

## FOLLOW-UP RESPONSES TO REFUSALS BY INDONESIAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

**R. Dian D. Muniroh**

*Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*

email: yandi\_munir@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** The study is aimed at investigating strategies of follow-up responses to refusals performed by Indonesians learning English as a foreign language. Having known that his/her desire or want is refused by his/her hearer, a speaker may provide a follow-up response to the refusal to maintain the flow of a talk exchange. This act may also mitigate the tension and is able to prevent the speaker from being considered impolite or non-cooperative. The study involves 20 students of the English Education Department of Indonesia University of Education. The data were collected through Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs). The collected data were then analyzed by using the framework proposed by Searle (1969), Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), and Aziz (2000). It is found that the respondents manifest the follow-up responses in a number of ways, which can be categorized as request, acceptance, apology, promise, refusal, and passive comment. These responses contain some strategies. While the category of request and refusal are manifested in six and two strategies respectively, the categories of acceptance, apology, promise, and passive comment are not further divided into finer categories because they only consist of illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs). This study concludes that an act of providing a follow-up response cannot be separated from the speaker's attempt to maintain harmony in communication.

**Keywords:** follow-up response, speech act, refusal

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengungkap strategi-strategi dari respon lanjutan terhadap tindak tutur menolak yang dilakukan oleh orang Indonesia pembelajar bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing. Setelah mengetahui bahwa hasrat atau keinginannya ditolak, penutur memberikan respon lanjutan terhadap tindak tutur menolak untuk memelihara alunan percakapan. Selain itu, respon lanjutan dapat mengurangi ketegangan dalam komunikasi dan mampu mencegah penutur dari kemungkinan dianggap tidak sopan atau tidak kooperatif. Penelitian ini melibatkan 20 mahasiswa Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UPI. Data dikumpulkan melalui prosedur Angket Isian Wacana (AIW). Data terkumpul kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan kerangka dari Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Searle (1969), dan Aziz (2000). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa respon lanjutan terhadap tindak tutur menolak direalisasikan dengan beberapa cara dan dikategorikan ke dalam "menerima", "memohon maaf", "berjanji", "menolak", dan "komentar pasif". Kategori respon-respon tersebut mengandung beberapa strategi. Kategori "meminta" dan "menolak" dimanifestasikan masing-masing dalam enam dan dua strategi; kategori "menerima", "meminta maaf", "berjanji", dan "komentar pasif" tidak terbagi ke dalam strategi-strategi karena hanya mengandung Perangkat Pengunjuk Maksud Tututan (PPMT). Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa tindak memberi respon lanjutan terhadap tuturan menolak tidak dapat dipisahkan dari upaya penutur untuk memelihara keharmonisan dalam komunikasi.

**Katakunci:** *follow-up response, speech act, refusal*

In the social context of communication, how people interact in daily life is often associated with self concept (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Conversation is the basic verbal interaction (Finegan, 1992, p. 315), therefore to some extent, people are concerned with how others perceive them and how others see their identity. For instance, in an activity of talking, it is possible if our initiation, be it an offer, request, suggestion, or invitation, is refused by our interlocutor. However, in such a situation, people may feel that to be refused is to publicly suffer a face loss.

Conversation is like a game. It has its organizations of such rules as taking turns to speak, giving responses, marking the beginning and end of conversation, and making correction. To fulfill the rules of the game, a speaker may perform a series of responses after acts of refusals were given. Although it is possible that the speaker loses face, he/she may still need to maintain the flow or the move of talk exchange. Moreover, a follow-up response to the refusal implies that the refusal is received as such.

The strategies of refusals, direct or indirect, used by the interlocutor will affect a speaker's responses. These strategies often function to show the recipient of the refusal that his/her concern is still attended to. Unfortunately, however, the interlocutor has necessary reasons to make a refusal.

There are basically a few studies so far conducted to investigate the acts of refusal (Sarfo, 2011; Felix-Brasdefer, 2006; Nelson, Batal, & Bakary, 2002; Aziz, 2000; Kitao, 1996; Chen, Ye, & Zhang, 1995; Ikoma & Shimura, 1993). However, little research has been carried out to study the follow-up responses to refusals. Thus, the study will examine the realizations of follow-up responses to refusals performed by Indonesians learning English as a foreign language. These realizations indeed need to be probed as they are closely connected with the ease of the conversation, the effectiveness of the communication exchange, level of politeness, and culture of speakers and hearers.

In a conversation, people are able to

converse with one another because they recognize common goals in conversation and specific ways of achieving the goals (Grice, 1975). The participants often go through certain rituals especially at the beginning and end. They follow the general formula 'give greeting, transact the business at hand, and issue a farewell' (Kess, 1992, p. 176). They are not supposed to simply leave the conversation, turn their backs, and just walk away unless they wish to be considered socially-inept or ill mannered. Both parties gain concurrently the same benefit without taking much risk.

In a conversation, the norm of reciprocity—the idea that one will receive the equivalent of what one gives, one is able to satisfy the needs of one's fellow conversant—operates as the guidance for successful verbal communication. It is evident that conversational actions tend to occur in pairs. Certain turns have specific follow-up turns associated with them. This is named adjacency pairs.

Adjacency pairs are utterance pairs consisting of two-part ritual exchanges in which an utterance by one speaker requires a particular type of response by the listener (Kess, 1992, p. 175). Given the first element of an adjacency pair, the second is expected (Schegloff, 1995). Questions take answers. Greetings and farewells typically call for another utterance of the same type. Invitations are returned by acceptances (or rejections); congratulations by thanks; offers by acceptance (or refusals), etc. Here are the examples of adjacency pairs.

[a] Question and answer

Speaker 1 : Where's the chocolate I bought last night?

Speaker 2 : In the freezer.

[b] Invitation and acceptance

Speaker 1: My sister will get married on Sunday, I'd really like you to come.

Speaker 2 : Sure!

[c] Offers and refusals

Speaker 1 : Can I help you Madam?

Speaker 2 : No, thanks. I'm just looking.

Like conversation, adjacency pairs also have their own structures. Finegan (1992, p. 320) partitioned an adjacency pair into three sequences. First, the two parts are adjacent and are produced by different speakers. The interaction will sound strange and can provoke anger if the speaker makes a statement before answering the question that has been fronted. Consequently, it causes a non-consecutive adjacency pairs.

- [d] Speaker 1 : Where's the chocolate I bought last night?  
 Speaker 2 : They said that the thief of his house had been caught by the police last night.  
 It's in the freezer.

Second, the two parts are ordered. In ordinary communication, a question cannot be preceded by an answer; an invitation cannot be accepted before it has been offered; a refusal cannot be performed before a request or an offer is uttered; a follow-up utterance cannot be produced prior to the initial utterance.

Third, the first and second parts must be aptly matched to avoid such odd exchanges as the following.

- [e] Speaker 1 : Do you want more tea?  
 Speaker 2 : That's all right, you got my stomach better!

Follow-up responses to refusals investigated in this study have completed the structure of adjacency pairs especially the second sequence in which the two parts are ordered. The follow-up responses to refusals cannot be performed unless the refusals have been given.

The study of speech act has gained researchers' attention like Searle from (1969), Bach & Harnish (1979), and Allan (1986). The British philosopher, Austin (1962), was the first to draw attention to the study of interpersonal communication in relation to act. His basic assumption is that the minimal units of communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds

of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking, and so on. Therefore, when a speaker produces an utterance, intention will be his/her underlying purpose. Every time a speaker speaks, it is expected that there must be something accomplished by the act of speaking. This is the core of the speech act theory.

In a speech act analysis, the effect of utterances on the behavior of speakers and hearers can be distinguished from a threefold distinction (Austin, 1962). First, *the locutionary act* i.e. the utterance that is actually said by the speaker. Secondly, *the illocutionary act* describes the real intention of the speaker by saying a particular statement, offer, promise, etc. Thirdly, *the perlocutionary act* concerns the particular effect the speaker's utterance on the audience. Regarding this study, follow-up responses to refusals can be taken as *the perlocutionary act* of a refusal, which is in the form of utterances.

Since there are so many basic things speakers can do with language, the number of speech act must be limited in both scope and variety. Hence, taxonomy of speech acts must be created. Austin (1962) only listed five categories of speech acts: (1) *verdictives*, typified by the giving of evidence, reasons, or are evaluative of truth like acquit/calculate/describe; (2) *exercitives*, having to do with deciding or advocating particular actions like order/ direct/ nominate/appoint; (3) *commissives*, typified by committing the speaker to a particular action like promise/pledge/vow/swear; (4) *expositives*, a term used to elaborate the speaker's views like affirm/deny/emphasize/illustrate; (5) *behabitives*, providing reactions to the behavior of others like applaud/deplore/felicitate/ congratulate.

Searle (1979, p.10) argued that the most salient weakness in Austin's taxonomy is simply there is no clear principle of classification and there is a persistent confusion between illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs. Therefore, Searle proposed an alternative taxonomy. His classification also has five classes of speech acts: (1) *assertives* is to

commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to the truth of the expressed proposition by using such verbs as suggest/swear/insist/state; (2) *directives*, refers to the attempt of the speaker to get the hearer to do something by using such verbs as ask/command/request/invite/advise; (3) *commissives* is to commit the speaker to some future course of action by using verbs like promise/guarantee/pledge/threaten; (4) *expressives* is to express the speaker's psychological state of affairs by using the expressive verbs like thank/congratulate/apologize/welcome; (5) *declarations* is to bring into reality the state of affairs noted in the propositional content of the declarative by using the verbs like appoint/declare/christen/name.

Speech acts are successful only if the rules of the acts are satisfied. For Searle (1969, p. 66), there are five rules that govern request-making. The first, *the propositional content rule*, is that the speaker predicates a future act of the hearer. The second and the third, *the preparatory rules*, require that while the speaker believes the hearer is able to do the act, the hearer is able to do the act. The fourth, *the sincerity rule*, requires the requester to intend to perform the act, that is the speaker wants the hearer to perform the act and the fifth, *the essential rule*, says that the uttering of words counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do the act.

To certain conditions, a speaker utters a sentence which meaning is not at the same way as its surface structure. For example, a speaker may utter the sentence "I want to do it" by way of requesting the hearer to do something. The utterance is incidentally meant as a statement, but it is also meant primarily as a request, a request which is made by way of making a statement. In such cases, the illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. This is termed indirect speech acts (Searle, 1979, p.31]).

However, in another condition, the illocutionary acts of an utterance relatively gain no success. It is mostly due to the hearer's circumstances. In case of a refusal, the speaker's belief that the hearer is able to

perform the act is in fact biased. The speaker's attempt to get the hearer to do something results a failure which is obviously observed from the hearer's statement of unwillingness or inability. Previous studies on the acts of refusals will say more about this.

The acts of refusals have gained many attentions from many researchers including for examples American English refusals (Felix-Brasdefer, 2006), British refusals (Kitao, 1996), Chinese refusals (Chen, Ye, & Zhang, 1995), Japanese refusals (Ikoma & Shimura, 1993), Arabic refusals (Nelson, Batal, & Bakary, 2002), and Indonesian refusals (Aziz, 2000). These researchers have successfully revealed the strategies of politeness in expressing a refusal.

In Indonesia, the study of refusals was inspired by the trend of Indonesians who do not speak openly, are rarely frank, prefer to express their feelings, thoughts and ideas indirectly and such manners have made the non-Indonesian speakers regard it as a sign of uncooperativeness and impoliteness (Aziz, 2000). Aziz (2000, p. 76) views refusals as the acts that show one's inability and unwillingness to perform the request uttered by the requester for some reason, regardless of whether it is expressed sincerely or insincerely. To a certain extent, the characteristics of Indonesian refusals are similar to those of Japanese refusals.

Considering the factors like gender, age, setting, social distance, power, ranking of imposition, and the seriousness of losing face from the utterances revealed by 163 respondents, Aziz (2000, p. 76) successfully revealed 12 strategies of refusing in Indonesian. However, to limit the nature and variety of the follow-up responses given to refusals, only four strategies—the far more preferred ones, are chosen as the initiations to fulfill the objectives of the present study: 'direct no', 'giving reason and explanation', 'offer an alternative', and 'general acceptance with excuse' strategies.

#### 1) Direct no

This is a blunt refusal. To show inability or unwillingness to cooperate with hearers,

the speaker directly and explicitly says 'no'. Aziz (2000, p. 81) stated that in the Indonesian language, an explicit refusal is always marked by negator 'no' followed by other supportive moves such as modal auxiliaries 'want', 'can', 'maybe', etc.

2) Giving reason and explanation

This is an implicit or indirect refusal. The speaker, in some cases, makes the point of being verbose and this shows that the speaker appears to be vague in his/her refusal. Therefore, the interlocutor has to wait until the final word of the speaker before he/she concludes that the speaker actually intends to refuse the request. Expression [f] shows this.

[f] Today, I'm very busy. I've got a lot of orders, you know. Orders for a birthday party; for a wedding celebration; for a thanksgiving gathering and so on.

3) Offer an alternative

The speaker decides to offer an alternative to his/her interlocutor when the speaker regards the interlocutor's request as being in need of immediate realization but the speaker has already committed to complying with his/her own planned schedule. By this strategy, the speaker intends to save both the speaker's and hearer's face. Expression [g] illustrates this.

[g] How about if we discuss it next week?

4) General acceptance with excuse

The speaker is unable to fulfill the request because he/she has the previous commitment. However, in expressing his/her inability, the speaker seems to have accepted the interlocutor's request by expressing a feeling of sympathy or giving appreciation to the interlocutor's request but for some reasons, he/she eventually negates it. This is illustrated in [h].

[h] I really understand your condition but I'm very sorry because there are other students who will rent this room if you don't pay until 12-tomorrow afternoon.

## METHODS

The present study is largely qualitative. The research is conducted at the English Education Department of Indonesia University of Education of which 20 students are selected to be the subjects by using judgment sampling method (Milroy, 1987).

Two different procedures employed in collecting data for this research are questionnaire and interview. The questionnaire, which is in the form of Discourse Completion Test (DCT), contains a number of situations involving a speaker and his/her interlocutor. For every situation, the respondents are supposed to fill in the blank space by giving follow-up responses to the refusals. Below is the example of the DCT.

Situation #1 : Your students association presents a bazaar and you are responsible for one of the kiosks. As you've promised to pick up your younger sister in bus station, you ask your female friend to shift your job. In such a situation, it seemed that she wasn't interested in helping you. She said, "I can't!" What will you say to her?

You :

The other procedure is interviews with selected respondents. The interview was conducted in respondents' first language, that was Indonesian, to make them more comfortable in expressing their ideas or opinions towards the questions of interview.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Follow-up responses to refusals are classified into six categories: (1) request, (2) acceptance, (3) apology, (4) refusal, (5) promise, and (6) passive comment. The distribution of their occurrences is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Categories of follow-up responses to refusals

Categories	Follow-up Responses to Refusals	Total	%
1	Request	97	40.42
2	Acceptance	118	49.17
3	Apology	5	2.08
4	Refusal	16	6.66
5	Promise	1	0.42
6	Passive comment	3	1.25
Total Responses		240	100

The table shows that the follow-up responses to refusals that appear most are acceptance, followed by request. The following sections discuss each follow-up response in detail.

a. **Category 1: request**

Basically, a request according to Trosborg (1995, p. 187) is “an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for benefit of the speaker.” In natural conversation, the request may take place in the immediate time (request-now) or at some later stage (request-then). The request in this study is “the request-then”—the second request which is given after the stage of refusal has been run.

The request functioning as a follow-up response to a refusal is performed when a speaker wants to persuade a hearer to carry out the desired act. It is considered as the second attempt of the speaker after his/her first attempt to get the hearer to perform the act fails, as evidenced in the refusal. Based on the degree of directness, the study identifies the following strategies of request as a response to a refusal (based on Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, pp. 288-289).

1) *Mood derivable*

This strategy is usually in imperative form and the request is determined by its illocutionary force which is indicated by the grammatical mood of the locution. This is exemplified in [i].

[i] Please, *help me explain it!*

(a follow-up response from a junior to his senior’s refusal to explain semantics material, situation #2)

2) *Explicit performative*

The speaker conveys the request by naming explicitly the illocutionary intent of the locution using a relevant illocutionary verb. This is exemplified in [j].

[j] Hey ... that would be too late. You can watch that cartoon every week. *I only ask you* today.

(A follow-up response from an elder sister to her younger sister’s refusal to accompany her to the supermarket, situation #9)

3) *Suggestory formulae*

The illocutionary intent is phrased as a suggestion by means of a framing routine formula. Example [k] illustrates this category.

[k] Well, we are all busy now. I can understand that. But *what about five or three pages*, please.

(A follow-up response from an elder sister to her younger sister’s refusal to accompany her to the supermarket, situation #9)

4) *Preparatory*

The speaker questions the presence of the chosen preparatory condition for the feasibility of the request, willingness, or possibility as conventionalized in the given language. This is shown in [l].

[l] *Can you* give it to my friend living beside your boarding room?

(A follow-up responses from a senior to a junior’s refusal to return the books to the library, situation #12)

5) *Strong hint*

The illocutionary intent is not immediately derivable from the locution but the locution refers to relevant elements of the intended illocutionary and/or propositional act. This is exemplified in [m].

[m] Mm .. who will go to campus?

(A follow-up response from a senior to her junior’s refusal to return the books to the library, situation #12)

6) *Want statement*

The utterance expresses the speaker’s desire that the event denoted in the proposition comes about. The example will be [n].

[n] Please ... I need your help. I’ve to pick up my sister. She is waiting for me in the bus station.

(A follow-up response from a friend to his male friend’s refusal to shift the job, situation #1)

material, situation #3)

[p] *OK, Maam.* I hope my parents sent the allowance before 12 tomorrow afternoon.

(A follow-up response from a boarder to his landlord’s refusal to postpone the payment of boarding house, situation #11)

In the examples above, the illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs) used to mark an explicit or a direct acceptance are *that’s all right* and *OK*. Other devices are *it doesn’t matter*, *never mind*, and *no problem*.

c. **Category 3: apology**

While a hearer makes a refusal, the speaker realizes that he/she has penetrated on the hearer’s sphere of privacy which may offend the hearer. The state of unwillingness or inability provided by the hearer has proved this. The apology executed is concerned specifically with repairing damage to face, where face preservation itself becomes the object of the conversation for a time, however short (Owen, 1983 cited in Trosborg, 1995, p.374). By doing so, the equilibrium between speaker and the addressee can be restored. Expression [q] illustrates this.

[q] *I am sorry to bother you.* And I will try to borrow it from another person.

(A follow-up response from a senior to a younger girl to correct the FRS, situation #5)

Tabel 2 Distribution of request strategies

No.	Request Strategies	Total	%
1.	Mood derivable	53	54.64
2.	Explicit performative	4	4.12
3.	Suggestory formula	5	5.16
4.	Preparatory	24	27.74
5.	Strong hint	5	5.16
6.	Want statement	6	6.18
Total Responses		97	100

b. **Category 2: acceptance**

After the hearer executes a refusal, the speaker may make an acceptance as a follow-up response to a refusal when he/she finds the hearer is unable or unwilling to fulfill the speaker’s request because of his/her prior commitment. In this case, the speaker cannot force the hearer as he/she finds very little chance that the hearer can satisfy his/her wants. Implicitly, this strategy is intended to save both the speaker’s and hearer’s faces, as exemplified in [o] and [p].

[o] *That’s all right.* I’ll ask somebody else.

(A follow-up response from a junior to his senior’s refusal to explain the semantics

d. **Category 4: refusal**

Having received the refusal from the hearer, the speaker may also respond it with a refusal. The speaker employs this strategy since he/she feels unwilling or unable to accept the hearer’s refusal regarded to his/her condition. Specifically, the refusal functioning as the follow-up response to a refusal is delivered mostly when the initiation used is the ‘offer an alternative’ strategy of refusal. In the realization, the refusal can be performed in such ways as direct and indirect. Examples [r] and [s] exemplify this.

[r] *No, it's not necessary.* Thanks.  
(A follow-up response from a girl to her boyfriend's refusal to pick her up. Instead of directly saying no, the boy offers his younger brother to pick her up. Situation #8)

[s] I'm sorry but I can't go out this evening.  
It will be hard for me. *How about tomorrow around 1 pm?*

(A follow-up response from a junior to her senior's refusal to discuss mini research. Being unable to come tomorrow evening for the discussion, the senior offers another alternative. Situation #7)

Example [r] is categorized into direct refusal as the speaker explicitly refused the hearer's alternative by using negator 'No'. Expression [s] is categorized into indirect refusal, as instead of using the negator 'No', the speaker offers the hearer another alternative. Both are the strategies of refusals. Table 3 presents their distribution

Table 3 Distribution of refusal strategies

No.	Refusal Strategies	Total	%
1.	Direct No	4	40
2.	Offer an alternative	6	60
Total		10	100

#### e. Category 5: promise

In this category of follow-up responses to refusals, the speaker is committing him/herself to do a certain act to make the hearer change his/her decision. This category is considered the speaker's negotiation with the hearer. To show that the speaker wants to cooperate with the hearer and to make the hearer believe the promise, the speaker provides some evidence. This is illustrated in example [t]

[t] Oh ... please just his time. I promise I won't bother you next time.  
(A follow-up response from a friend to her female friend's refusal to shift a job, situation #1)

#### f. Category 6: passive comment

In response to the initiations, some respondents

provided passive comments. They only said '*nothing*'; '*I won't say anything*'; or even kept the space blank (giving no response). Such responses are categorized into passive comments. By conducting the interview to selected respondents, the reasons why they chose the passive comments were revealed. First, the respondents considered it indeed unnecessary to give responses to the description in the DCT. This was simply because they had already understood enough about the condition enforcing the refusals to be executed. Secondly, the respondents chose not to provide the comment because the description of situation in the DCT was not in accordance with his/her belief. Lastly, being upset or desperate that his/her requests were refused, the respondents chose not to make a response (see [4Int7]). This may be interpreted as manifesting harmony between the speaker and hearer. In other words, the passive comment is considered as the speaker's attempt not to prolong the conversation to avoid conflict that probably occurs due to the act of refusal.

Data from interviews showed that to a refusal described in situation #9 (a follow-up response from an elder sister to her younger sister's refusal to accompany her to a supermarket), a respondent claimed as follows.

[4Int.2] *Udahlah minum aja yang ada di rumah, ngerti dong dia kan lagi sibuk.*

'Just drink whatever is available. Please understand that he is busy.'

On the other hand, data from interviews regarding situation #6 (a follow-up response from a student to her lecturer's refusal to examine a research proposal), a respondent claimed that she felt very hopeless and powerless, because there is nothing that can be done to respond to her lecturer's refusal to examine a research proposal.

[4Int.7] *Kayaknya sudah gak bisa ngapa-ngapain dan kalau ngomong pun kayaknya bakalan gak ngaruh*

'It seems there's nothing that can be done and it will likely give no result.'



**The distribution of each category of responses: discussion**

An analysis of the total of 240 responses reveals that the responses are distributed unevenly for each category of follow-up responses (see Table 4). The trend of the distribution in which the occurrence of the ‘acceptance’ strategy (49.17%) far exceeds that of other strategies is not very surprising. This suggests that to a certain extent, most speakers will employ the ‘acceptance’ strategy when they are confronted with a circumstance where the conversation cannot be extended. It is possible that an extended conversation can lead to a jumbled talk, which may provoke a conflict in communication. In view of that, to accept the refusal may result in conversation ending but this does not necessarily mean communication breakdowns. Although it may cause the speakers to be upset, they still give responses. This suggests that they still preserve politeness and maintain the norm of adjacency pairs. Expression [u] shows this.

[u] Oh, that’s OK. I’ll ask someone else.  
(A follow-up response from a senior to a younger girl’s refusal to correct the academic record form, situation #5)

Being in a hurry, the girl—a stranger, refused the speaker’s request to lend him a pencil and an eraser to correct the academic record form by saying “Sorry, I’m in a rush”.

The girl refused it since she knew that the process of correcting the form could take times that she cannot wait. Utterance [u] was made because the speaker realized that the hearer was unable to satisfy his request. The speaker cannot impose the girl to lend him those things, as she is a stranger; otherwise, he will be considered impolite. Further, the speaker immediately shows his commitment by mentioning another person that may be able to comply with his request, although at that time he does not know exactly who will be available. In such a condition, it is likely that the ‘solution’ presented by the speaker is not sincerely given but rather a spontaneous act to maintain the speaker’s image. By so doing, the negative face of the hearer is preserved.

Table 4 Distribution of each category of follow-up responses to refusals

Categories	Strategies	Total	%
REQUEST	1) Mood derivable	53	22.08
	2) Explicit performatives	4	1.67
	3) Suggestory formula	5	2.08
	4) Preparatory	24	10.00
	5) Strong hint	5	2.08
	6) Want statement	6	2.50
<i>Request Subtotal</i>		<i>97</i>	<i>40.41</i>
ACCEPTANCE	7) Acceptance	118	49.17
APOLOGY	8) Apology	5	2.08
REFUSAL	9) Direct no	5	2.08
	10) Offer an alternative	11	4.58
<i>Refusal Subtotal</i>		<i>16</i>	<i>6.66</i>
PROMISE	11) Promise	1	0.43
PASSIVE COMMENT	12) Passive comment	3	1.25
Total Responses		240	100

Other attempts made by a speaker to show that he/she managed to preserve the face of the interlocutor are by providing gratitudes (i.e. *thank you*), expressing sympathy (e.g. *I*

*quite understand*), stating speaker’s wishes (*I hope ...*), or apologizing (*Sorry for bothering you*). Expression [v] illustrates this.

[v] OK, thanks anyway.

(A follow-up response from a senior to her junior's refusal to return her books to the library, situation #12)

Due to a time constraint, the speaker asked her friend to return some books to the campus library. In fact, she could not help the speaker because at the same time she had to attend a seminar in another campus (situation #12). The speaker responded by making an acceptance accompanied by thanking. The act of thanking is intrinsically polite and takes the form of positive politeness. However, the sincerity condition of this act is not fulfilled. Basically, a speaker expresses a gratitude for the hearer's participation in the past action which was beneficial to the speaker (Searle, 1969). Meanwhile, a gratitude in example [v] does not reflect this condition. It is merely an empty utterance which functions as a way to maintain the social relationship.

In another case, where the acceptance is conveyed explicitly, the speaker is apt to accompany his/her acceptance with statement of wishes which indicates that he/she still expects the interlocutor's willingness to assure his/her requests. This circumstance conveys a contradictory fact that the speaker on the one hand accepts the refusal but he/she on the other hand states a wish or an expectation to the hearer to fulfill the speaker's request. This suggests that there is a tendency of the speaker not to fully accept the refusal. The acceptance is best functioned as a way to preserve the speaker's image. Thus, the insincerity lessens the essential condition of the acceptance into a merely empty utterance. This is shown in [w].

[w] It doesn't matter, but I hope you read my research proposal as soon as possible, because I want to finish my research soon.

(A follow-up responses from a student to her lecturer's refusal to examine a research proposal, situation #6)

The analysis further revealed that the 'request' category (40.42%) is perceived among other categories as the second-preferred categories of follow-up responses

to refusals. It seems that the speakers tended to deliver the request simply because they were not satisfied with the result of the first executed request. Basically, it is humane for the speaker to have his desires or wants satisfied by the hearer. However, it is a matter of self-centeredness that every request must be fulfilled. Example [x] shows an utterance given by a boy to his friend's refusal to help him to finish the translation orders (situation #4).

[x] Come on, help me out, will you? I'm your best friend and you don't do it for free.

The utterance above was viewed as another attempt addressed by the speaker for request compliance. To increase the degree of compliance, therefore, the speaker minimizes a cost and maximizes a support to the hearer. Initially, the speaker attracts the hearer's attention by alerting the words 'come on'. By using an imperative form (strategy #1), the speaker tries to deliberately point out what he wants the interlocutor to do. The tag "will you?" indicates that the speaker tones down the impact on the hearer in order that the hearer becomes more cooperative. Lastly, the expression of sympathy is uttered to get the hearer's commitment. Promise of rewards is provided to strengthen the attempt of the speaker to minimize the cost to the hearer. By so doing, compliance can be expected.

Some respondents used a preparatory strategy to persuade the hearer to carry out the desired act after the refusal had been given. This is exemplified in [y].

[y] Can you help me for a moment, please? I will not ask you if I'm not so tired.

(A follow-up response from an elder sister to her younger brother's refusal to buy her something to drink, situation #2)

The speaker reduces the impositive force by uttering understater 'for a moment'. The phrase 'for a moment' was used only after the repeated request to buy something to drink failed. When an understater is used, the degree of imposition has also been lowered (Trosborg,

1995, p. 213). The politeness marker ‘please’ in the utterance above indicates that the speaker still asks for his interlocutor’s attention that he still needs the interlocutor’s help. On the other hand, the marker ‘please’ softens the force of the request. The speaker provides a supporting statement to explain a plausible condition of the speaker. It is expected that the hearer may be more willing to comply with the request. Within the category of request, the proportion gained by strategy #1 (Mood derivable) and strategy #4 (Preparatory), 22.08% and 10% respectively, exceeds the occurrence of other responses. This suggests that both strategies are perceived to potentially lead the request to be a success. Strategy #1 seems to be powerful to enforce the interlocutor to fulfill the speaker’s wants for its imperative forms (on-record) while strategy #4 seems to be less demanding because it employs a polite request (off-record). Both are completely contrastive. According to Trosborg (1995, p. 207), “Structures employing verbs like *need* and *want* are more difficult to refuse than structures employing verbs with a less demanding (and more polite) lexical meaning.” ‘Want statement’ strategy (2.50%) was also used to respond to a refusal by which the speaker explicitly expressed his/her desire, as exemplified in expression [z].

[z] Please ... I need your help. I’ve to pick up my sister. She is waiting for me in bus station.

(A follow-up response from a friend to her female friend’s refusal to shift a job, situation #1)

The speaker increases the imposition of the request. The marker ‘please’ indicates that the speaker pleads for compliance. Trosborg (1995, p. 202) explicated that “want-statements are normally impolite in their unmodified form. If they are softened by ‘please’ or some other mitigating devices, they may take on the character of pleading.” In addition, the plausible reason provided by the speaker in the request allows the hearer to be cooperative with her.

Although in a lower occurrence,

‘suggestory formula’ (2.08%), ‘strong hint’(2.08%) and ‘explicit performative’ (1.67%) categories are also used by the respondents to respond to the refusals. Examples [aa], [ab], and [ac] respectively illustrate these strategies.

[aa] Well, we are all busy now. I can understand that. What about five or three pages, please?

(A follow-up response from a friend to his friend’s refusal to help him finish the translation orders, situation #4)

[ab] Mmm ... who will go to campus?

(A follow-up response from a senior to her junior’s refusal to return her books to the library, situation #12)

[ac] Hey ... that would be too late. You can watch that cartoon every week. I only ask you today.

(A follow-up response from an elder sister to her younger sister’s refusal to accompany her to the supermarket, situation #9)

In example [aa], the speaker managed to place him/herself in the hearer’s position. It is a way to maximize support to the hearer in order that the hearer is willing to comply with the speaker’s request. The speaker expected that by offering a suggestion which was obviously lower in cost, the hearer could be more cooperative.

As example [ab] illustrates, the speaker began the utterance with a hesitation filler ‘Mmm’. Such a filler is likely to indicate the appearance of a dispreferred response (Finegan, 1992, p. 321). However, the hesitation is still viewed as the speaker’s attempt to preserve politeness. Meanwhile, plausible reasons were given by the speaker (example [ac]) to begin her attempt to make the hearer be more cooperative. The downtoner ‘only’ was likely to be effective to minimize the cost to the hearer.

The ‘refusal’ category is also revealed as the follow-up responses to refusals. The speaker responded by refusal again when he/she feels unwilling or unable to accept the interlocutor’s refusal. Mostly, this response emerges when

the initiation used is 'offer an alternative'. The following example, which was uttered by a girl to her boyfriend's refusal to pick her up, illustrates this. Unable to pick up his girlfriend, the boy offered his younger brother to pick her up (Situation #8).

[ad] No, no don't send your brother to pick me up. If you're busy then I'll come to your house.

[ae] If you've got lots of things to do, I think I will visit you another time or you can see me if you go to Bandung some day.

The speaker in example [ad] stated the refusal by explicitly saying 'no'. She accompanied her 'direct no' with a supporting statement of sympathy by which the politeness would not be violated. As example [ae] illustrates, the speaker indirectly refused the alternative offered by the hearer, instead she provided another sympathetic offer.

'Promise' and 'apology' categories respectively seem to be the least preferred categories among other categories to be used as the follow-up responses to refusals. These categories are not further divided into finer categories because they only consist of IFIDs. Furthermore, both categories are only occasionally used as supportive statements for the 'request' or 'acceptance' category. These are exemplified in [af] and [ag].

[af] I beg you please ... please, give me an extension again. I promise when my parents send me money I will give it to you directly.

(A follow-up response from a boarder to his landlord's refusal to postpone the payment of boarding house, situation #11)

[ag] Ah, all right Mam. Sorry to bother you. (A follow-up responses from a student to her lecturer's refusal to examine a research proposal, situation #6)

The promise executed in example [af] demonstrates that the imposition of the request was high. It is considered the strong attempt to

minimize the cost and maximize the support to the hearer. Meanwhile, the apology in example [ag] is considered an empty utterance because its function was merely to save the speaker's face and placate the hearer. However, in case of the above utterance, it was not necessary for the speaker to express the apology. Basically, an apology serves to express regret on the part of the speaker at having performed or failed to perform a prior action which has negative consequences for the hearer. Thus, the apology in the above utterance was only a social routine functioning to maintain the social relationship.

## CONCLUSION

This study reveals 12 strategies of follow-up responses to refusals. They are mood derivable, explicit performative, suggestory formula, preparatory, strong hint, want statement, acceptance, apology, direct no refusal, offer an alternative, promise, and passive comments. These strategies are developed under six categories of follow-up responses to refusals: request, acceptance, apology, refusal, promise, and passive comment. This study revealed that the two most preferred strategies of follow-up responses to refusals are acceptance and request strategies. This study suggests that accepting a refusal is the most-preferred solution to maintain social relationship. However, when the speaker employs an acceptance strategy, the conversation may end. Meanwhile, when a request is used, the conversation will be prolonged. In the context of politeness, the follow-up responses can be taken as a manifestation of a face-saving act.

## Acknowledgement

This paper is based on the writer's undergraduate research paper in 2004. I am grateful to Professor E. Aminudin Aziz for his valuable contributions during the preparation of this article.

## REFERENCES

Allan, K. (1986). *Linguistic Meaning (Vols 1 and 2)*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Aziz, E. A. (2000). *Refusing in Indonesian: Strategies and Politeness*. Unpublished Dissertation, Monash University, Department of Linguistics.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, X., Ye, L., & Zhang, Y. (1995). Refusing in Chinese. In G. Kasper, *Pragmatics of Chinese as a Native and Target Language* (pp. 119-163). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(12), 2158–2187.
- Finegan, E. (1992). *Language Its Structure and Use*. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Group.
- Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. a. Cole, *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts. Volume 3*. (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic.
- Ikoma, T., & Shimura, A. (1993). Eigo kara nihongoeno pragmatic transfer: “Kotowari” toiu hatsuwa kouinitsuite (Pragmatic transfer from English to Japanese: The speech act of refusals). *Nihongokyouiku (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching)*, 79, 41-52.
- Kess, J. F. (1992). *Psycholinguistics Psychology, Linguistics, and The Study of Natural Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kitao, S. (1996). Communicative Competence, Preference Organizations, and Refusals in British English. *Sougou Bunka Kenkyujo Kiyou*, 13, 47-58.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistics Method*. United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Nelson, G. L., Batal, M. A., & Bakary, W. E. (2002). Directness vs indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English Communication Style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 39-57.
- Sarfo, E. (2011). Variations in Refusing Requests in English among Members of a College Community in Ghana. *African Nebula*(3), 1-15.
- Schegloff, E. (1995). *Sequence Organization*. UCLA: Department of Sociology.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. New York: Mouten de Gruyter.