

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used in this present study. It covers four sub-chapters. First, it states the research questions that are put into formulation of problems. Second, it describes the research design employed in this study. Third, it explains the data collection and the procedures for collecting the data. Last but not least, it demonstrates how the collected data are analyzed in the study.

3.1 Formulation of Problems

The objectives of this present study are to identify the types of refusal strategies used by Sundanese and Minangnese in refusing direct requests that appear along their daily interactions as well as to find relationship between the realizations of the refusal strategies with four social variables namely power relation, social distance, rank of imposition and gender. To put it into simple words, those objectives are formulated into two research questions as follows:

- 1) What types of refusal strategies are employed by Sundanese and Minangnese students in refusing direct requests that appear within their day-to-day interactions?
- 2) How do power relation, social distance, and rank of imposition contribute to the realization of refusal strategies used by Sundanese and Minangnese students?

3.2 Research Design

In order to produce a good and comprehensive analysis about the way Sundanese and Minangnese realize the refusal strategies toward direct requests, in this present study the researcher employs generally a descriptive qualitative method. There are several reasons why descriptive qualitative method is regarded as the appropriate method to be employed in this study.

First, it is because mainly the findings of this study involve data in the form of words rather than in the form of numbers (numerical way). Since the main focus

of this study is about meanings of someone's talk, specifically focusing on the refusal strategies realized by people from different cultural backgrounds, a descriptive qualitative approach is the appropriate one to be applied in this study. Additionally, considering that the research questions involve investigating and observing how people behave in some particular situations in which this investigation and observation can be described mostly by words, so the descriptive qualitative method is the good method to be applied (Hancock, Ockleford & Windridge, 2009). In addition, with regards to the investigation and discovery which cover the information about the way participants in this study communicate and behave in their day-to-day interactions (as a form social phenomenon), so this study is developed and described qualitatively. Furthermore, as the study also involves analyzing cases which is started from people's expressions in particular contexts and situation, so to gain a concrete analysis it can be best helped by using descriptive qualitative method (Flick, 2009).

Therefore, by applying the descriptive qualitative method, it is expected that this study could give an important contribution to the understanding of cross-cultural communication and provide information so that people who read this can gain something that can contribute to their understanding of social phenomenon that is happened around them.

3.3 Data Collection

This study employed questionnaire in the form of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as the instrument. DCT can be said as a form of open-ended questionnaires which was firstly used in 1982 by Blum-Kulka et al (Ahangar, Sarani & Zeynali, 2012). DCT is a test in which the participants are required to answer and give responses to several hypothetical situations that are listed in the form of questions (Chojimah, 2015). Actually, there is one drawback of using DCT as a research instrument, that is, by using DCT, the data gathered from the respondents may be not as natural as the data which are obtained through direct observation of the respondents' daily conversations. Nonetheless, due to time constraint and efficiency of the research, therefore DCT is used as the instrument of the present study. As for this study, the DCT consists of 24 hypothetical situations

that need to be answered by the participants descriptively. Those hypothetical situations oblige the participants to refuse several direct requests from other people which are different from the participants in terms of power relation, social distance, and gender, for instance, lecturers, classmates, parents, neighbors, and so on. The difference also involves the rank of imposition of the things requested as well. The form of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that is used in the present study can be seen in Appendix 1.

3.4 Data Analysis

As what has been stated in the data collection, the data in this study were collected from a DCT that has been administered by the participants. Additionally, to gain a comprehensive analysis and findings, the analysis itself was divided into four steps.

The first step was coding the answers of the participants into sixteen classifications of refusals proposed by Takahashi and Beebe (1987) (the analysis can be seen in Appendix 2). Those categorizations are as follows:

a. Direct Refusals

- Performative: *“I refuse”*
- Non-performative: *“No”, “I can’t”, “I don’t think so”*

b. Indirect Refusals

- Statement of regret: *“I’m sorry.”*
- Wish: *“I wish I could help you.”*
- Excuse, reason, explanation: *“I have an exam.”*
- Statement of alternative.
- Set condition for future or past acceptance: *“If I had enough money, ...”*
- Promise of future acceptance: *“I’ll do it next time.”*
- Statement of principle or philosophy: *“I never drink right after dinner.”*
- Attempt to dissuade interlocutor:
 - Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester: *“If I knew you would judge me like this, I never did that.”*
 - Criticize the requester: *“It’s a silly suggestion.”*

- Guilt trip (waiter to customers who want to sit for a while): *“I can’t make a living off people who just order tea.”*

- Acceptance functioning as a refusal:
 - Unspecific or indefinite reply: *“I don’t know when I can give them to you.”*
 - Lack of enthusiasm: *“I’m not interested in diets.”*
- Avoidance:
 - Non-verbal (silence, hesitation, doing nothing and physical departure)
 - Verbal (topic switch, joke, repetition of past request, postponement and hedge);
 - An example for postponement can be: *“I’ll think about it.”*

c. Adjuncts to Refusals

- Statement of positive opinion: *“That’s a good idea.”*
- Statement of empathy: *“I know you are in a bad situation.”*
- Pause fillers like *“well”* and *“uhm”*
- Gratitude/appreciation: *“Thank you.”*

After finishing the coding step, the next step was quantifying the occurrence of refusal strategies and calculating the most-used type of refusal. This step was done to show which refusal strategy that was mostly employed by all participants in answering the questions. This step was done by using this following formula.

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

P= Percentage

F= Frequency

N= Total

After quantifying and calculating the strategies used by the respondents, the next step was analyzing and describing the participants’ answers based on the refusees’ status (power, distance, impositions, and gender). For example the second participant answered the second question by using refusal strategy of *attempt to dissuade the interlocutor* him or her because here the refusee is a student which is powerless than the refuser. After those steps above were done, the last step was drawing conclusion from the findings.