon but the understanding of this speech act may vary across cultures.

2.1.1 Framework of refusal strategies

The framework or taxonomy that was widely used in the studies concerning the speech act of refusal was the one proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) in their cross-cultural study of refusals by Americans and Japanese. This framework comprised the refusal strategies that were commonly used and was divided into two main categories, namely semantic formulas and adjuncts. Semantic formulas are the expressions of the refusals itself and adjuncts are supposed to function as a part of a refusal expression but they cannot be on their own as a refusal strategy and cannot carry out a refusal independently (Campillo et al., 2009; p.141). The semantic formulas are further split into two categories, direct strategies and indirect strategies. The taxonomy is as shown in the table below:

Table 2.1: Theoretical framework by Beebe et al. (1990)

Type	Strategies	Semantic formulas/Expressions
Direct	Performative	"I refuse"
	Non-performative: 1. "No"	"No"
	2. Negative willingness/ability	"I can't", "I don't think so"
Indirect	Statement of regret	"I'm sorry …", "I feel terrible …"
	Wish	"I wish I could help you…"
	Excuse, reason, explanation	"My children will be home that night", "I have a headache"
	Statement of alternative: 1. I can do X instead of Y	I'd rather …, "I'd prefer …"
	2. Why don't you do X instead of Y	"Why don't you ask someone else?"
	Set conditions for future or past acceptance	"If you had asked me earlier, I would have …"
	Promise of future acceptance	"I'll do it next time", "I promise I'll …", "Next time I'll …" -- using "will" or "promise"

	Statement of principle	"I never do business with friends"
	Statement of philosophy	"One can't be too careful"
	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor: 1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	"I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation.
	2. Guilt trip	For instance: waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"
	3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	"That's a terrible idea!" "Who do you think you are?"
	4. Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request	
	5. Let interlocutor off the hook	"Don't worry about it", "That's okay", "You don't have to"
	6. Self-defence	"I'm trying my best", "I'm doing all I can do"
	Acceptance that functions as a refusal: 1. Unspecific or indefinite reply	
	2. Lack of enthusiasm	
	Avoidance: 1. Non-verbal i. Silence	
	ii. Hesitation	
	iii. Do nothing	
	iv. Physical departure	
	2. Verbal i. Topic switch	
	ii. Joke	
	iii. Repetition of part of request, etc.	"Monday?"
	iv. Postponement	"I'll think about it"
	v. Hedging	"Gee, I don't know", "I'm not sure"

Adjuncts to refusals	Semantic formulas/Expressions
1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement	"That's a good idea …", "I'd love to …"
2. Statement of empathy	"I realise you are in a difficult situation"
3. Pause fillers	"uhh", "well", "oh", "uhm"
4. Gratitude/appreciation	

2.1.2 Previous studies on refusals

There were commonly two types of refusal studies in the past: studies on the refusal actions in one specific culture or refusal comparison across cultural groups; and

investigation studies on the characteristics of refusal made by non-native speaker in English.

Beebe et al. (1990) were among the ones that investigated how the sociocultural norms of L1 influenced the refusal performance of L2 learners. In their refusals, they found that Japanese learners of English (JE) had the resemblance of native speakers of Japanese (JJ), and were different from the native speakers of English (AE), in which the pragmatic transfer took place. The result showed that the Japanese speakers were influenced by the interlocutors' status and Americans responded according to their degree of familiarity with the interlocutors. Referring to the content of semantic formulas, the researchers found that the AE group used more specific excuses than those of the JJ and JE groups.

Beebe at al.'s (1990) theoretical framework did not only manage to show the distinctive degrees of refusal directness and indirectness but also showed the variation in the content of the excuses given. No effort was taken to look into the structure of the refusal strategies at discourse level. Besides having different levels of power and situations and 12 Discourse Completion Test (DCT) in their study, they only came up with general qualitative results in which the major classification of refusals strategies were discussed.

There were many studies done on the native speakers of Arabic after Beebe et al. (1990). One of them was Al-Kahtani (2005). He looked into refusals made by Americans, Japanese and Arabs in which the refusals were studied in terms of status and analysed in different dimensions of 'order', 'frequency' and 'content of semantic formulas'. The findings showed that first language interference and culture resulted in the differences of refusal understanding between native and non-native speakers. Hence,

Al-Kahtani came up with a suggestion that proper ways of refusing in the target language should be taught to English as a second language (ESL) learners in order for them to communicate with errors free, especially with the native speakers of English.

Nelson et al. (2002) on the other hand looked into the similarities and differences that arise in communication styles of Egyptian Arabic and US English. A verbal DCT comprised of four type situations (requests, invitations, offers and suggestions) in which each situation had addressees of different status was used as the instrument in this study. The analysis that was carried by using the refusal coding of Beebe et al. (1990) showed that though similar strategies with similar frequencies were made by both Egyptians and Americans, the Americans used more indirect strategies compared to the Egyptians.

On the other hand, Al-Issa (2003) looked into the phenomenon of sociocultural transfer and its motivating factors within the realization patterns of the speech act refusal by Jordanian EFL learners. He used a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that was created by referring to an observational field note and semi-structured interviews to elicit the data. The results highlighted the learners' sociocultural transfer occurred in the three areas: choice of selecting semantic formulas, length of responses, and content of semantic formulas. Each area reflected the cultural values transferred from Arabic to English. Not only that, form the interview data, it was found that sociocultural transfer was most probably motivated by the learners' pride of L1, learners' perception of L2, and religion.

Beebe et al.'s (1990) framework had been adopted by many researchers though there were weaknesses in their methodology. Their refusal framework of direct and indirect

strategies was used as an important research basis for many interlanguage studies on refusals such as Chen (1996) and Félix-Brasdefer (2006).

Chen (1996) investigated the speech acts of refusal by American and Chinese speakers of English. Her subjects were 26 graduates, native English speakers of English and non-native speakers that came from different linguistic background. Three types of data were gathered: naturally-occurring refusals in daily conversation; data from a discourse completion task; and information from a metapragmatic judgment task. Results showed that, when emphasising on individuality and stressing on the linguistic function of the speech act, the native speakers had truthfulness, directness, clarity, and effectiveness, whereas in valuing social interaction and solidarity, the native speakers were more worried about being direct, preserving face, and avoiding embarrassment.

Félix-Brasdefer (2006) looked into the linguistic strategies used by monolingual native speakers of Mexican Spanish in one Mexican community in refusal based interactions: formal and informal situations. A collection of 80 role-play interactions by male university students ages ranged from 21 to 26 were used to gather the data of this study. The data were analysed using a modified version of Beebe et al.'s (1990) framework resulted in indirect strategies were commonly used to weaken the face-threatening effect of refusal and the correct degree of politeness in the Mexican society was determined by factors such as power and distance.

Within the Malaysia context focusing on the nationality, Farnia and Wu (2012) conducted a study to find out the refusals of Chinese and Malaysian university students to invitations. The aims of this study were to examine how Chinese international and Malaysian university students in Malaysia refuse invitations and their perception of the

refusing process. DCT and structured interview were the instruments used to collect the data in this study. The data collected were analysed using the adopted framework of Beebe et al. (1990). The findings of the study showed that the refusal strategies used by both Chinese international and Malaysian students were similar but they differed in the number of strategies used in a given situation.

Sattar et al.'s (2011) study was not cross-cultural. They focused on the refusal strategies by Malay university students in which 40 Malay students of University Sains Malaysia took part. This study employed a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as an instrument to collect data and the data were analysed according to the framework provided by Beebe et al. (1990). The findings showed that Regret or saying 'sorry', and giving excuses or explanations were the preferred formulas used by the participants, and that the refusal performance in English were influenced by the Malay culture.

Al-Shboul et al. (2012) study looked into the similarities and differences of the refusals made in English between Jordanian (EFL) and Malay (ESL) postgraduates. Audiotaped situations were created using a modified Discourse Completion Test (DCT) to gain the natural verbal responses from the participants. Data were then analysed in terms of semantic formulaic sequences in which they were categorized by four trained coders based on Beebe et al.'s (1990) framework. Results showed that both groups used almost similar strategies with similar frequency in performing refusals. However, Malays used less indirect strategies than the Jordanians. When came to invitations refusal made to equal and lower status person, Jordanian participants expressed 'gratitude' less frequently than the Malay participants and the results were similar when the participants performed refusals in all request situations.

Kathir (2015) investigated the English refusal patterns employed by academicians in refusing an invitation or a request. 50 academic staff from two Malaysian universities with different educational backgrounds was the participants of this study. A Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and interview were used to collect the data of this study and the data was analysed using the taxonomy of refusal by Beebe et al. (1990). The findings revealed that the participants complied to the indirect behaviour of refusal, at the same time provided reasons and explanations; used polite forms and diplomatic approaches in their refusals. It was concluded that high level of pragmatic competence, cultural awareness and ethnic sensitivities were acquired by the participants when dealing with refusals.

2.2 Research gap

Variables to most speech acts situations were classified by Brown and Levinson (1987) into Power, Distance and Ranking of Imposition. In general, current literature demonstrated the factors that influenced the choice of refusal strategies as social status, gender, age, social distance, and power, level of education, culture and language proficiency. Whereas, in this study, the focus was on the power factor and how it influenced the choices of refusal strategies used by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to refuse a simulated situation in an academic context. In order to achieve the aim of this study, a DCT comprised of five (5) prompts adapted from the study conducted by Al-Issa (2003) was used to distinguish the power and a framework of refusal strategies adapted from the ones proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003) was used as a fundamental to analyse the refusal expressions.

2.3 Conclusion

This chapter gave a general view of the previous literatures and the framework that were related to the current study. As a whole, the speech act of refusal has been widely researched on in many cultures as well as cross-cultures. This information gave the knowledge needed to carry out a valid and reliable study. The current study was conducted in hope that it will contribute by providing some input on how a selected group of Malaysian Indian undergraduates make refusals in English under an academic context.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter explains about all the theories and methods that were used to collect and analyse the data in this study. Some methods employed here were inspired by the previous literature and some were created to fit the nature of the data that was collected for this study. The research design of the current study was qualitative supported by some minor quantitative calculations of total and percentage. The analysis of the strategies employed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and the influences of power on the choice of refusal strategies made by them in an academic context were done qualitatively. This chapter also gives a clear understanding on the background of the participants and also on how the analysis was carried out.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

Refusals are responses to speech acts like request, invitation, offer and suggestions, in which speakers refuse to take part in an action expected by the interlocutor (Chen, Ye, & Zhang, 1995). A framework of refusal strategies was employed in this study to analyse the data. This framework is a combination of the frameworks of refusal strategies developed by Beebe et al. (1990) and by Al-Issa (2003). Below is the table showing both the frameworks:

Table 3.1: Theoretical frameworks of Beebe (1990) and Al-Issa (2003)

Beebe et al. (1990)		Al-Issa (2003)	All examples from Beebe et al. (1990) except when indicated
Performative			"I refuse"
		Explicit rejection	"Hell no", "No way" (Al-Issa)
Non-performative:	1. "No"		
	2. Negative willingness/ability	2. Negative ability/willingness	"I can't", "I don't think so"
Statement of regret		Regret	"I'm sorry …", "I feel terrible …" "Excuse me …", "Forgive me …" (Al-Issa)
Wish			"I wish I could help you…"
Excuse, reason, explanation		Explanation/Excuse	"My children will be home that night", "I have a headache" "I have to study", "I'm very busy" (Al-Issa)
Statement of alternative:	1. I can do X instead of Y	Alternative	I'd rather …, "I'd prefer …"
	2. Why don't you do X instead of Y		"Why don't you ask someone else?"
Set conditions for future or past acceptance		1. Future or past acceptance	"Can we do it next week?" (Al-Issa) "If you had asked me earlier, I would have …"
		2. Conditional acceptance	"If I finish early, I'll help you" (Al-Issa)
Promise of future acceptance			"I'll do it next time", "I promise I'll …", "Next time I'll …" -- using "will" or "promise"
Statement of principle			"I never do business with friends" "I don't borrow money from friends", "I don't ride with strangers" (Al-Issa)
Statement of philosophy			"One can't be too careful"
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor:	1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	Negative consequences	"I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation "I'm afraid you can't read my notes" (Al-Issa)
	2. Guilt trip		For instance: waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"
	3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	1. Criticize 2. Insult/Attack/Threat	"That's a terrible idea!" "Who do you think you are?" "You are lazy!", "Who asked about your opinion?" "If you don't get out of here, I'll call the police." (Al-Issa)
	4. Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request	Request for understanding	"Please understand my situation …" (Al-Issa)
	5. Let interlocutor off the hook		"Don't worry about it", "That's okay", "You don't have to"
	6. Self-defence		"I'm trying my best", "I'm doing all I can do"
		Reprimand	"You should attend classes too", "You shouldn't wait till the last

			minute" (Al-Issa)
		Sarcasm	"I forgot I'm your servant" (Al-Issa)
Acceptance that functions as a refusal:	1. Unspecific or indefinite reply		
	2. Lack of enthusiasm		
Avoidance: 1. Non-verbal	a. Silence		
	b. Hesitation		
	c. Do nothing		
	d. Physical departure		
Avoidance: 2. Verbal	a. Topic switch		
	b. Joke		
	c. Repetition of part of request, etc.		"Monday?"
	d. Postponement		"I'll think about it"
	e. Hedging		"Gee, I don't know", "I'm not sure"
		Request for information	"Why do you think I should take it?" (Al-Issa)
		Return favour	"I'll pay for you and me" (Al-Issa)
Adjuncts to refusals:	1. Statement of positive opinion/ feeling or agreement	Positive opinion/feeling/agreement	"That's a good idea …", "I'd love to …"
	2. Statement of empathy		"I realise you are in a difficult situation"
	3. Pause fillers		"uhh", "well", "oh", "uhm"
	4. Gratitude/ appreciation	Gratitude	"Thank you very much", "I appreciate it" (Al-Issa)
		Removal of negativity	"You are a nice person but …" (Al-Issa)
		Define relation	"Okay my dear professor but …" (Al-Issa)

In Beebe et al.'s (1990) framework, there were a total of 33 refusal strategies including the adjuncts to refusals and Al–Issa's (2003) framework had a total of 26 refusal strategies. The refusal strategies that were omitted from Al-Issa's framework are:

1. Promise of future acceptance

2. Statement of philosophy

3. Guilt trip

4. Self-defence

5. Unspecific or indefinite reply

6. Lack of enthusiasm

7. Avoidance (Nonverbal) – Silence, Hesitation, Do nothing, Physical departure

                (Verbal) – Topic switch, Joke, Repetition of part of request, etc.

8. Statement of empathy

Most of the strategies in Al-Issa's framework were summarised into general terms from Beebe's original framework resulted in less strategy count though he had an additional 7 refusal strategies found from his study in his own framework. The additional refusal strategies are:

1. Explicit rejection

2. Reprimand

3. Sarcasm

4. Request for information

5. Return favour

6. Removal of negativity

7. Define relation

Since Al-Issa's (2003) theoretical framework was originally adopted from Beebe et al. (1990), some names of the strategies in both the framework were almost similar. I found the names of the strategies chosen by Al-Issa were very short, direct and general meanwhile in Beebe et al.'s framework, they were very long, detail and specific. Below is the table to show the differences between the names the refusal strategies of the two frameworks and the ones that were chosen for the current study.

Table 3.2: Names of the refusal strategies

Beebe (1990)	Al-Issa (2003)	Current Study
Negative willingness/ability	Negative ability/willingness	Negative willingness/ability
Statement of regret	Regret	Statement of regret
Excuse, reason, explanation	Explanation/excuse	Excuse, reason, explanation
Statement of alternative: 1. I can do X instead of Y 2. Why don't you do X instead of Y	Alternative	Statement of alternative: 1. I can do X instead of Y 2. Why don't you do X instead of Y
Set conditions for future or past acceptance	1. Future or past acceptance 2. Conditional acceptance	1. Future or past acceptance 2. Conditional acceptance
Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	Negative consequence	Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester
Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	1. Criticize 2. Insult/Attack/Threat	Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack
Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request	Request for understanding	Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request
Adjuncts to refusals: 1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement 2. Gratitude/appreciation	1. Positive opinion/feeling/ agreement 2. Gratitude	Adjuncts to refusals: 1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement 2. Gratitude/appreciation

Hence, I decided to choose the strategy names from Beebe et al.'s framework as I felt the names explained the strategies well except for the strategy [Set conditions for future or past acceptance]. For this particular strategy, I opted for Al-Issa's as it was categorized separately into specific two single strategies.

Besides that, the examples given for each strategy in both their theoretical frameworks were used as the semantic formulas/expressions to identify the refusal strategies employed in the refusals of this study.

In this current study, not all the taxonomy mentioned in the above table was used. Some of them were omitted as they did not appear in the data of this study. The theoretical framework of the current study is a combination of the theoretical frameworks by Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003). It should also be noted that the Adjuncts to refusals in this combined framework are categorised under indirect refusals. Below is the combined theoretical framework:

Table 3.3: Combined theoretical framework of Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003)

Type	Strategies	Semantic formulas/Expressions
Direct	Performative	"I refuse"
	Explicit rejection	"Hell no", "No way"
	Non-performative: 1. "No"	"No"
	2. Negative willingness/ability	"I can't", "I don't think so"
Indirect	Statement of regret	"I'm sorry …", "I feel terrible …", "Excuse me …", "Forgive me …"
	Wish	"I wish I could help you …"
	Excuse, reason, explanation	"My children will be home that night", "I have a headache", "I have to study", "I'm very busy"
	Statement of alternative: 1. I can do X instead of Y	I'd rather …, "I'd prefer …"
	2. Why don't you do X instead of Y	"Why don't you ask someone else?"
	Future or past acceptance	"Can we do it next week?" "If you had asked me earlier, I would have …"
	Conditional acceptance	"If I finish early, I'll help you"
	Promise of future acceptance	"I'll do it next time", "I promise I'll …", "Next time I'll …" -- using "will" or "promise"
	Statement of principle	"I never do business with friends", "I don't borrow money from friends", "I don't ride with strangers"
	Statement of philosophy	"One can't be too careful"
	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor: 1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	"I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation. "I'm afraid you can't read my notes", "If you don't get out of here, I'll call the police."
	2. Guilt trip	For instance: waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"
	3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	"That's a terrible idea!" "Who do you think you are?" "You are lazy!" "Who asked about your opinion?"
	4. Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request	"Please understand my situation …"

	5. Let interlocutor off the hook	"Don't worry about it", "That's okay", "You don't have to"
	6. Self-defence	"I'm trying my best", "I'm doing all I can do"
	Reprimand	"You should attend classes too", "You shouldn't wait till the last minute"
	Sarcasm	"I forgot I'm your servant"
	Acceptance that functions as a refusal: 1. Unspecific or indefinite reply 2. Lack of enthusiasm	
	Avoidance (Nonverbal): 1. Silence 2. Hesitation 3. Do nothing 4. Physical departure	
	Avoidance (Verbal): 1. Topic switch 2. Joke	
	3. Repetition of part of request, etc.	"Monday?"
	4. Postponement	"I'll think about it"
	5. Hedging	"Gee, I don't know", "I'm not sure"
	Request for information	"Why do you think I should take it?"
	Return favour	"I'll pay for you and me"
	Adjuncts to refusals: 1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement	"That's a good idea ...", "I'd love to ..."
	2. Statement of empathy	"I realise you are in a difficult situation"
	3. Pause fillers	"uhh", "well", "oh", "uhm"
	4. Gratitude/appreciation	"Thank you very much", "I appreciate it"
	Removal of negativity	"You are a nice person but ..."
	Define relation	"Okay my dear professor but ..."

3.2 Participants

As stated earlier, this study looked into the strategies employed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and the influences of power on the choice of refusal strategies made by them in an academic context. The participants were 40 local Indian undergraduates who were doing their teaching course in Institut Pendidikan Guru Pulau Pinang in Malaysia. Participants' ages were identified to be within 26 to 36 years old. Out of the 40 participants, there were 6 males and 34 females. Most of them were from Tamil language faculty and the rest were from the Mathematics faculty.

All the participants had the experience teaching in Tamil medium school across Malaysia. This particular group of undergraduates was special as they were the last batch to do their degree in teaching despite many working years in the teaching industry without any relevant teaching qualification. All of them started their teaching career as part-time teachers after they completed either their Sijil Peperiksaan Malaysia (SPM) or Diploma or Degree in their non-teaching field. They were given the opportunity by the Government to do a Degree in teaching in order to place them as permanent teachers in schools across Malaysia. That was the reason behind the big age range of the participants in this study.

Indian undergraduates were chosen for this study simply because I had the direct access to all of them through a senior lecturer who was in charge of the Indian students in that institute which made the work easy for me. Nearly all the participants in this study were bilingual or trilingual besides Malay and English languages that were taught in school. Most of them acquired their mother tongues either at home or in a Tamil-medium school. However, neither second language acquisition nor socio - cultural factors in making the refusals were looked into in this study.

3.3 Instrument

3.3.1 Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

The data for this study was collected by using a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) (see Appendix A). The description of the DCT is explained later in detail in Table 3.4 of this chapter. Initially, I got the idea of using the DCT method from the previous study done by Al-Issa (2003). The DCT used by Al-Issa comprised of 15 different prompts in an

academic context (see Appendix B). The prompts were carefully designed using an observational notebook data and used by him to elicit refusal responses in his study. However, these prompts were not suitable for this study as his focus was the occurrence of the sociocultural transfer and its motivating factors and to what extent the pattern of the speech act of refusal being understood by Jordanian EFL learners.

His DCT was certainly designed to elicit refusals and so can be used in a way to collect the data to identify the strategies employed in the current study, but the focus of his study was in social-cultural transfer rather than in studying the influence of power on the choice of the refusal strategies. Thus, there were too many variables (in particular, different actions were required from the addressee) in his instrument to attribute choices of strategies solely to power. Yet, in this study, I adapted some of the prompts from Al-Issa and designed new situations by narrowing down the variables as they were still within a suitable academic context that were familiar to the participants of this study.

In this study, ideas from prompts 1, 4, 8, 9 and 10 from Al-Issa's (2003) DCT were used to design the prompts in a way to bring out the specific speech act covering the focus of the study, refusals. Each prompt was categorized into two stimulus types: request and offer and as the current study also focused on the influences of the power on the choice of the refusal strategies, the frequency of each prompt was increased by using three constant addressees: a lecturer, a friend and a junior that had different power (higher, equal and lower) with the speaker and familiarity was made constant. It should be noted that the power in each prompt referred to the recipients of the refusal. Below is the description of the DCT used in the current study.

Table 3.4: Description of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Power \ Situation	Request (a)	Offer (b)
Situation 1: Look after books i. Lecturer [Higher] ii. Friend [Equal] iii. Junior [Lower]	Refuse a request to look after books in a faculty cafe.	Refuse an offer to look after books in a faculty cafe.
Situation 2: Carry books and papers i. Lecturer [Higher] ii. Friend [Equal] iii. Junior [Lower]	Refuse a request to carry books and papers.	Refuse an offer to carry books and papers.
Situation 3: Ride i. Lecturer [Higher] ii. Friend [Equal] iii. Junior [Lower]	Refuse a request for a ride to the nearest transportation hub.	Refuse an offer to give a ride home.
Situation 4: Borrow/Lend Book i. Lecturer [Higher] ii. Friend [Equal] iii. Junior [Lower]	Refuse a request to borrow a book for upcoming research/exam.	Refuse an offer to lend a book for upcoming exam.
Situation 5: Interview i. Lecturer [Higher] ii. Friend [Equal] iii. Junior [Lower]	Refuse a request for an interview for a research/class project.	Refuse an offer for an interview for a class project.

3.4 Coding

I coded the data of this study in order to find out the strategies employed by the Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English. Initially, I got the idea of coding by referring to Asmali, M. (2013) study on the cross cultural comparison of non-native speakers' refusal strategies in English of Turkish, Polish and Latvian prospective English Language Teachers. He used the coding schema that was used by Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz (1990).

I used the same coding schema (see Appendix C) to codify the data gathered in this study based on the original combination of theoretical frameworks of Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003) (see Table 3.1). After the data coding process, the schema was revised according to the adapted theoretical framework of this study (see Table 3.3). Though some refusal strategies were omitted from the framework, the coding remained unchanged for the rest of the refusal strategies used in this study. Below was the revised coding schema that was used in this study.

Table 3.5: Refusal strategies revised coding schema

Type	Coding of the strategies	Strategies	Semantic formulas/Expressions
Direct	**D-1**	Performative	"I refuse"
	D-2	Explicit rejection	"Hell no", "No way"
	D-3	Non-performative	
	D-3-a	1. "No"	"No"
	D-3-b	2. Negative willingness/ability	"I can't", "I don't think so"
Indirect	**I-1**	Statement of regret	"I'm sorry …", "I feel terrible …", "Excuse me …", "Forgive me …"
	I-2	Wish	"I wish I could help you …"
	I-3	Excuse, reason, explanation	"My children will be home that night", "I have a headache", "I have to study", "I'm very busy"
	I-4	Statement of alternative	
	I-4-a	I can do X instead of Y	I'd rather …, "I'd prefer …"
	I-4-b	Why don't you do X instead of Y	"Why don't you ask someone else?"
	I-5	Future or past acceptance	"Can we do it next week?" "If you had asked me earlier, I would have …"
	I-6	Conditional acceptance	"If I finish early, I'll help you"
	I-7	Promise of future acceptance	"I'll do it next time", "I promise I'll …", "Next time I'll …" -- using "will" or "promise"
	I-8	Statement of principle	"I never do business with friends", "I don't borrow money from friends", "I don't ride with strangers"
	I-9	Statement of philosophy	"One can't be too careful"
	I-10	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	
	I-10-a	Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	"I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation. "I'm afraid you can't read my notes", "If you don't get out of here, I'll call the police."
	I-10-b	Guilt trip	For instance: waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"
	I-10-c	Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	"That's a terrible idea!" "Who do you think you are?" "You are lazy!" "Who asked about your opinion?"
	I-10-d	Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or	"Please understand my situation …"

		holding the request	
I-10-e	Let interlocutor off the hook	"Don't worry about it", "That's okay", "You don't have to"
I-10-f	Self-defence	"I'm trying my best", "I'm doing all I can do"
I-11	Reprimand	"You should attend classes too", "You shouldn't wait till the last minute"
I-12	Sarcasm	"I forgot I'm your servant"
I-13	Acceptance that functions as a refusal	
I-13-a	Unspecific or indefinite reply	
I-13-b	Lack of enthusiasm	
I-14	Avoidance	
I-14-a	Non-verbal	
I-14-a-i	Silence	
I-14-a-ii	Hesitation	
I-14-a-iii	Do nothing	
I-14-a-iv	Physical departure	
I-14-b	Verbal	
I-14-b-i	Topic switch	
I-14-b-ii	Joke	
I-14-b-iii	Repetition of part of request, etc.	"Monday?"
I-14-b-iv	Postponement	"I'll think about it"
I-14-b-v	Hedging	"Gee, I don't know", "I'm not sure"
I-15	Request for information	"Why do you think I should take it?"
I-16	Return favour	"I'll pay for you and me"
I-17	Adjuncts to refusals	
I-17-a	Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement	"That's a good idea …", "I'd love to …"
I-17-b	Statement of empathy	"I realise you are in a difficult situation"
I-17-c	Pause fillers	"uhh", "well", "oh", "uhm"
I-17-d	Gratitude/appreciation	"Thank you very much", "I appreciate it"
I-18	Removal of negativity	"You are a nice person but …"
I-19	Define relation	"Okay my dear professor but …"

There were two different strategy types: direct and indirect in this coding schema. Direct strategy had two types of strategies which were Explicit rejection and Non-performative. Explicit rejection was a direct refusal strategy used for a clear-cut refusal by saying "No way" or any other semantic formulas similar to that. Non-performative strategies were also direct refusal strategies used to tell that a particular act was not going to take place in other ways. This strategy had two sub-categories: No and Negative willingness/ability. No was a strategy in which the participants refused by saying "No" to indicate the request or offer was not accepted and Negative willingness/ability strategy was used by saying for example "I cannot" to show that the

speaker was not in a position to accept the request or offer. Indirect strategies in this study were divided into 19 different strategies and 5 of them had their own subcategories. The direct strategies were coded as "D" and the indirect strategies were coded as "I". The subcategories were coded with numbers, letters and roman numerals.

3.5 Procedures of Data Collection

First of all, I personally asked permission from a friend, who was a senior lecturer, in Institut Pendidikan Guru Pulau Pinang to have the Indian undergraduates under his supervision as the participants of this study. After the approval, the details of the study were explained to the senior lecturer via several phone calls and e-mails. The participants, who were Malaysian Indian undergraduates, were then briefed about the study by their lecturer to seek for their voluntary participation in this study. Once the date and time were confirmed, I had the opportunity to meet all the selected participants.

I was then briefed by the lecturer on the background of the participants in order to ease the communication between me and them. They were all grouped in a tutorial class after an exam session and I was introduced to them. The purpose of the visit was explained to them in detail once again. They were also informed that their personal information given in this study was kept confidential. Though the directions and content were written out clearly on the DCT, I still explained verbally the instructions and content of the test to the participants before they were asked to answer it at their own pace.

The entire data collection process took about 45 minutes and during that period, I walked around the class to help the participants that had doubts in the DCT. Participants were allowed to submit their DCT and leave once they finished answering them.

Participants had sufficient English proficiency to answer the DCT; hence, translation was not needed. In the end, a token of appreciation was given to each of the participant for their participation.

3.6 Procedures of Data Analysis

Semantic formulas were used as an analysis unit to analyse the data gathered in this study. A semantic formula could be ''a word, phrase, or sentence that meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy; any one or more of these can be used to perform the act in question'' (Cohen, 1996, p. 265). Both the terms "semantic formula" and "strategy" were used reciprocally in previous cross-cultural pragmatic studies in which they referred to the same concept. Responses obtained from the DCT were classified into semantic formulas and identified as direct or indirect strategy by referring to the examples given in the initial coding schema (see Appendix C). Any semantic formula that did not fall into the coding schema was considered as a new finding of this study.

The data then was tabulated in which the frequency of each single strategy identified in the responses across the three different addressees in each situation was counted (see Appendix D). For example, in the situation where participants had to refuse a request from a friend that asked to watch over his/her books in a faculty café until he/she brings his/her food, a response such as " Sorry friend. I have work to do. Please don't mistake me." was analysed as four units, each falling into a corresponding semantic formula as shown below:

1. Sorry [Statement of regret]
2. Friend [Define relation]

3. I have work to do [Excuse/reason/explanation]

4. Please don't mistake me. [Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or

holding the request]

Both single and multiple strategies found in responses were counted separately and then were coded based on the framework of refusal strategies to spot the employed strategies by the participants to make refusals in English. The frequency of single and multiple strategies across the addressees in each situation was also counted and tabulated (see Appendix D). For example, in the situation where participants had to refuse a request to borrow an important book for upcoming research/exam, there were three different responses of single and multiple strategies:

1. I cannot.

[Negative willingness/ability] – Single strategy

2. I can't help you + because I'm going out

[Negative willingness/ability] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] – Two strategies

3. So sorry + friend + actually I have a lot of work

[Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] – Three

strategies

In cases of the same strategy that occurred more than once in a response, it was still counted as one strategy but double the frequency. For example,

1. I'm sorry Sir + I need to do some researches in this book + so can't borrow you Sir + sorry again, Sir

[Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

Four types of strategies were used in this response but the frequency of the Statement of regret strategy was counted as 2 times and Define relation strategy as 3 times.

Besides that, the total frequency of the refusal strategies found in request and offer type situations was also tabulated and analysed. The data was then analysed further based on the power variable in each situation and the total frequency of each refusal strategy employed respectively to identify the effects of power on the choice of the refusal strategies made by the participants. All the calculation in this study was done manually. Grammatical accuracy was not examined.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter described the background of the participants by mentioning who the participants were and why they were selected for this study. Not to forget the instrument and the theoretical framework that was used to collect and analyse the data of this study. It was made clear on how the data was collected followed by explanations on how the data was analysed.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

The purpose of this study was not only to find out the strategies employed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English but also to find out the influence of power on the choice of the refusal strategies made by them in an academic context. This chapter explains the situations used in the DCT of this study, the refusal strategies employed by participants in all the refusal eliciting situations made of two different stimuli (request and offer) and also discusses the choice of refusal strategies made by the participants to refuse addressees (lecturer, friend and junior) that shared different power in between them . Besides that, this chapter also highlights other additional findings of this study.

4.1 Discourse Completion Test DCT

As explained earlier in Chapter 3, the DCT (see Appendix A) used in this study initially comprised five main situations. Each situation later was categorised based on two different stimuli: request and offer which resulted in 10 new situations: five request based situations and five offer based situations. The frequency of each situation then was increased by using three constant addressees: a lecturer, a friend and a junior that had different power with the speaker and familiarity was constant. The description of the DCT used in this study is shown clearly in Table 3.4.

4.2 Findings and Discussion

The complete data coding for each situation is in Appendix C. It should be noted that the refusal strategies listed in all the tables of this chapter were used only for the specific situations.

4.2.1 Request type situations

Only the three refusal strategies with the higher frequency for each situation are discussed briefly with examples here. Descriptions of all the refusal strategies employed for the entire request based situations are given in Section 4.2.1.7 together with examples.

4.2.1.1 Situation 1 (a)

In this situation, participants had to refuse requests from the three addressees who asked to look after their books in a faculty café while they go and bring their food. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.1: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 1 (a)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	2	2	2
Negative willingness/ability	7	10	15
Statement of regret	38	30	30
Excuse, reason, explanation	36	36	31
I can do X instead of Y	1	1	
Why don't you do X instead of Y		1	4
Promise of future acceptance	1		1
Threat/Statement of negative consequences		1	
Request for help, empathy and assistance		1	1
Repetition of part of request		1	1
Hedging			1
Pause fillers	8		
Gratitude/appreciation			1
Define relation	41	27	25

As shown in Table 4.1, a total of 14 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 1 (a). When it came to refuse a lecturer, Define relation occurred 41 times, Statement of regret occurred 38 times and Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 36 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation]

   Sorry, Sir! I have to go meet another lecturer at library. (Participant 1 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Pause fillers] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] +

   [Excuse/Reason/Explanation]

Hmm, sorry Sir! I need to leave now. I have class. (Participant 40 refusing a

lecturer)

3. [Pause fillers] + [No] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation]

Ohh… No, Madam. I have work. (Participant 17 refusing a lecturer)

In refusals involving both friend and junior, the three high frequency refusal strategies employed by the participants were the Excuse, reason, explanation, Statement of regret and Define relation. Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 36 times to refuse a friend and 31 times to refuse a junior. Statement of regret occurred 30 times to refuse both friend and junior meanwhile Define relation occurred 27 times to refuse a friend and 25 times to refuse a junior. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

   Dei! Cannot la. I have work to do. So sorry da. (Participant 29 refusing a friend)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

   Sorry bro. I go cinema now, I am in rushing. Very sorry, bro. (Participant 15 refusing a friend)

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation] + [Negative willingness/ability]

   Sorry gurl. I'm in rushing so I can't help you. (Participant 32 refusing a junior)

4. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

[Excuse/Reason/Explanation]

Sorry dear, I can't do it for you because I have class after this. (Participant 25

refusing a junior)

4.2.1.2 Situation 2 (a)

In this situation, participants had to refuse requests from the three addressees who asked

for assistance to carry books and papers after the class to their car which was located at

the car park 500m away from the classroom. The table below summarises the frequency

of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.2: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 2 (a)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"		1	4
Negative willingness/ability	9	11	16
Statement of regret	41	33	33
Excuse, reason, explanation	36	33	20
I can do X instead of Y	5	1	
Why don't you do X instead of Y	4	5	8
Future or past acceptance	1	1	
Promise of future acceptance		1	2
Threat or statement of negative consequences			1
Criticize		1	2
Request for help, empathy and assistance		3	1
Reprimand			1
Sarcasm		1	1
Statement of empathy	1		
Pause fillers	3	4	1
Removal of negativity	1		
Define relation	46	25	28

As shown in Table 4.2, a total of 17 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 2 (a). In refusals involving a lecturer, the three high frequency strategies were Define relation, Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation. Define relation occurred 46 times, Statement of regret occurred 41 times and Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 36 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   I'm sorry, Sir. Mr Siva asked me to come and meet him right now. (Participant 4 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry, Sir. I can't help you, Sir. Now, I have class. (Participant 19 refusing a lecturer)

In refusals involving a friend, the three high frequency strategies were Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation. Both Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 33 times and Define relation occurred 25 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dear. I can't help you now. I have urgent work to do. (Participant 10 refusing a friend)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry bro. I very weak to carry this stuff. (Participant 15 refusing a friend)

Meanwhile, when refusing a junior, the three high frequency strategies were Statement of regret, Define relation and Excuse, reason, explanation. Statement of regret occurred 33 times, Define relation occurred 28 times and Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 20 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Negative willingness/ability]

Sorry girl/boy, I have class now. I can't help you. (Participant 5 refusing a junior)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry girl, far la. (Participant 24 refusing a junior)

4.2.1.3 Situation 3 (a)

In this situation, participants had to refuse requests from the three addressees who asked for a ride to the nearest transport hub after attending an event at the faculty that happened to finish very late. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.3: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 3 (a)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
Explicit rejection		1	
"No"	1	2	1
Negative willingness/ability	13	17	17
Statement of regret	37	31	31
Excuse, reason, explanation	33	25	22
I can do X instead of Y	1		
Why don't you do X instead of Y	1	6	6
Conditional acceptance		1	1
Promise of future acceptance		3	2
Statement of principle			1
Criticize			1
Request for help, empathy and assistance	2	2	1
Sarcasm			1
Request for information			1
Statement of empathy	1		
Pause fillers	6	3	2
Removal of negativity	1	2	1
Define relation	40	31	21

As shown in Table 4.3, a total of 18 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 3 (a). In this situation, it is clearly noticeable that the three high frequency refusal strategies used to refuse both lecturer and friend were Define relation, Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation. Define relation occurred 40 times to refuse a lecturer and 31 times to refuse a friend, Statement of regret occurred 37 times to refuse a lecturer and 31 times to refuse a friend, Excuse, reason, explanation

occurred 33 times to refuse a lecturer and 25 times to refuse a friend. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation]

   I'm really very sorry Mam/Sir. Actually I'm rushing to home. So that, I can't help you Mam/Sir. (Participant 2 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Define relation] + [Statement of regret] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sir, I'm sorry. I follow my friends. (Participant 24 refusing a lecturer)

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry, my dear. I need to bring my boyfriend to go eat. (Participant 1 refusing a friend)

4. [Pause fillers] + [Define relation] + [Statement of regret] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Oh, dear, very sorry. My car is full. (Participant 3 refusing a friend)

In refusal involving a junior, the three high frequency strategies were Statement of regret with 31 occurrences, Excuse, reason, explanation with 22 occurrences and Define relation with 21 occurrences. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry dear I can't because I'm rushing to back home. (Participant 25 refusing a junior)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

I'm sorry, dear. I'm in rush. (Participant 26 refusing a junior)

4.2.1.4 Situation 4 (a)

In this situation, participants had to refuse requests from the three addressees who asked to borrow an important book needed for the preparation for their upcoming research or exam for few days after they failed to get it from the library. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.4: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 4 (a)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"		4	3
Negative willingness/ability	17	14	11
Statement of regret	40	29	28
Excuse, reason, explanation	34	32	27
Why don't you do X instead of Y	1	2	5
Conditional acceptance	3	2	4
Promise of future acceptance	2	2	1
Statement of principle			1
Request for help, empathy and assistance	1		
Reprimand		1	
Repetition of part of request			1
Postponement	1		
Pause fillers	7	1	3
Removal of negativity	1		
Define relation	45	27	21

As shown in Table 4.4, a total of 15 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 4 (a) and the three high frequency refusal strategies were Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation. However, the order varied in refusals among the three addressees. When it came to refuse a lecturer in this situation, Define relation had the highest frequency of 45 occurrences followed by Statement of regret with 40 occurrences and Excuse, reason, explanation with 34 occurrences. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation]

   I'm sorry, Sir. I need to do some researches based on this book. So can't borrow you,

   Sir. ... (Participant 4 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [Define relation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

   Sorry, Sir/Madam. I'm using the book, Sir/Madam. Sorry, Sir/Madam. (Participant 6

   refusing a lecturer)

In refusals involving a friend, Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 32 times, Statement of regret occurred 29 times and Define relation occurred 27 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry da, me too want to do revision. (Participant 28 refusing a friend)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry bro. I have give it back to library. (Participant 31 refusing a friend)

When it came to refuse a junior in this situation, Statement of regret occurred 28 times, Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 27 times and Define relation occurred 21 times. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry dear. I want to use it now. (Participant 9 refusing a junior)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry girl. My friend asked me ready. (Participant 31 refusing a junior)

4.2.1.5 Situation 5 (a)

In this situation, participants had to refuse requests from the three addressees who asked for an interview for a research or class project. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	4	3	2
Negative willingness/ability	12	10	12
Statement of regret	33	31	30
Excuse, reason, explanation	33	31	25
Why don't you do X instead of Y	3	3	7
Future or past acceptance	4	4	2
Promise of future acceptance		1	1
Threat or statement of negative consequences	1	1	1
Criticize			1
Statement of positive opinion	2		
Pause fillers	2	3	1
Define relation	36	25	23

As shown in Table 4.5, a total of 12 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 5 (a). In refusals involving a lecturer, the three high frequency refusal strategies were Define relation with 36 occurrences, both Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation with 33 occurrences. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry Sir/Madam. I'm not interested to give interview. (Participant 5 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

   Sorry Sir/Madam. I'm busy now. Sorry Sir/Madam. (Participant 6 refusing a lecturer)

When refusing both friend and junior, the three high frequency refusal strategies were Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation. Statement of regret occurred 31 times to refuse a friend and 30 times to refuse a junior, Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 31 times to refuse a friend and 25 times to refuse a junior and Define relation occurred 25 times to refuse a friend and 23 times to refuse a junior. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in the responses:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dear. I have another work to do. (Participant 1 refusing a friend)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry friend. I'm not ready for that. (Participant 2 refusing a friend)

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dear. I can't help you because I'm quite busy now. (Participant 9 refusing a junior)

4. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dear. I am busy now. (Participant 14 refusing a junior)

All the five tables above were meant to highlight specifically the strategies employed by participants to refuse in each situation in the request category though only three highest frequency refusal strategies are discussed with some examples.

4.2.1.6 Refusal strategies in all five request type situations

Below is a table summarising all the refusal strategies that were used in all the five request type situations. Each refusal strategy that had the minimum total frequency of 10 used in this category is illustrated with examples to clearly show the choice of strategies used by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and a simple comparison of the frequency of the refusal strategies across the situations is also highlighted.

Table 4.6: Total frequency of the refusal strategies used in five request type situations

Refusal Strategies	Situation 1(a)	Situation 2 (a)	Situation 3 (a)	Situation 4 (a)	Situation 5 (a)	Total
Explicit rejection			1			**1**
"No"	6	5	4	7	9	**31**
Negative willingness/ability	32	36	47	42	34	**191**
Statement of regret	98	107	99	97	94	**495**
Excuse, reason, explanation	103	89	80	93	89	**454**
I can do X instead of Y	2	6	1			**9**
Why don't you do X instead of Y	5	17	13	8	13	**56**
Future or past acceptance		2			10	**12**
Conditional acceptance			2	9		**11**
Promise of future acceptance	2	3	5	5	2	**17**
Statement of principle			1	1		**2**
Threat or statement of negative consequences	1	1			3	**5**
Criticize		3	1		1	**5**
Request for help, empathy and assistance	2	4	5	1		**12**
Reprimand		1		1		**2**
Sarcasm		2	1			**3**
Request for information			1			**1**
Repetition of part of request	2			1		**3**
Postponement				1		**1**
Hedging	1					**1**
Statement of positive					2	**2**

opinion						
Statement of empathy		1	1			**2**
Pause fillers	8	8	11	11	6	**44**
Gratitude/appreciation	1					**1**
Removal of negativity		1	4	1		**6**
Define relation	93	99	92	93	84	**461**
Total	**356**	**385**	**369**	**371**	**347**	

As shown in Table 4.6, a total of 26 refusal strategies were employed by participants to make refusals in the five request type situations to three different addressees. Below is a table summarising the refusal strategies that had at least 10 occurrences in total listed from the highest to lowest frequency together with examples:

Table 4.7: Top 10 refusal strategies in five request type situations

Strategy	Frequency	Example	Situation with highest frequency	
Statement of regret	495	*Madam, very sorry because now I'm moving to hostel … (Participant 38 refusing a lecturer)*	2(a)	107
Define relation	461	*Sorry my friend … (Participant 16 refusing a friend)*	2(a)	99
Excuse, reason, explanation	454	*… I have to move now. (Participant 13 refusing a friend)*	1(a)	103
Negative willingness/ability	191	*Actually I can't help you … (Participant 4 refusing a friend)*	3(a)	47
Why don't you do X instead of Y	56	*… Why don't you ask your other friends? (Participant 33 refusing a junior)*	2(a)	17
Pause fillers	44	*Ohh, I'm sorry … (Participant 26 refusing a lecturer)*	3 & 4(a)	11
"No"	31	*No girl … (Participant 18 refusing a junior)*	5(a)	9
Promise of future acceptance	17	*Sorry dear … Maybe next time. (Participant 10 refusing a friend)*	3 & 4(a)	5

Future or past acceptance	12	*... Can you do it later? (Participant 3 refusing a friend)*	5(a)	10
Request for help, empathy and assistance		*... don't mistake me. (Participant 26 refusing a lecturer(*	3(a)	5
Conditional acceptance	11	*... I give you after I complete my assignment. (Participant 14 refusing a lecturer)*	4(a)	9

Besides that, the highest total occurrences of refusal strategies were used in Situation 2 (a) which was 385 although only 17 types of refusal strategies were employed by the participants. Situation 4 (a) had 371 occurrences of strategies with the use of 15 types of refusal strategies. Despite having the highest number of types of refusal strategies which were 18, Situation 3 (a) only had 369 occurrences of strategies. Situation 1 (a) had 356 occurrences with the use of 14 types of refusal strategies and Situation 5 (a) had the lowest occurrences of 347 with the use of 12 types of refusal strategies.

4.2.1.7 Refusal strategies used to all three different addressees

Below is a table summarising the refusal strategies that were used to all the three different addressees; a lecturer, a friend and a junior, in request type situations by the participants in this study. The influence of the power of the three addressees on the choice of refusal strategies made by Malaysian Indian undergraduates of this study is discussed here.

Refusal Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
Explicit rejection		1	
"No"	7	12	12
Negative willingness/ability	58	62	71
Statement of regret	189	154	152
Excuse, reason, explanation	172	157	125
I can do X instead of Y	7	2	
Why don't you do X instead of Y	9	17	30
Future or past acceptance	5	5	2
Conditional acceptance	3	3	5
Promise of future acceptance	3	7	7
Statement of principle			2
Threat or statement of negative consequences	1	2	2
Criticize		1	4
Request for help, empathy and assistance	3	6	3
Reprimand		1	1
Sarcasm		1	2
Request for information			1
Repetition of part of request		1	2
Postponement	1		
Hedging			1
Statement of positive opinion/feeling	2		
Statement of empathy	2		
Pause fillers	26	11	7
Gratitude/appreciation			1
Removal of negativity	3	2	1
Define relation	208	135	118
Total	**699**	**580**	**549**

Participants used a total of 17 strategies to refuse a lecturer, 19 strategies to refuse a friend and 21 strategies to refuse a junior. Despite the lowest number of refusal strategies, refusals made to a lecturer had the highest occurrences of strategies used which were 699 followed by refusals to a friend with 580 occurrences and finally

refusals to a junior with 549 occurrences. It could be said that the number of types of refusal strategies chosen by the participants did not affect the total frequency of their usage in refusals to requests in this study.

As shown in the table above, Explicit rejection strategy occurred only once and it was used as a single strategy to refuse a friend who asked for a ride by participant 37 in Situation 3 (a). For example:

Friend: Hey, can you give me a ride to the nearest bus/train station?

*Participant: **No way**.*

This could be because the participant and the addressee shared the same power and most probably a friend would not find the response offensive.

The occurrences of the "No" strategy were found across the three addressees. In this study, this strategy was not used alone when it came to refuse any of them. It was used frequently along with Define relation, Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation strategies which had the highest frequency. A plain flat "No" might sound rude to anyone. Most probably, that was why the participants of this study used other refusal strategies like Define relation, Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation and etc. along with "No" to mitigate the refusals. Below are some of the examples of "No" strategy used with other strategies to refuse:

1. [No] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   No, Sir. I have not enough time to wait here. (Participant 32 refusing a lecturer in

   Situation 1(a))

2. [No] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Statement of regret]

No, macha. I have to give to others. So sorry. (Participant 7 refusing a friend in

Situation 4(a))

3. [No] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

[Why don't you do X instead of Y] + [Conditional acceptance]

No, girl, I need to use this book. You try to search for it. If still cannot find, you

come and get it from me. (Participant 18 refusing a junior in Situation 4(a))

Besides that, the frequencies of Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation, Negative willingness/ability and Define relation strategies were very high across the addressees.

Although Negative willingness/ability was a direct refusal strategy, participants commonly used it with other indirect refusal strategies, which maybe softened the refusals with all the three addressees. Below are some of the examples of how Negative willingness/ability direct strategy was used together with indirect refusal strategies to refuse politely:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

[Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry Sir/Madam. I can't do it. I have to go now. (Participant 13 refusing a lecturer

in Situation 1(a))

2. [Negative willingness/ability] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Future/past

acceptance]

52

Cannot la. After this we got class what. Later we go. (Participant 5 refusing a friend in Situation 2(a))

3. [Pause fillers] + [Statement of regret] + [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation] + [Promise of future acceptance]

Ohh... Sorry. I can't dear. You borrow from me after 3 days. (Participant 32 refusing a junior in Situation 4(a))

By using the indirect Statement of regret strategy, one could sound very apologetic for not being able to grant requests and at the same time it also could mean 'No' in a more polite way. In that way, addressees could still find the refusals acceptable and relationship would not be damaged. This strategy had the highest frequency in refusals involving a junior. It was not only used to express regret to a lecturer (high power) but also to a friend (equal power) and a junior (low power), made it one of the common indirect refusal strategies employed in this study either as a single strategy or together with other refusal strategies. Below are some of the examples:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation]

   Sorry, Sir. (Participant 23 refusing a lecturer in Situation 4(a))

2. [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Statement of regret] + [Negative willingness/ability]

   I have to go to my uncle house and it's already late. Sorry, I can't make it.
   (Participant 34 refusing a friend in Situation 3(a))

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dik. I'm going to move now. (Participant 9 refusing a junior in Situation 1(a))

Excuse, reason, explanation strategy was also a very common refusal strategy employed by the participants. It occurred with all the addressees as well. When participants used this strategy either alone or together with other refusal strategies, it could be because they wanted to show that they cared about what the addressees think or feel when being refused. Hence, most probably they wanted to justify their refusals. Below are some of the examples:

1. [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Macha, I'm using the book to do revision da. (Participant 24 refusing a friend in Situation 4(a))

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry dear. Akka busy right now with assignments. (Participant 26 refusing a junior in Situation 5(a))

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Define relation] + [Request for help/empathy/assistance by dropping or holding the request] + [Negative willingness/ability]

   Sorry, Sir. I have some important programmes here to attend, Sir, please don't mind! I can't make it. (Participant 21 refusing a lecturer in Situation 3(a))

The indirect Alternative strategy was also seen used to all the three addresses but was used most (30 times) when it came to refuse a junior. There were two types of Alternative strategy: I can do X instead of Y and Why don't you do X instead of Y. The indirect I can do X instead of Y strategy was used mostly (7 times) to refuse a lecturer

(high power). Though the participants could not help, they were willing to look for other solutions. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [I can do X instead of Y]

   Sorry Madam. I have an important work to do now. I will ask my friend to send you.

   (Participant 9 refusing a lecturer in Situation 3(a))

The indirect *Why don't you do X instead of Y* strategy was used to all the addressees but mostly to refuse a junior (30 times). Participants of a higher power than the junior, most probably felt it was alright to offer suggestions though they could not help them which could be inappropriate with a lecturer (high power) and addressees could understand the refuser's concern for them. Below are some of the examples of the strategy used as single strategy and also together with other refusal strategies:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [Why don't you do X instead of Y]

   Sorry, bro. I got so much of work to do. Please ask someone else. (Participant 33

   refusing a friend in Situation 5(a))

2. [Statement of regret] + [Why don't you do X instead of Y] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry, you try to find someone else. I'm busy right now. (Participant 28 refusing a

   junior in Situation 5(a))

3. [Define relation] + [Why don't you do X instead of Y]

Girl, you better ask the next class people. (Participant 24 refusing a junior in

Situation 5(a))

The indirect Pause fillers strategy was also one of the common strategies used in request situations. It was used to all the three addressees but mostly to refuse a lecturer (26 times). Participants might find it difficult to refuse a request from someone of a higher power immediately. This strategy could show that the refusers were taking time to think how to refuse the request. Below are some of the examples of the strategy used along with other refusal strategies:

1. [Pause filler] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] +

[Negative willingness/ability] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Oo… Sorry Sir. I cannot. I have to bring my father to go to hospital today.

(Participant 36 refusing a lecturer in Situation 5(a))

2. [Pause filler] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] +

[Excuse/reason/explanation]

Ohh, sorry Sir. I have work to do. (Participant 30 refusing a lecturer in Situation

1(a))

The indirect Define relation was one of the refusal strategies with high occurrences used to all the addressees. Though it was used to all the addressees, it occurred the most (208 times) when refusing a lecturer. This strategy could be a way to show the closeness between the speaker and addressee and to reduce the negative effect of refusal on the addressee. It also could be a way to point out the relationship that the requester had with

one another or indicate the power the interlocutors held in the academic context. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry my friend. I have other work to do. (Participant 16 refusing a friend in Situation 2(a))

2. [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Cannot junior. I have another work. (Participant 10 refusing a junior in Situation 5(a))

There were other refusal strategies used as well that had lower frequencies compared to the ones mentioned above. The indirect Future or past acceptance strategy was used the most often, 5 times each to refuse a lecturer and a friend. This strategy indicated that the refuser was not able to help at the moment and could have grant the request if it was made in the past or maybe in the future and therefore relationship with someone of a higher or equal power would not be damaged. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Future/past acceptance]

Sorry, Sir. Can I come later for this interview? (Participant 3 refusing a lecturer in Situation 5(a))

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Future/past acceptance]

So sorry dear. I'm having a class now. Later can ah? (Participant 38 refusing a friend in Situation 5(a))

The indirect Conditional acceptance and Promise of future acceptance strategies were most commonly used to refuse a junior with a frequency of 5 and 7 respectively. Setting a condition may not be appropriate to refuse a lecturer (high power) and being senior or older than junior, participants may use this strategy to highlight the power that they had over the junior. For example:

1. [Conditional acceptance]

   Okay but you must treat me one day. (Participant 28 refusing a junior in Situation 3(a))

Participants also used Promise of future acceptance strategy to refuse a junior. Looking at the cultural reason from the perspective of my experience as the member of the community, it is quite common for the older participants/senior to be polite to the younger addressee/junior though they are not related to each other and this strategy could give hope to a junior and mitigate the disappointment caused by the refusals. Yet this cannot be generalised for all the participants of this study. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +
   [Promise of future acceptance]
   Sorry girl. I'm so tired. Maybe next time I will help you. (Participant 23 refusing a junior in Situation 2(a))

Other indirect refusal strategies like Statement of principle, Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester, Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack, Reprimand, Sarcasm, Repetition of part of request, etc. and Hedging were used to refuse a junior. These strategies showed the

power the participants had over the juniors and not much attention was given to preserve the social relationship between them. For example:

1. [Request for information] + [Criticize/insult/attack]

   If I give you a ride, what you will give to me? Tell faster. So brave ah you until asking me for a ride. (Participant 19 refusing a junior in Situation 3(a))

2. [Criticize/insult/attack] + [Threat/statement of negative consequences]

   Boy, don't play fool with me. Better watch before you ask. (Participant 15 refusing a junior in Situation 2(a))

Meanwhile, indirect strategies like Postponement, Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement, Statement of empathy and Gratitude/appreciation were used to refuse a lecturer. Once again, these strategies were most probably used because participants had to maintain a good relationship with a lecturer (high power) in an academic context. For example:

1. [Statement of positive opinion/feeling/agreement] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Future/past acceptance]

   That's great. But I am some kind of busy. Maybe some other time. (Participant 40 refusing a lecturer in Situation 5(a))

2. [Statement of empathy] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   I pity of you, Sir because you carry many books but really sorry, Sir. I have an appointment with Pengarah. (Participant 36 refusing a lecturer in Situation 2(a))

The Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request strategy was used mostly to refuse a friend with 6 occurrences. This strategy could indicate the addressee (equal power) to understand participant's inability to help and would not damage the relationship they shared. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Request for empathy] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry, bro. You know about our next lecturer, right. I can't take the risk. (Participant
   33 refusing a friend in Situation 2(a))

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Request for empathy]

   Sorry dear, can't help you. Don't mistake me. (Participant 4 refusing a junior in
   Situation 3(a))

4.2.2 Offer type situations

Only three refusal strategies with the highest frequency from each situation are discussed briefly with examples here. Descriptions of all the refusal strategies employed for the entire offer based situations are given in Section 4.2.2.7 together with examples.

4.2.2.1 Situation 1 (b)

In this situation, participants had to refuse the offers from the three addressees who volunteered to look after their books they get their food from the café. The table below

summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.9: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 1 (b)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	4	5	3
Negative willingness/ability	1		1
Excuse, reason, explanation	26	25	24
Promise of future acceptance			2
Criticize			1
Let interlocutor off the hook	33	34	24
Sarcasm			1
Pause fillers	2	1	3
Gratitude/appreciation	19	12	18
Removal of negativity	1	1	4
Define relation	42	22	18

As shown in Table 4.9, a total of 11 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 1 (b) and the three highest frequency refusal strategies for all the three addressees were Let interlocutor off the hook, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation.

Let interlocutor off the hook occurred 33 times to refuse a lecturer and 34 times to refuse a friend. Excuse, reason, explanation strategy was used 26 times to refuse a lecturer and 25 times to refuse a friend. Meanwhile, the Define relation strategy occurred 42 times when refusing a lecturer and 22 times when refusing a friend. However, refusals involved a junior occurred 24 times for both Let interlocutor off the hook and Excuse, reason, explanation strategies; 18 times for both Define relation and

Gratitude/appreciation strategies. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in responses:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation]

   It's ok Madam. I can manage myself. Thank you Madam. (Participant 3 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Let interlocutor off the hook]

   Thank you so much, Sir. But, it's ok. (Participant 16 refusing a lecturer)

3. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Never mind sister. I'll manage. (Participant 21 refusing a junior)

4.2.2.2 Situation 2 (b)

In this situation, participants had to refuse the offers from the three addressees who volunteered to carry books and papers after the class to the car in a car park 500m away from the classroom. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.10: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 2 (b)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	4	3	4
Negative willingness/ability	1	1	1
Statement of regret	1	2	
Excuse, reason, explanation	32	33	25
Promise of future acceptance			1
Threat/statement of negative consequences			1
Criticize			1
Let interlocutor off the hook	31	29	31
Pause fillers	1	1	
Gratitude/appreciation	19	13	21
Removal of negativity	3		1
Define relation	47	24	25

As shown in Table 4.10, a total of 12 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 2 (b) and the three highest frequency refusal strategies used to all three addressees were Excuse, reason, explanation, Let interlocutor off the hook and Define relation.

The order of the three highest frequency refusal strategies varied to all the three addressees. Refusals to a lecturer had Define relation with 47 occurrences followed by Excuse, reason, explanation with 32 occurrences and Let interlocutor off the hook with 31 occurrences. On the other hand, refusals to a friend had Excuse, reason, explanation with 33 occurrences followed by Let interlocutor off the hook and Define relation with 29 and 24 occurrences respectively. Refusals to a junior in this situation had Let interlocutor off the hook with 31 occurrences followed by Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation strategies with 25 occurrences each. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in responses:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +
   [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Gratitude/appreciation] +
   [Define relation]

   It's ok, sis. I want to use again the books and papers in tomorrow's class. No

   problem, sis. Thank you so much, sis. (Participant 38 refusing a junior)

2. [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Let interlocutor off the hook] +
   [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Thank you, Mam. It's okay. I can carry my books. (Participant 2 refusing a lecturer)

3. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   It's ok. I can bring this. (Participant 5 refusing a friend)

4.2.2.3 Situation 3 (b)

In this situation, participants had to refuse the offers from the three addresses who
volunteered to give them a ride home when it was late and the bus did not come. The
table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the
participants in this situation.

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	9	10	9
Negative willingness/ability	2	2	3
Statement of regret	2	1	2
Excuse, reason, explanation	27	30	25
Promise of future acceptance		1	1
Criticize			1
Let interlocutor off the hook	27	27	22
Pause fillers	1	1	
Gratitude/appreciation	19	13	18
Define relation	44	26	20

As Table 4.11 shows, a total of 10 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 3 (b). In this situation, as shown in Table 4.11, the three highest frequency refusal strategies for all the three addressees were Excuse, reason, explanation, Let interlocutor off the hook and Define relation.

In refusals to a friend and a junior, Excuse, reason, explanation occurred 30 and 25 times respectively. Let interlocutor off the hook strategy occurred 27 times to refuse a friend and 22 times to refuse a junior followed by Define relation strategy that occurred 26 times and 20 times to refuse a friend and a junior respectively. However, Define relation occurred 44 times and both Excuse, reason, explanation and Let interlocutor off the hook strategies occurred 27 times in refusals to a lecturer. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in responses:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Never mind, I will take the bus to go home. (Participant 22 refusing a junior)

2. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Gratitude/appreciation] +

[Excuse/reason/explanation]

It's ok Madam/Sir. Thank you. I'm waiting for friends to come over. (Participant 40

refusing a lecturer)

3. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

It's ok, bro. I have time, I'm not rushing. (Participant 15 refusing a friend)

4.2.2.4 Situation 4 (b)

In this situation, participants had to refuse offers from the three addressees who volunteered to lend an important book needed for the preparation of an upcoming exam. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by participants in this situation.

Table 4.12: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 4 (b)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	4	7	7
Negative willingness/ability	4	4	4
Statement of regret			1
Excuse, reason, explanation	28	32	18
Statement of principle			1
Threat or statement of negative consequences			1
Let interlocutor off the hook	29	29	25
Statement of positive opinion/feeling/agreement			1
Pause fillers	2	1	2
Gratitude/appreciation	13	7	11
Define relation	37	21	12

As shown in Table 4.12, a total of 11 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 4 (b). The three highest frequency refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation were the Let interlocutor off the hook, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation in different orders.

In refusals to a lecturer, Define relation strategy occurred 37 times followed by Let interlocutor off the hook strategy with 29 occurrences and Excuse, reason, explanation strategy with 28 occurrences. Meanwhile, in refusals to a friend, Excuse, reason, explanation had the highest frequency with 32 occurrences followed by Let interlocutor off the hook 29 times and Define relation 21 times. However, when it came to refusing a junior, Let interlocutor off the hook occurred 25 times followed by Excuse, reason, explanation 18 times. Define relation had the third highest frequency with 12 occurrences. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in responses:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation]

   It's okay, Mam. I can borrow some other days. Madam use this first. Thank you for your offer, Mam. (Participant 2 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Excuse/Reason/Explanation]

   It's ok. Maybe I have the notes. I need to search for it. (Participant 20 refusing a junior)

3. [No] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   No, thanks dear. My father promised me to buy for me that book. (Participant 1 refusing a friend)

4.2.2.5 Situation 5 (b)

In this situation, participants had to refuse offers from the three addressees who volunteered to give an interview for a class project. The table below summarises the frequency of the refusal strategies employed by the participants in this situation.

Table 4.13: Frequency of the refusal strategies for Situation 5 (b)

Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	3	4	2
Negative willingness/ability	2	2	2
Statement of regret	23	21	23
Excuse, reason, explanation	32	30	28
Conditional acceptance			4
Promise of future acceptance	4	4	4
Criticize		1	1
Request for help, empathy and assistance	1		
Let interlocutor off the hook	6	8	8
Sarcasm			1
Statement of positive opinion/feeling/ agreement	2	2	3
Pause fillers	3	2	1
Gratitude/appreciation	6	4	5
Define relation	36	24	25

As shown in Table 4.13, a total of 14 refusal strategies were used by participants to refuse in Situation 5 (b). In this situation, when it came to refuse all the three addressees, the three highest frequency refusal strategies employed by the participants were Excuse, reason, explanation, Statement of regret and Define relation.

In refusals to both friend and junior, Excuse, reason, explanation strategy occurred 30 and 28 times respectively. Define relation occurred 24 times to refuse a friend and 25 times to refuse a junior. The third strategy was Statement of regret with 21 occurrences to refuse a friend and 23 occurrences to refuse a junior. However, in refusals to a lecturer, Define relation came in first with 36 occurrences, followed by Excuse, reason, explanation with 32 occurrences and finally Statement of regret with 23 occurrences. Below are some of the examples of the strategies used in responses:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation]

   Never mind, Sir. I don't want to trouble you as I have already asked other lecturers to help me out. By the way, thanks Sir. (Participant 33 refusing a lecturer)

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry girl. I need a senior for interview, not you. (Participant 25 refusing a friend)

3. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Gratitude/appreciation]

   It's OK dear. Thank you for your support. (Participant 14 refusing a junior)

All the five tables above were meant to highlight specifically the strategies employed by participants to refuse in each situation in the offer category though only three highest frequency refusal strategies are discussed with some examples in random order.

4.2.2.6 Refusal strategies in all five offer type situations

Below is a table summarising all the refusal strategies that were used in all the five offer type situations. Each refusal strategy that had a minimum total frequency of 10 is illustrated with examples to clearly show the choice of strategies used by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and a simple comparison of the frequency of the refusal strategies across the situations is also highlighted.

Table 4.14: Total frequency of the refusal strategies used in five offer type situations

Refusal Strategies	Situation 1(b)	Situation 2 (b)	Situation 3 (b)	Situation 4 (b)	Situation 5 (b)	Total
"No"	12	11	28	18	9	**78**
Negative willingness/ability	2	3	7	12	6	**30**
Statement of regret		3	5	1	67	**76**
Excuse, reason, explanation	75	90	82	78	90	**415**
Conditional acceptance					4	**4**
Promise of future acceptance	2	1	2		12	**17**
Statement of principle				1		**1**
Threat/statement of negative consequences		1		1		**2**
Criticize	1	1	1		2	**5**
Request for help, empathy and assistance					1	**1**
Let interlocutor off the hook	91	91	76	83	22	**363**
Sarcasm	1				1	**2**
Statement of positive opinion/feeling/disagreement				1	7	**8**
Pause fillers	6	2	2	5	6	**21**
Gratitude/appreciation	49	53	50	31	15	**198**
Removal of negativity	6	4				**10**
Define relation	82	96	90	70	85	**423**
Total	**327**	**356**	**343**	**301**	**327**	

From Table 4.14, a total of 17 out of 27 refusal strategies were employed by participants to make refusals in all five offer type situations to the three different addressees. Below is a table summarising the refusal strategies that had at least 10 occurrences in total listed from highest to the lowest frequency together with examples:

Table 4.15: Top 10 refusal strategies in five offer type situations

Strategy	Frequency	Example	Situation with highest frequency	
Define relation	423	*It's ok, dear. ... (Participant 1 refusing a friend)*	2(b)	96
Excuse, reason, explanation	415	*... I can do myself. (Participant 13 refusing a friend)*	2 & 5(b)	90
Let interlocutor off the hook	363	*... but it's okay. I can manage ... (Participant 26 refusing a friend)*	1 & 2(b)	91
Gratitude/ appreciation	198	*... Thank you for your help. (Participant 23 refusing a junior)*	2(b)	53
"No"	78	*No, dear. I'm waiting ... (Participant 1 refusing a junior)*	3(b)	28
Statement of regret	76	*Sorry, Sir. (Participant 19 refusing a lecturer)*	5(b)	67
Negative willingness/ability	30	*... but I don't want da. (Participant 8 refusing a junior)*	4(b)	12
Pause fillers	21	*Oh, sorry dear ... (Participant 27 refusing a friend)*	1 & 5(b)	6
Promise of future acceptance	17	*... Some other time I will take your interview Mam/Sir. (Participant 2 refusing a lecturer)*	5(b)	12
Removal of negativity	10	*So kind of you but ... (Participant 31 refusing a junior)*	1(b)	6

The highest number of refusal strategies was used in Situation 2 (b) (356) although only 12 types of refusal strategies were employed by the participants. Despite having the

highest number of types of refusal strategies (14), Situation 5 (b) only had 327 occurrences of strategies. Situation 3 (b) had 343 occurrences with the use of 10 types of refusal strategies. Situations 1 and 4 (b) had 11 types of refusal strategies with 327 and 301 respectively.

4.2.2.7 Refusal strategies used to all three different addressees

Below is a table summarising the refusal strategies that were used to all the three different addressees: a lecturer, a friend and a junior in offer type situations by the participants in this study. The influence of the power of the three addressees on the choice of refusal strategies made by Malaysian Indian undergraduates of this study is discussed here.

Table 4.16: Total frequency of the refusal strategies used to all three different addressees in offer type situations

Refusal Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
"No"	24	29	25
Negative willingness/ability	10	9	11
Statement of regret	26	24	26
Excuse, reason, explanation	145	150	120
Conditional acceptance			4
Promise of future acceptance	4	5	8
Statement of principle			1
Threat/statement of negative consequences			2
Criticize		1	4
Request for help, empathy and assistance	1		
Let interlocutor off the hook	126	127	110
Sarcasm			2
Statement of positive opinion/feeling/disagreement	2	2	4
Pause fillers	9	6	6
Gratitude/appreciation	76	49	73
Removal of negativity	4	1	5
Define relation	206	117	100
Total	**633**	**520**	**501**

Participants used a total of 12 types of strategies to refuse both lecturer and friend and 16 types to refuse a junior. Despite the lowest number of types of refusal strategies, refusals made to a lecturer had the highest number of strategies used (633) followed by refusals to a friend (520) and refusals to a junior (501) though it had the highest number of types of refusal strategies. As with request type situations, it could be said that the number of types of refusal strategies chosen by the participants did not affect the total frequency of strategies in refusals to offers in this study.

As shown in the table above, the direct "No" strategy was found across the three addressees. In all the offer type situations, this strategy was not used alone when it came to refuse any of addressees. It occurred with indirect Gratitude/appreciation strategy, which also had a high frequency count. "No" strategy was softened with the usage of indirect Gratitude/appreciation strategy and it did not reflect differences in power. Besides that, direct "No" was also used with indirect Define relation, Excuse, reason, explanation and Let interlocutor off the hook strategies by the participants maybe to mitigate the refusals in offers. Below are the some of the examples of how direct "No" strategy was used with other indirect strategies:

1. [No] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   No, thanks my dear. I don't want to trouble you. (Participant 1 refusing a friend in Situation 1(b))

2. [No] + [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation]

   No, thanks dear. (Participant 13 refusing a junior in Situation 2(b))

3. [No] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

No, sir. I will follow my friends. (Participant 24 refusing a lecturer in Situation 3(b))

As discussed earlier in request type situations (section 4.2.1.7), the direct Negative willingness/ability strategy was used with other indirect refusal strategies by the participants in offer situations maybe to soften the refusals with all the three addressees as well. Below are some of the examples of how Negative willingness/ability direct strategy was used with other indirect refusal strategies to refuse offers politely:

1. [Negative willingness/ability] + [Statement of regret]

Cannot, sorry. (Participant 12 refusing a junior in Situation 5(b))

2. [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation] + [Let interlocutor off the hook]

I don't want, Madam. It's okay. (Participant 8 refusing a lecturer in Situation 2(b))

3. [Negative willingness/ability] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

I don't want da. I can go by bus. (Participant 8 refusing a junior in Situation 3(b))

Although the frequency range of the indirect Statement of regret strategy was low across the addressees (24 to 26), it was used mostly (67 times) to refuse in Situation 5(b) (see Table 4.14). By expressing regret, refusers could hint that they were not refusing intentionally and trying to reduce damage to their relationship. This strategy was used lesser (76 times) (see Table 4.14) in offer situations than in request situations (495 times) (see Table 4.6) by the participants. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse, reason, explanation] +

   [Statement of regret]

   Sorry Madam. I am almost finished. Sorry again. (Participant 9 refusing a lecturer in

   Situation 5(b))

2. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse, reason, explanation] +

   Sorry, bro. List of interviewees is full. (Participant 31 refusing a friend in Situation

   5(b))

Excuse, reason, explanation was also a very common strategy employed by the participants in refusing offers and it was used to all the addressees. In fact, it was the strategy that had the highest frequency in refusals to a friend and a junior with 150 and 120 occurrences respectively. When participants used this strategy either alone or with other strategies, they may have wanted to show that there were justifications behind their refusals. Below are some of the examples:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [Gratitude/appreciation]

   Never mind. It's not so heavy. I can carry it. Thank you. (Participant 23 refusing a

   friend in Situation 1(b))

2. [Pause fillers] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Hmmm… I'm moving now. I will take it along. (Participant 13 refusing a junior in

   Situation 1(b))

3. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

Sorry dear. Those are my books and papers. So, I can bring myself. (Participant 3

refusing a friend in Situation 2(b))

The indirect Define relation strategy was also used in offer situations to refuse all the addressees but mostly to a lecturer (206 times). In fact, it was the strategy that had the highest frequency in refusals to a lecturer. This strategy could be a way to show the closeness between the speaker and addressee and to stress their relationship. For example:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

[Define relation] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] +

[Promise of future acceptance] + [Define relation]

I'm sorry, Sir/Mam. I've already select my interviewees, Sir/Mam. Sorry, Sir/Mam.

Some other time I will take your interview, Sir/Mam. (Participant 2 refusing a

lecturer in Situation 5(b))

2. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

It's OK friend. No problem for me to carry the books with me. (Participant 10

refusing a friend in Situation 1(b))

As shown in Table 4.16, the Let interlocutor off the hook and Gratitude/appreciation indirect strategies had high frequencies to all the addressees after Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation. They also very commonly appeared together in refusals to offers. These strategies could have been used to tell the addressees not to worry and to show appreciation for their concern. Once again, it looks like effort was taken to

76

make sure that the addressees were not offended when their offers were refused. Below are some of the examples of these strategies used with other refusal strategies:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Gratitude/appreciation]

   It's okay, Sir. Thank you. (Participant 28 refusing a lecturer in Situation 1(b))

2. [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Thank you girl for your offer. But it's OK. My brother will come to pick me. You go first. (Participant 36 refusing a junior in Situation 3(b))

3. [Gratitude/appreciation] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Thank you, sir. But will get the notes from my friends. (Participant 15 refusing a lecturer in Situation 4(b))

4. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Gratitude/appreciation]

   It's OK, Madam. I can manage. Thank you for your kindness. (Participant 29 refusing a lecturer in Situation 1(b))

The indirect Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request strategy was only used once to refuse an offer from a lecturer by Participant 4 in Situation 5 (b). It was a request for the lecturer's empathy or understanding of the refusal. For example:

Lecturer: I heard about your class project and I find it interesting. I would love to

be one of your interviewees.

Participant: I'm sorry Sir. I already interviewed everyone who could help for my

*project. **Please don't mistake me**, sir. Sorry sir.*

The indirect Pause fillers strategy was used with all the addressees but mostly to refuse a lecturer's offer 9 times. Again this strategy could be a sign of refusal delaying by the participants at that particular moment. For example:

Ohh*… No madam. It's not now. When I start it, I will come and find out you. (Participant 18 refusing a lecturer in Situation 5(b))*

Other indirect refusal strategies like Statement of principle, Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester, Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack and Sarcasm were used to refuse a junior. These strategies most probably were used to show the power the participants had over the juniors and the refusals were very impolite. For example:

1. [Criticize/insult/attack] + [Threat/statement of negative consequences]

   Hey, you think I am so weak until cannot carry all these books. Better you go away.

   (Participant 19 refusing a junior in Situation 2(b))

2. [Criticize/insult/attack]

   You no need to watch my books. (Participant 17 refusing a junior in Situation 1 (b))

However, other indirect strategies like Conditional acceptance, Promise of future acceptance, Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement and Removal of

negativity were also used to refuse juniors. These strategies were polite and it looks like effort was taken to ensure that the juniors were not offended when their offers were refused. For example:

1. [Statement of positive opinion/feeling/agreement] + [Negative willingness/ability]

   That's good but I really don't need it now. (Participant 40 refusing a junior in Situation 4(b))

2. [Removal of negativity] + [Excuse, reason, explanation]

   So kind of you but I can hold my books. (Participant 31 refusing a junior in Situation 1(b))

4.2.3 Request and offer type situations

Below is a table summarising the total frequency of the refusal strategies used in both request and offer type situations to all the three addressees.

Table 4.17: Total frequency of the refusal strategies used to all three different addressees in both request and offer type situations

Type of Situation	Lecturer	Friend	Junior	Total	Percentage (%)
Request	699	580	549	**1828**	**52**
Offer	633	520	501	**1654**	**48**
Total	**1332**	**1100**	**1050**		
Percentage (%)	**38**	**32**	**30**		

As shown in Table 4.17, it is clear that request type situations had higher frequency with 1828 occurrences which were 52% of the total refusal strategies used and offer type

situations had only 1654 occurrences which were 48% of the total refusal strategies used in this study.

Refusals to a lecturer had the highest frequency of strategies with 1332 occurrences which was 38% of the total of refusal strategies used. Refusals to a lecturer also had the higher frequency of strategies used in request type situations (699) than in offer type situations (633). Refusals to a friend had the second highest frequency of strategies with 1100 occurrences, which was 32% of the total refusal strategies used. More strategies were used in request type situations (580) than in offer type situations (520). Refusals to a junior had the lowest frequency of strategies with 1050 occurrences which was 30% of the total refusal strategies used. Once again, more strategies were used in request type situations (549) than in offer type situations (501).

4.3 Single/Multiple strategies

The table shows the total frequency of single and multiple strategies that were used by the participants in their responses to refuse the addressees in this study.

Table 4.18: Total frequency of single/multiple strategies used to all the three addressees

Number of Strategies	Lecturer	Friend	Junior	Total
1	1	16	23	**40**
2	32	99	139	**270**
3	226	204	162	**592**
4	107	55	53	**215**
5	14	5	7	**26**
6	3			**3**

As shown in Table 4.18, a single strategy was used 40 times to make refusals. However, it was commonly used to refuse a junior (23 times). Below are some of the examples of how a single strategy was used:

1. [Negative willingness/ability]

   I can't. (Participant 17 refusing a junior in Situation 1(a))

2. [Explicit rejection]

   No way. (Participant 37 refusing a friend in Situation 3(a))

Two refusal strategies were used 270 times to make refusals. They were used for all the addressees but most commonly used to refuse a junior (139 times). Below are some of the examples of how any two refusal strategies were used together:

1. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation]

   Never mind, friend. (Participant 21 refusing a friend in Situation 1(b))

2. [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Gratitude/appreciation]

   It's OK. Thank you. (Participant 14 refusing a junior in Situation 2(b))

Three refusal strategies were used 592 times to make refusals. They were also used to all the addressees but most frequently used to refuse a lecturer (226 times). It could be because a lecturer had higher power than the participants, they had to employ more strategies to refuse. Below are some of the examples of how any three refusal strategies were used together:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation]

   Sorry, my friend. I have other work to do. (Participant 16 refusing a friend in

   Situation 2(a))

2. [Pause fillers] + [Let interlocutor off the hook] + [Define relation]

   Oh, never mind dear. (Participant 30 refusing a junior in Situation 1(b))

Four refusal strategies were used 215 times to make refusals. They were also used to all the addressees but most frequently used to refuse a lecturer (107 times). As mentioned earlier, it looks like more strategies are needed with someone who had a higher power in the academic context. Below are some of the examples of how any four refusal strategies were used together:

1. [Removal of negativity] + [Define relation] + [Let interlocutor off the hook] +

   [Excuse, reason, explanation]

   So nice of you, Sir. But, it's OK. I will manage. (Participant 16 refusing a lecturer in

   Situation 2(b))

2. [Pause fillers] + [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] +

   [Excuse, reason, explanation]

   Ohh… sorry Sir. I have work to do. (Participant 30 refusing a lecturer in Situation

   1(a))

Five refusal strategies were used 26 times to make refusals. They were used to all the addressees but most frequently used to refuse a lecturer (14 times). Most probably participants felt more strategies were needed to refuse someone in a higher power in the

academic context. Below are some of the examples of how any five refusal strategies were used together:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Excuse/reason/explanation] +

   [Negative willingness/ability] + [Promise of future acceptance]

   Sorry Madam. After this, I have class. So, I can't help you. Maybe next time I will

   help you. (Participant 23 refusing a lecturer in Situation 1(a))

2. [Pause fillers] + [Statement of regret] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Define relation] + [Conditional acceptance]

   Oh, sorry. I can't, dear. You borrow from me after three days. (Participant 32

   refusing a junior in Situation 4(a))

Six refusal strategies were used only 3 times to make refusals to a lecturer. As mentioned before, probably participants needed more strategies to refuse someone in a higher power than them in the academic context. Below are some of the examples of how any six refusal strategies were used together:

1. [Statement of regret] + [Define relation] + [Negative willingness/ability] +

   [Excuse/reason/explanation] + [Conditional acceptance] +

   [Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request]

   I'm really sorry, madam. I can't borrow it to you because I need to use it for my own

   assignment. Maybe I will give it to you after I used it. Please don't take me wrong.

   (Participant 33 refusing a lecturer in Situation 4(a))

4.4 Other findings

'Lor', a Malaysian particle used to emphasize a word or a sentence, sounds more Chinese was found as a part of the refusal response. Besides that, the term 'lah' from the Malay language has become a part of our daily language as well. For example:

1. *Cannot **lor**, I finished my food ... (Participant 6 refusing a friend in Situation 1(a))*

2. *Cannot **lah**, I have to go to ... (Participant 19 refusing a friend in Situation 1(a))*

There was a use of the phrases like 'Oh God' and 'Oh my God' as part of the refusal response too. The use of this exclamation and phrase could be a way for the participant to indicate the addressee that he or she was not ready for the request or offer. For example:

Oh my God*! I finished. (Participant 6 refusing a junior in Situation 5 (b))*

4.5 Conclusion

The findings of this study showed that the participants, Malaysian Indian undergraduates used various types of direct and indirect strategies to make refusals in English. In both request and offer situations, there were single strategy, multiple strategies of the same type and even a combination of both direct and indirect refusal strategies. The power of each addressee did influence the participants' choice of refusal strategies in an academic context. Participants used multiple strategies with the highest occurrences when it came to refuse a lecturer and their choice of strategies was decent and polite. Alike, in refusals to a friend, participants used different types of strategies in order not to offend them and also to soften the refusals. However, in refusals to a junior, less effort was taken to mitigate the refusals and in some responses, the choice of

strategies by the participants was impolite. Participants, in general, tried to avoid awkward situations in order to protect the face of the addressees.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The objectives of this study was to find out the strategies employed by Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English and the influence of power on the choice of refusal strategies made by them in an academic context. In this chapter, the summary of the findings and discussion of this study are given. Besides that, suggestions for future research are also given.

5.1 Summary of Findings

There were a total of 27 refusal strategies employed by the 40 Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English in both request and offer type situations in an academic context.

5.1.1 First research question

The first question of this research was to find out the strategies employed by the Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English in an academic context. To answer this question, the semantic formulas found in the responses from the DCT were analysed and coded according to the framework of refusal strategies that was adapted from Beebe et al. (1990) and Al-Issa (2003).

The findings of the study showed that participants chose 26 out of 27 strategies to make refusals in request type situations and 17 out of 27 strategies to make refusals in offer type situations. There were single strategies, multiple strategies of the same type and even a combination of both direct and indirect refusal strategies in order to get the refusal messages across. The 27 refusal strategies that were relevant to this study employed by the participants in this study were:

1. Explicit rejection

2. 'No'

3. Negative willingness/ability

4. Statement of regret

5. Excuse, reason, explanation

6. I can do X instead of Y

7. Why don't you do X instead of Y

8. Future or past acceptance

9. Conditional acceptance

10. Promise of future acceptance

11. Statement of principle

12. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester

13. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack

14. Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request

15. Let interlocutor off the hook

16. Reprimand

17. Sarcasm

18. Repetition of part of request, etc.

19. Postponement

20. Hedging

21. Request for information

22. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement

23. Statement of empathy

24. Pause fillers

25. Gratitude/appreciation

26. Removal of negativity

27. Define relation

In request situations, the most common types of refusal strategies used by the participants to all the three addressees were Statement of regret, Excuse, reason, explanation and Define relation. In offer situations, the most common types of refusal strategies used by the participants to all the addressees were Excuse, reason, explanation, Let interlocutor off the hook and Define relation.

Participants in this study employed mainly indirect strategies to make refusals to all the three addressees. Direct strategies are often used with other indirect strategies to mitigate refusals in responses. Thus, the findings had given the answer to the first question of this study by displaying the strategies that were employed by the Malaysian Indian undergraduates to make refusals in English in an academic context.

5.1.2 Second research question

The second research question of this study was to find out the influence of power on the choice of the refusal strategies made by Malaysian Indian undergraduates in an

academic context. The situations in this study were categorised into two types: request and offer. Below is a table summarising the number of refusal strategies used to all the three addressees and their occurrences in both request and offer situations:

Table 5.1: Number of refusal strategies and total frequency of the strategies used to all three addressees in request and offer situations

Types of situation	Addressee	Number of refusal strategies	Total frequency
Request	Lecturer	17	699
	Friend	19	580
	Junior	21	549
Offer	Lecturer	12	633
	Friend	12	520
	Junior	16	501

In request situations, a total of 17 types of refusal strategies were used to refuse a lecturer, they were used 699 times, more than to a friend (580) and a junior (549). In offer situations, only 12 types of refusal strategies were used. Strategies were used 633 times, more than to a friend (520) and a junior (501).

Refusals to a junior in both request and offer situations showed the most types of refusals strategies, 21 and 16 respectively but with the lowest occurrences of strategies, 549 and 501 respectively. Refusals to a friend in request situations showed the second highest number of types of refusal strategies (19) with 580 occurrences.

The direct "No" and Negative willingness/ability strategies were often used with other strategies to refuse a lecturer in both request and offer situations. It could be inappropriate to refuse directly someone of a higher power in an academic environment. Statement of regret strategy was often emphasised with the use of intensifiers like 'so', 'really' and 'very' or supported by long detailed Excuse, reason, explanation strategy

when it came to refuse a lecturer in both types of situations. It showed that the participants wanted the lecturer to know that they felt bad upon refusing the request or offer and tried to validate their decision by giving excuses.

The use of I can do X instead of Y strategy was found more often in refusals to a lecturer in request situations. In other words, volunteering oneself to help in other ways was seen used to a lecturer (higher power). The Future or past acceptance strategy was used too in refusals to a lecturer in request situations. It showed that participants did not want to offend someone of higher power than them therefore tried to say that the request/offer would have not been refused if it came before or after that moment.

Besides that, the indirect Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request, Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement, Statement of empathy and Removal of negativity strategies were frequently used in refusals to a lecturer in both types of situations except for Statement of empathy (only in offer situations). Participants most probably used these strategies to avoid from being rude and to gain the understanding from a lecturer for their decision to refuse.

Pause fillers strategy was used more often with a lecturer compared to the other two addressees in both types of situations. This strategy might give the addressee the idea that one is not interested and thinking on how to refuse requests/offers politely. Gratitude/appreciation and Let interlocutor off the hook strategies were also often used to a lecturer in offer situations. It could indicate that the participants appreciate concern for them and refuse to trouble the addressee.

Indirect strategy Define relation was used frequently in refusals to a lecturer in both request and offer situations. The common terms used by the participants to address a lecturer were 'Sir', 'Madam' or 'Mam' in their responses. It could be one of the ways to show respect when interacting with a lecturer as a lecturer was someone with a higher power than the participants in an academic context.

The use of direct Explicit rejection strategy was only found in a refusal to a friend as a single strategy in request situation. The direct "No" and Negative willingness/ability strategies were used together with other indirect strategies in both request and offer situations to refuse a friend in order not to damage the relationship in between them. Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation strategies were also used in a similar way in both types of situation. Participants apologised and gave lengthy explanations or reasons when they had to refuse their friends.

Promise of future acceptance strategy was also used to refuse a friend by giving hopes to the addressee in both types of situation. Gratitude/appreciation and Let interlocutor off the hook strategies in offer situations were used as well to a friend. Participants appreciated the offers and might hint the addressee that they are able to handle the situations. The [Reprimand] strategy came in refusals to a friend as well in request situations. Giving orders to a friend (equal power) could not be very offensive as it showed the rights the participants had towards a friend.

Indirect strategy Define relation was used frequently in refusals to a friend in both request and offer situations. When referring to a friend, participants used terms like dear and darling and they were used by female participants commonly. The usage of these terms in refusals showed the good close relationship interlocutors had as friends.

Besides that, knowing Tamil language myself, I would say that there were terms used in this study showed its influence. The term 'da', a unisex term had similar meaning to dear. It also can be used to refer to a male who is younger but commonly it is used between male friends. Even friends of different gender use it to address each other. Similarly, the term 'di' is also used in the response. However, the term 'di' can only be used to a female.

There were also other Tamil terms to highlight the Define relation strategy like 'pa', 'dei', 'machi' and 'cha' or 'macha' and all these terms were used to a male yet now they are used to friends regardless of their gender. All these terms showed the familiarity and closeness interlocutors had with one another. Other address terms like 'dude', 'buddy' and 'beb' were used by the participants to friends. These terms are an informal and casual way of addressing a friend in the western countries.

Both "No" and Negative willingness/ability strategies were used quite occasionally as a single strategy to refuse a junior maybe due to the lower power they had with the participants till no further explanations or reasons were bothered to be given. Not only that, Statement of regret and Excuse, reason, explanation strategies were often used alone and the excuses were shorter in length, more formal and direct.

The use of Why don't you do X instead of Y strategy was found more often in refusals to a junior. In other words, giving suggestions was seen used to a junior. This strategy shows that the participants could still be a help in other ways to the addressee by suggesting options and help to soften the refusal state. The Conditional acceptance and Promise of future acceptance strategies were used to refuse a junior as well. Setting

conditions would be inappropriate to be used with a lecturer (higher power) but more acceptable with a junior (lower power) and promises could help to mitigate the refusals.

The indirect Statement of principle, Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester and Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack strategies were seen frequently in refusals to a junior. It showed the relationship gap the participants had with someone of a lower power than them in which the feelings of a junior were not given much attention. Let interlocutor off the hook strategy was often used as a single strategy by the participants to refuse a junior maybe to indicate that they can take care of the situations and do not need any help from the addressee.

Other indirect strategies like Sarcasm, Repetition of part of request, etc., Postponement, Hedging and Request for information were used to a junior. It indicated the not-so-close relationship participants shared with someone of a lower power than them.

Indirect strategy Define relation was used frequently in refusals to a junior in both request and offer situations. There was lots of address terms used to a junior. Participants used terms like 'sis', 'girl' or 'gurl' to address female juniors and terms like 'bro' and 'boy' to address male juniors. In Tamil, a younger brother is addressed as 'thambi' and this term was used in this study to a junior. Besides that, the terms 'ma' and 'yaa' are used to mother and father but often in Tamil culture, these terms are used to address a younger person and in this case, they were used to the juniors as well. There were terms that had influences of other cultures as well. 'Moi' or 'amoi' were used to a junior. In Chinese, 'moi' or 'amoi' are used to a young lady. The term 'dik'

was used to a junior as well. "Dik' or "Adik' is a Malay term for a younger brother or sister.

In general, more efforts were taken in making refusals to a lecturer (higher power), who was a very important person in an academic environment. Multiple refusal strategies were used to avoid the awkward situation with a lecturer rather than refuse directly on the face. Compared to a junior (lower power), refusals to a friend (equal power) was given more attention by the participants in order not to offend his/her feelings and to maintain the solidarity in their relationship. There was an evident of hierarchy from the refusals made across all the addressees. Thus, the second research question was answered: power did influence the choice of refusal strategies made by the Malaysian Indian undergraduates in making refusals in English.

5.2 Suggestions for Future Research

The expressions and strategies used by the participants of this study to make refusals may not be used by other races in Malaysia. Thus, it is important to learn how other cultures in Malaysia make refusals in English to improve the communication exchanges in between multi-cultural people in Malaysia.

The findings of this study also can be used to do a comparison with any similar studies related to other races in Malaysia to find out whether there is a similar pattern in carrying out refusal. Not only that, the findings of this study can also be used to compare data obtained from a DCT like this with data of any other elicitation tools or naturalistic data.

5.3 Conclusion

This study has identified the different strategies Malaysian Indian undergraduates employed in making refusals in English. The power between the participants and addressees had a huge influence on the choice of the strategies made by the participants in making refusals in English. This chapter provided a summary of the findings and implications of this study that could give ideas on how future research can be carried out. The findings of this study hopefully can function as a basis for future researches in the field of speech act.

REFERENCES

Al-Issa, A. (2003). Sociocultural transfer in L2 speech behaviours: Evidence and motivating factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27,* 581 – 601.

Al-Kahtani, S.W. (2005). Refusals realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University, 18,* 35-57.

Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M. & Yasin, M.S.M. (2012). An Intercultural Study of Refusal Strategies in English between Jordanian EFL and Malay ESL Postgraduate Students. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies 18* (3), 29-39

Asmali, M. (2013). Cross-cultural Comparison of Non-native Speakers' Refusal Strategies in English. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies Vol-1, Issue-3,* 111-135. Retrieved from http://www.eltsjournal.org

Beebe, L.M., & Takahashi, T. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal 8*, 131-155.

Beebe, L., Tomoko T. & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990) "Pragmatic Transfer in ESL Refusals" In Scarcella, R., Anderson, E., Krashen, S. (Eds.) *Developing Communication Competence in a Second Language* (55–73), Newbury House, New York.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In Goody, E.N. (ed.) *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56-311.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campillo, P.S, Safont-Jorda, M.P & Codina-Espurz, V. (2009). Refusal Strategies: A proposal From a Sociopragmatic Approach. *Electronic Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8,* 139-150

Chen, H.J. (1996). *Cross-cultural comparison of English and Chinese metapragmatics in refusal.* Indiana University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408-860).

Chen, X., Ye, L., & Zhang, Y.Y. (1995). Refusing in Chinese. In Gabriele Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatic of Chinese as Native and Target Language* (pp. 119-163) Manoa, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18,* 253-267. doi: 10.1017/S027226310001490X, http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310001490X

Farnia. M, Buchheit. L & Salim. S.B (2010). "I need to talk to you" – A contrastive pragmatic study of speech act of complaint in American English and Malaysian. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture. Issue 30*

Farnia, M., Wu, X. (2012). An Intercultural Communication Study of Chinese and Malaysian University Students' Refusal to Invitation. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Vol 2, No. 1,* 162-176.

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). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics 14*: 219–236.

Gass, S. and Houck, N. (1999). *Interlanguage Refusals: A Cross-Cultural Study of Japanese-English.* Mouton de Gruyter, New York

Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kasper, G. and Rose, K. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K.R. Rose and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1-12). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kathir, R. (2015). *Refusal Strategy: Patterns of Refusal Amongst Language Academicians at Public Universities At Malaysia.* Retrieved on November 23 2015, from http://klicels.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/10/KLiCELS1_L_29_7r01FZofAG.pdf

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M. & El Bakary, W. (2002). Directness vs. Indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English Communication Style. *International journal of Intercultural Relations. 26,* 39-57.

Sattar, A., Lah, S. & Suleiman, R.R. (2011). Refusal Strategies in English by Malay University Students. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*. *Vol. 11*(3), 69-81.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University

Shaozhong, L. (n.d). *What is Pragmatics?* Retrieved on April 4 2012, from http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/definition.html

Smith, C. (1998). *Can adults 'Just Say No?' how gender, status and social goals affect refusals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.

Tanck, S. (2002). *Speech Acts sets of Refusal and complaints: A Comparison of Native and Non-native English Speakers' Production.* Retrieved on May 20 2012, from http://www.american.edu/tesol/wptanck.pdf#search

Wolfson, Nessa, (1981). Invitations, compliments and the competence of the native speakers. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics 25,* 7–22.

Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Age	: ……………………………………………………………………....
Gender	: ……………………………………………………………………....
Faculty	: ……………………………………………………………………....
Spoken Languages	: ……………………………………………………………………....

Dear Respondent,
This instrument has been designed to investigate **'Refusal Strategies in English by Malaysian Indian Undergraduates'**. You are kindly requested to give the most appropriate responses to the situations given below. The answers should be written in the provided spaces and in English. They should be whatever you would say in the given conversational situations. Rest assured that the information obtained in the course of this study will be kept confidential and used only for the purposes of academic research. Thanks for your participation.
Instructions: Read each of the situations on the following pages and write after each situation what you would normally say in the given situation. Please write the actual words you would say rather than saying "I would …"

1. a) LOOK AFTER BOOKS (REQUEST)

i) At lunch time, you are sitting at the faculty cafe eating your lunch. One of your **lecturers** puts his/her books on the table and asks you to watch them until he/she brings his/her food but you cannot.

Lecturer: Could you please watch my books while I go and get my food?
You refuse by saying:
_____

ii) At lunch time, you are sitting at the faculty cafe eating your lunch. A **friend** puts his/her books on the table and asks you to watch them until he/she brings his/her food but you cannot.

Friend: Hi there! Can you please watch my books while I go and get my food?
You refuse by saying:
_____

iii) At lunch time, you are sitting at the faculty cafe eating your lunch. A **junior**, whom you know, puts his/her books on the table and asks you to watch them until he/she brings his/her food but you cannot.

Junior: Excuse me. Could you please watch my books while I go and get my food?
You refuse by saying:
_____

b) LOOK AFTER BOOKS (OFFER)

i)   At lunch time, you are standing at the faculty café buying lunch with books in your hand. One of your **lecturers** offers to watch over them until you bring your food but you do not want to accept it.

Lecturer: I can watch your books while you go and get your food.
You refuse by saying:
_____

ii) At lunch time, you are standing at the faculty café buying lunch with books in your hand. A **friend** offers to watch over them until you bring your food but you do not want to accept it.

Friend: Hey, I can watch your books while you go and get your food.
You refuse by saying:
_____

iii) At lunch time, you are standing at the faculty café buying lunch with books in your hand. A **junior**, whom you know, offers to watch over them until you bring your food but you do not want to accept it.

Junior: Excuse me. I can watch your books while you go and get your food.
You refuse by saying:
_____

2.   a) CARRY BOOKS AND PAPERS (REQUEST)

i)   One of your **lecturers** comes into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, he/she asks if you can assist him/her with carrying the books and papers to his/her car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom, but you cannot do that.

Lecturer: Could you please help me to carry these books and papers back to my
          car?
You refuse by saying:
_____

ii) A **friend** comes into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, he/she asks if you can assist him/her with carrying the books and papers to his/her car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom, but you cannot do that.

Friend: Hey! Can you please help me to carry these books and papers back to my
          car?

You refuse by saying:
_____

iii) A **junior**, whom you know, comes into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, he/she asks if you can assist him/her with carrying the books and papers to his/her car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom, but you cannot do that.

Junior: Excuse me! Could you please help me to carry these books and papers back to my car?
You refuse by saying:
_____

b) CARRY BOOKS AND PAPERS (OFFER)

i)   You come into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, one of your **lecturers** offers to help you to carry the books and papers to your car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom but you have to decline his/her offer.

Lecturer: Come. Let me help you with the books and papers!
You refuse by saying:
_____

ii)   You come into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, a **friend** offers to help you to carry the books and papers to your car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom but you have to decline his/her offer.

Friend: Hey, let me help you with the books and papers!
You refuse by saying:
_____

iii) You come into the classroom with many books and papers. After the class, a **junior**, whom you know, offers to help you to carry the books and papers to your car, which is located at the car park 500m away from your classroom but you have to decline his/her offer.

Junior: Excuse me. Let me help you with the books and papers!
You refuse by saying:
_____

3.   a) RIDE (REQUEST)

i)   You attended an important event at your faculty and it happened to finish very late at night. One of your **lecturer**s asks you to give him/her a ride to the nearest transport hub but you cannot.

Lecturer: Could you give me a ride to the nearest bus/train station?
You refuse by saying:

_____

ii) You attended an important event at your faculty and it happened to finish very late at night. A **friend** asks you to give him/her a ride to the nearest transport hub but you cannot.

Friend: Hey, can you give me a ride to the nearest bus/train station?
You refuse by saying:

_____

iii) You attended an important event at your faculty and it happened to finish very late at night. A **junior**, whom you know, asks you to give him/her a ride to the nearest transport hub but you cannot.

Junior: Excuse me. Could you give me a ride to the nearest bus/train station?
You refuse by saying:

_____

b) RIDE (OFFER)

i) You are waiting for the bus near the university to go home. It starts getting late and the bus does not show up. One of your **lecturer**s, stops his/her car, opens the car window and offers you a ride. You decline the offer.

Lecturer: Would you like me to give you a ride somewhere?
You refuse by saying:

_____

ii) You are waiting for the bus near the university to go home. It starts getting late and the bus does not show up. A **friend** stops his/her car, opens the car window and offers you a ride. You decline the offer.

Friend: Hey, you want me to give you a ride somewhere?
You refuse by saying:

_____

iii) You are waiting for the bus near the university to go home. It starts getting late and the bus does not show up. A **junior**, whom you know, stops his/her car, opens the car window and offers you a ride. You decline the offer.

Junior: Excuse me. Would you like me to give you a ride somewhere?
You refuse by saying:

_____

4. a) BORROW BOOK (REQUEST)

i) One of your **lecturers** is looking for an important book from the library to help him/her with the preparation for his/her upcoming research. You happened to have it with you and he/she asks if he/she could borrow it from you for few days but you cannot.

Lecturer: Could I borrow that book from you for one or two days?
You refuse by saying:

_____

ii) A **friend** is looking for an important book from the library to help him/her with the revision for his/her upcoming exam. You happened to have it with you and he/she asks if he/she could borrow it from you for few days but you cannot.

Friend: Hey, can I borrow that book from you for one or two days?
You refuse by saying:

_____

iii) A **junior**, whom you know, is looking for an important book from the library to help him/her with the revision for his/her upcoming exam. You happened to have it with you and he/she asks if he/she could borrow it from you for few days but you cannot.

Junior: Excuse me. Could I borrow that book from you for one or two days?
You refuse by saying:

_____

b) LEND BOOK (OFFER)

i) You only have few days left before taking a final exam and you realised that you missed some of the important notes during a discussion session with your lecturer and classmates. One of your **lecturers** offers you his/her book for few days but you do not want to.

Lecturer: I can lend you my book for few days.
You refuse by saying:

_____

ii) You only have few days left before taking a final exam and you realised that you missed some of the important notes during a discussion session with your lecturer and classmates. A **friend** offers you his/her book for few days but you do not want to.

Friend: Hey, don't worry! I can lend you my book for few days.

You refuse by saying:

_____

iii) You only have few days left before taking a final exam and you realised that you missed some of the important notes during a discussion session with your lecturer and classmates. A **junior**, whom you know, offers you his/her book for few days but you do not want to.

Junior: Excuse me. I can lend you my book if you don't mind.
You refuse by saying:

_____

5. a) INTERVIEW (REQUEST)

i) One of your **lecturer**s is doing a research project and asks if he/she could interview you but you cannot at the moment.
Lecturer: I am doing a research project, which requires me to interview a subject. Can I interview you now?
You refuse by saying:

_____

ii) A **friend** is doing a class project and asks if he/she could interview you but you cannot at the moment.

Friend: Hey, I'm doing a class project, which requires me to interview a subject. Can I interview you now?
You refuse by saying:

_____

iii) A **junior**, whom you know, is doing a class project and asks if he/she could interview you but you cannot at the moment.

Junior: Excuse me. I am doing a class project, which requires me to interview a subject. Can I interview you now?
You refuse by saying:

_____

b) INTERVIEW (OFFER)

i) You are doing a class project for your final semester. One of your **lecturer**s comes to know about it and offers to give you an interview but you decline it.

Lecturer: I heard about your class project and I find it very interesting. I would love to be one of your interviewees.

You refuse by saying:

_____

ii)   You are doing a class project for your final semester. A **friend** comes to know about it and offers to give you an interview but you decline it.

Friend: Hey, I heard about your class project and it sounds very interesting. You can interview me if you want.
You refuse by saying:

_____

iii)   You are doing a class project for your final semester. A **junior**, whom you know, comes to know about it and offers to give you an interview but you decline it.

Junior: Hi there! I heard about your class project and I find it very interesting. I would love to be one of your interviewees.
You refuse by saying:

_____

APPENDIX B

Al-Issa's DCT

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

   Your classmate: You know I missed the last class. Could I please copy your notes from that class?
   You refuse by saying: _____

2. During your advising session, your faculty advisor suggests that you take another course in writing but you do not want to.

   Your advisor: I think it would be a good idea if you take another elective course in writing. What do you think?
   You refuse by saying: _____

3. You are a senior student in your department. A freshman, whom you met a few times before, invites you to lunch in the university cafeteria but you do not want to go.

   Freshman: I haven't had my lunch yet. Would you like to join me?
   You refuse by saying: _____

4. At lunch time, you are sitting at the cafeteria eating your lunch. A student, whom you never met before, puts his books on the table and asks you to watch them until he brings his food but you cannot.

   Student: Excuse me. Could you please watch my books while I go through the line and get my food?
   You refuse by saying: _____

5. You are in your professor's office talking about your final paper which is due in two weeks. Your professor indicates that he has a guest speaker coming to his next class and invites you to attend that lecture but you cannot.

   Your professor: By the way, I have a guest speaker in my next class who will be discussing issues which are relevant to your paper. Would you like to attend?
   You refuse by saying: _____

6. You are sitting on campus reviewing the schedule of classes for the following semester trying to decide which classes to take. A student, who is sitting next to you but who you do not know, begins asking you about your major. The student then suggests that you take a class with Professor X but you do not want to.

   Student: Since this is your major, I really think you should take a class with Professor X. You will learn a great deal. He is an excellent teacher.
   You refuse by saying: _____

7. You are trying to come up with a topic for your final paper. You consult a friend of yours who suggests that you write about something related to your personal experiences as a student but you do not want to write about that.

   Your friend: Hey, I've got a great idea. Write your paper about your own personal experiences as a student in this university.
   You refuse by saying: _____

8. Your professor comes in the classroom with many books and papers to share with you and your fellow students. After class, he asks if you can assist him with carrying his books and papers to his office, which is located in the next building, but you cannot do that.

   Your professor: Could you please carry these books and papers back to my office?
   You refuse by saying: _____

9. You are waiting near the university for your friend to give you a ride home. It starts getting late and your friend does not show up. A stranger stops his car, opens his car window and offers you a ride. You decline his offer.

   Driver: Would you like me to give you a ride somewhere?
   You refuse by saying: _____

10. A friend of yours is doing a class project and asks if he could interview you but you cannot at the moment.

    Friend: I am doing a class project, which requires me to interview a subject. Can I interview you now?
    You refuse by saying: _____

11. After a class, you are complaining to a group of classmates about a particular professor. One of your classmates suggests that you go and speak directly with that professor about how you feel but you do not want to do that.

    Your classmate: I suggest you go and talk to the professor directly. That is the best way.
    You refuse by saying: _____

12. You only have one day left before taking a final exam. While you are studying for the exam, one of your relatives, who is in high school, asks if you would help him with his homework but you cannot.

    Your relative: I'm having problems with some of my homework assignments. Would you please help me with some of this homework tonight?
    You refuse by saying: _____

13. You are going through some financial difficulties. One of your friends offers you some money but you do not want to accept it.

    Your friend: I know you are having some financial difficulties these days. You always help me whenever I need something. I can lend you 20 JD. Would you accept it from me?

You refuse by saying: _____

14. You are getting on the public bus to go to the university. You start looking in your pockets for the money to pay the fare. One of your classmate sees you and offers to pay your fare but you do not accept this offer.

Your classmate: Don't worry. I'll pay for it.
You refuse by saying: _____

15. You are in the university cafeteria standing in line to choose your lunch meal. There are many items but none seems appealing to you. The person serving the food, noticing that you are having a difficult time choosing your meal, suggests that you try the chicken dish but you do not want to.

The serving person: You seem to be having a hard time choosing your meal. I
                    suggest that you try the chicken. It is delicious.
You refuse by saying: _____

Refusal Strategies Coding Schema

Type	Coding of the strategies	Strategies	Semantic formulas
Direct	**D-1**	Performative	"I refuse"
	D-2	Explicit rejection	"Hell no", "No way"
	D-3	Non-performative	
	D-3-a	1. "No"	"No"
	D-3-b	2. Negative willingness/ability	"I can't", "I don't think so"
Indirect	**I-1**	Statement of regret	"I'm sorry …", "I feel terrible …", "Excuse me …", "Forgive me …"
	I-2	Wish	"I wish I could help you…"
	I-3	Excuse, reason, explanation	"My children will be home that night", "I have a headache", "I have to study", "I'm very busy"
	I-4	Statement of alternative	
	I-4-a	I can do X instead of Y	I'd rather …, "I'd prefer …"
	I-4-b	Why don't you do X instead of Y	"Why don't you ask someone else?"
	I-5	Future or past acceptance	"Can we do it next week?" "If you had asked me earlier, I would have …"
	I-6	Conditional acceptance	"If I finish early, I'll help you"
	I-7	Promise of future acceptance	"I'll do it next time", "I promise I'll …", "Next time I'll …" -- using "will" or "promise"
	I-8	Statement of principle	"I never do business with friends", "I don't borrow money from friends", "I don't ride with strangers"
	I-9	Statement of philosophy	"One can't be too careful"
	I-10	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	
	I-10-a	Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester	"I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation. "I'm afraid you can't read my notes", "If you don't get out of here, I'll call the police."
	I-10-b	Guilt trip	For instance: waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee"
	I-10-c	Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack	"That's a terrible idea!" "Who do you think you are?" "You are lazy!" "Who asked about your opinion?"
	I-10-d	Request for help, empathy and assistance by dropping or holding the request	"Please understand my situation …"
	I-10-e	Let interlocutor off the hook	"Don't worry about it", "That's okay", "You don't have to"
	I-10-f	Self-defence	"I'm trying my best", "I'm doing all I can do"
	I-11	Reprimand	"You should attend classes too", "You shouldn't wait till the last minute"
	I-12	Sarcasm	"I forgot I'm your servant"
	I-13	Acceptance that functions as a refusal	
	I-13-a	Unspecific or indefinite reply	
	I-13-b	Lack of enthusiasm	
	I-14	Avoidance	
	I-14-a	Non-verbal	
	I-14-a-i	Silence	

	I-14-a-ii	Hesitation	
	I-14-a-iii	Do nothing	
	I-14-a-iv	Physical departure	
	I-14-b	Verbal	
	I-14-b-i	Topic switch	
	I-14-b-ii	Joke	
	I-14-b-iii	Repetition of part of request, etc.	"Monday?"
	I-14-b-iv	Postponement	"I'll think about it"
	I-14-b-v	Hedging	"Gee, I don't know", "I'm not sure"
	I-15	Request for information	"Why do you think I should take it?"
	I-16	Return favour	"I'll pay for you and me"
	I-17	Adjuncts to refusal	
	I-17-a	Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement	"That's a good idea …", "I'd love to …"
	I-17-b	Statement of empathy	"I realise you are in a difficult situation"
	I-17-c	Pause fillers	"uhh", "well", "oh", "uhm"
	I-17-d	Gratitude/appreciation	"Thank you very much", "I appreciate it"
	I-18	Removal of negativity	"You are a nice person but …"
	I-19	Define relation	"Okay my dear professor but …"

Situation 1(a) Look After Books (Request)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S2	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3, I-10-d	I-1, I-3, I-19
S3	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-a	I-1, I-4-b, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S5		I-1, D-3-b, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S6	D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-1, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19
S7	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19
S8	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S9	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S10	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-17-d, I-19
S11	D-3-b, I-4-a	D-3-b, I-3	I-10-d, I-3
S12	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3
S13	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-14-b-v, I-3
S14	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-14-b-iii, D-3-b	I-1, I-3
S15	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-3, I-4-b, I-19
S16	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S17	I-17-c, D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b
S18	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-3, I-19
S19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3	I-14-b-iii, D-3-b
S20	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b
S21	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S22	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b, I-3
S23	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-7, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S25	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S26	I-17-c, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S27	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-19
S28	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S29	1-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S30	1-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S32	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19
S33	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-1, I-3
S34	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	D-3-b, I-3
S35	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3
S36	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S37	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1
S38	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-3, I-4-a	I-1, I-3, I-19
S39	1-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-1
S40	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-1, I-3	D-3-a, I-3

Situation 2(a) Carry Books and Papers (Request)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S2	I-1, D-3-b, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-10-d	I-1, D-3-b
S3	I-1, I-3, I-19	1-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	1-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S5	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-5	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19
S6	I-1, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19, I-19
S7	I-1, I-4-b, I-19	I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-4-b, I-19
S8	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S9	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-1, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S10	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3
S11	I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3	I-1, I-10-d, I-3
S12	I-3	I-17-c, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S13	I-1, I-4-b, I-19	I-3, I-1	I-3, I-4-b
S14	I-1, I-3, I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S15	1-17-c, I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-c, I-10-a, I-19
S16	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	D-3-a, I-3
S17	I-18, I-3, I-19	I-10-c	I-12, I-11
S18	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b, I-19
S19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-10-c, D-3-b
S20	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b, I-4-b, I-19
S21	I-1, I-4-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-4-b
S22	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b
S23	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S25	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S26	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19
S27	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b
S28	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-4-b
S29	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S30	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3
S32	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-10-d, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S33	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-10-d, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-4-b
S34	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-12, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b
S35	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-1
S36	I-17-b, I-1, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S37	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b	I-1
S38	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b, I-1	D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19
S39	I-1, I-4-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S40	I-5, I-3, I-1	I-4-b	D-3-a

Situation 3(a) Ride (Request)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-8
S2	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3, D-3-b, I-10-d	I-1, I-3
S3	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-1, I-10-d, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-10-d, I-19
S5	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S6	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19
S7	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-19
S8	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S9	I-1, I-3, I-4-a, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19
S10	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-7, I-19	I-1, I-19, D-3-b
S11	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S12	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-b, I-3
S13	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-4-b	I-3, I-1
S14	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-4-b
S15	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-12, I-19
S16	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3	I-1, D-3-b
S17	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-17-c, I-18, D-3-b	D-3-b
S18	D-3-a, I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-3, I-19
S19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-15, I-10-c
S20	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S21	I-1, I-3, I-10-d, D-3-b, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-19, D-3-b, I-3, I-4-b	I-1, I-3, I-19
S22	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b
S23	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7	I-1, D-3-b, I-7
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S25	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S26	I-1, I-3, I-10-d, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S27	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S28	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-18, I-6, I-19	I-18, I-6
S29	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S30	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S32	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-17-b, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-4-b, I-19, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-4-b
S33	I-18, I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S34	I-1, I-3	I-3, I-1, D-3-b	I-3, I-1
S35	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S36			
S37	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-2	I-1
S38			
S39	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S40	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-4-b, I-1	D-3-a, D-3-b, I-4-b

Situation 4(a) Borrow Book (Request)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S2	I-1, I-3, I-1, D-3-b, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3
S3	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S5	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S6	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19	D-3-b, I-3	I-3, I-19
S7	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b
S8	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-19, D-3-b
S9	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-6, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S10	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S11	D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	D-3-b, I-3
S12	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19
S13	I-1, I-3	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-3	I-1, I-3
S14	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-6, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S15	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-19
S16	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-11	D-3-a, I-3
S17	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-7, I-19	D-3-a, I-3
S18	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-6, I-7, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b, I-6, I-19
S19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-14-b-iii
S20	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-4-b
S21	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	D-3-b, I-6
S22	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b, I-3
S23	I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, D-3-a	I-1, I-3
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-19
S25	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S26	I-17-c, I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S27	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-8
S28	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-4-b
S29	I-1, I-3, I-19,	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S30	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-1, I-19	D-3-b, I-1, I-19	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-1, I-19
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S32	I-1, D-3-b, I-4-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-6, I-19
S33	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-6, I-10-d I-19,	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S34	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3	I-3, I-1
S35	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S36	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S37	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-6	I-1, I-3
S38	I-18, D-3-b, I-3, I-7, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-7, I-3	I-7, I-19
S39	I-1-, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b
S40	I-3, I-14-b-iv	I-3	I-3, I-6

Situation 5(a) Interview (Request)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S2	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b
S3	I-1, I-5, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-5, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, I-1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-5, I-19
S5	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S6	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-19
S7	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-3, I-1	I-1, I-3, I-1
S8	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S9	I-1, I-3, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S10	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-19, I-3
S11	I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	D-3-b, I-3
S12	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3
S13	I-17-c, D-3-a, I-3, I-4-b	I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-4-b, I-19
S14	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S15	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-7, I-19	I-3, I-7, I-19
S16	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S17	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-1
S18	D-3-a, I-4-b, I-10-a, I-1, I-19, I-19	D-3-a, I-4-b, I-10-a, I-1, I-19, I-19	D-3-a, I-4-b, I-10-a, I-1, I-19, I-19
S19	D-3-b, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-c
S20	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-5, I-19	D-3-b
S21	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-4-b
S22	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b
S23	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, D-3-b
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-4-b, I-19
S25	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S26	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S27	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, D-3-a, D-3-b, I-3
S28	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b	I-1, I-4-b, I-3
S29	I-1, I-3, I-5, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S30	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b	I-1, I-3
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S32	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-a, I-4-b, I-19	I-3, I-4-b
S33	I-17-a, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-4-b, I-19	I-1, I-3
S34	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3	I-1, D-3-b
S35	D-3-b, I-19	D-3-b, I-3	D-3-b, I-3
S36	I-17-c, I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S37	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-19
S38	I-1, I-3, I-5, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-5, I-19	I-3, I-5, I-19
S39	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S40	I-17-a, I-3, I-5	D-3-b, I-5	I-3, I-4-b

Situation 1(b) Look After Books (Offer)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
S1	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S2	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3
S3	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S4			
S5	I-10-e, I-3, I-19		I-10-e, I-3
S6	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-17-d
S7	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S8	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S9	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S10	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3	I-10-e, I-19, I-17-d, I-3
S11			
S12	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-d, I-3
S13	I-10-e, I-19	I-3	I-17-c, I-3
S14	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S15	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-7, I-3, I-19
S16	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S17	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-c
S18	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19
S19	I-17-d, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, D-3-b
S20	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-17-d, I-3
S21	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S22	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e	I-17-d, I-3
S23	I-10-e, I-3, I-7-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-17-d, I-3
S24	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S25	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S26	I-18, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-18, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-17-c, I-18, I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S27	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S28	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-19	I-12
S29	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S30	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-19
S31	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-18, I-3
S32	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19
S33	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-18
S34	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d
S35	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e
S36	I-10-e, I-19	I-17-c, I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S37	I-10-e, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d	I-10-e
S38	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-18, I-17-d, I-3, I-19
S39	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d
S40	D-3-a, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-17-d, I-7

Situation 2(b) Carry Books and Paper (Offer)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S2	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-17-d, I-3
S3	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S4	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-18, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S5	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S6	I-10-e, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S7	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S8	I-17-c, D-3-b, I-10-e, I-19	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S9	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S10	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19
S11			
S12	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S13	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19
S14	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19		I-10-e, I-17-d
S15	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S16	I-18, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-19
S17	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, D-3-b, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S18	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S19	I-10-e, I-18, I-3, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-c, I-10-a
S20	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3	I-10-e, I-19, I-7
S21	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S22	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d
S23	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d
S24	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-19	I-3, I-10-e, I-19
S25	I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3, I-19
S26	I-18, I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S27	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, D-3-b
S28	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19		
S29	I-10-e, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S30	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-c, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d
S31	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d
S32	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3, I-19
S33	I-17-d, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3
S34	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-3
S35	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S36	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S37	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e
S38	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19, I-19	D-3-a, I-3	I-10-e, I-3, I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19, I-19, I-19
S39	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3
S40	D-3-a, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	D-3-a, I-10-e

Situation 3(b) Ride (Offer)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	Friend	Junior
S1	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3	D-3-a, I-3, I-19
S2	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3
S3	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S4	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S5	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S6	I-10-e, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S7	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S8	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	D-3-b, I-3, I-19
S9	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3, I-17-d
S10	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S11			
S12	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d
S13	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19
S14	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-d, I-3, I-10-e, I-3	I-3, I-10-e, I-3
S15	I-17-d, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S16	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-19
S17	I-10-e, I-19		D-3-b
S18	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19
S19	I-17-d, D-3-b, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-c
S20	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-7, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S21	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d
S22	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d	I-10-e, I-3
S23	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-17-d, I-3
S24	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S25	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-19	D-3-a, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19
S26	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S27	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3
S28			I-10-e, I-3
S29	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S30	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19
S31	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3	I-3, I-10-e
S32	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d
S33	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-10-e, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3
S34	I-3, I-10-e	D-3-a, I-10-e	D-3-a, I-17-d
S35	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S36	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-10-e	I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S37	D-3-a, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e	D-3-a
S38	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19		
S39	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S40	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-7

Situation 4(b) Lend Book (Offer)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-19,	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-8, I-19
S2	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e
S3	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S4			
S5			
S6	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e	I-10-e, I-19
S7	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-10-e	I-10-e, I-3
S8	I-17-d, D-3-b, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-d, D-3-b
S9	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S10	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S11			
S12	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	D-3-b, I-3
S13	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3
S14	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-17-d
S15	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3
S16	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-3	D-3-a, I-17-d
S17		I-10-e	I-10-e, I-19
S18	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19
S19	I-10-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-d, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-10-a
S20	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S21	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S22	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19		
S23	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-17-d, I-3
S24	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S25	D-3-a, I-10-e, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e, D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-10-e, D-3-b, I-19
S26	I-17-c, I-17-d, I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19
S27	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-17-d
S28	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-17-c, I-10-e, I-3
S29	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S30	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-19
S31	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3
S32	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	D-3-a, I-3	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d
S33	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, D-3-a, I-17-d
S34	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-3, I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S35	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S36	I-17-c, I-3, I-10-e, D-3-b	I-10-e, I-3, D-3-b	I-10-e, I-3
S37	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-3	I-10-e, I-19
S38	I-10-e, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-19
S39	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-3, I-19,	I-10-e, I-3
S40	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e, I-3	I-17-a, D-3-b

Situation 5(b) Interview (Offer)

Student	Strategies		
	Lecturer	**Friend**	**Junior**
S1	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S2	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-7, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-1, I-3
S3	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S4	I-1, I-3, I-10-d, I-1, I-19, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19, I-19
S5	I-17-a, I-17-d, I-3	I-17-a, I-17-d, I-3	I-17-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-10-e, I-19, I-19, I-19
S6	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-3
S7	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S8	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-19, I-3	I-17-a, I-1, I-3, I-19
S9	I-1, I-3, I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S10	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-19, I-3
S11			
S12	D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-1, D-3-b, I-19	D-3-b, I-1
S13	I-17-c, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-c, I-3	I-1, I-10-e, I-19
S14	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S15	I-17-d, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-17-d, I-19
S16	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-10-e	I-10-e, I-19
S17		I-10-e	I-17-a, I-3, I-7
S18	I-17-c, D-3-a, I-3, I-7, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-7, I-19	I-3, I-7, I-19
S19	I-1, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-10-c
S20	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-6
S21	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-6, I-19
S22		I-1, I-3	I-1, I-3
S23			
S24	I-1, I-3, I-19	D-3-b, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S25	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S26	I-1, I-17-a, I-3, I-7	I-1, I-3, I-7, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-6, I-19
S27	I-1, D-3-b, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-c, I-1, I-3
S28	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3, I-10-c	I-10-e, I-3, I-6
S29	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19
S30	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-17-d, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-19
S31	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3, I-12
S32			
S33	I-10-e, I-3, I-17-d, I-19, I-19	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-17-d, I-3
S34	I-3, I-7	I-1, I-7	I-1, I-3, D-3-b
S35			
S36	I-10-e, I-3, I-19	I-10-e, I-3	I-10-e, I-3
S37	I-1, I-3, I-19	I-1, I-3	I-1, I-7, I-19
S38	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19	I-10-e, I-7, I-19,	I-10-e, I-17-d, I-19
S39	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19	D-3-a, I-3, I-19
S40	I-1, I-3, I-17-d, I-19	I-17-a, I-3	I-1, I-3, I-7