

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter exhibits the conclusion of this present study, which is drawn carefully on the basis of the formulation of problems. This chapter also presents some suggestions, especially for future research regarding the exploration of refusal strategies specifically the refusal strategies which are realized by different people with different ethnic groups.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

This research aims to reveal the refusal strategies realized by Sundanese and Minangnese students in responding to a variety of requests. In addition, this study also aims to examine the contribution of power relation, social distance, and rank of imposition to the realization of the refusal strategies by the respondents. The data are in the form of respondents' answers that are collected through the distribution of a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) to 10 Sundanese students and 10 Minangnese students. The present study applies classifications of refusal proposed by Takahashi and Beebe (1987) to analyze the responses of the participants.

With regards to the types of refusal strategies performed by Sundanese and Minangnese students, thirteen different refusal strategies proposed by Takahashi and Beebe (1987) are evidenced in this study. The strategies are *non-performative; statement of regret; wish; excuse, reason, explanation; statement of alternative; set condition for future or past acceptance; promise of future acceptance; attempt to dissuade interlocutor; acceptance functioning as refusal; avoidance; statement of empathy; pause fillers; and gratitude/appreciation*. Among these thirteen refusal strategies, *statement of regret; excuse, reason, explanation; and non-performative* become the three most frequently used types of refusal strategies by both Sundanese and Minangnese students. This similarity may result from the fact that they are all students at the same university and that

the data are collected through DCT which allows respondents to think carefully before giving a response (the answers may be not so natural).

Furthermore, regarding similarities and differences in the realization of refusal strategies by Sundanese and Minangnese students, it is found that there is no substantial difference in terms of the strategies employed by both Sundanese and Minangnese students. Some differences, however, can be noted especially with regard to the use of mother tongue, in which Sundanese respondents mixed Indonesian with Sundanese more often than the Minangnese.

Furthermore, in terms of the contribution of power relation, social distance, and rank of imposition, some conclusions also can be retrieved. First, it is revealed that more power of the requesters, larger social distance between the refusers and requesters, and higher rank of imposition tend to lead the refusers to use the *statement of regret* strategy. It seems that by doing so the the refuser prioritizes the emotional feeling of the requester by indicating that he or she does not feel at ease to extend a refusal to the request. In this context, an expression of regret is expected to mitigate the unpleasant effect of a refusal. In addition, it is also discovered that less power of the requesters, less social distance between the refusers and requesters, and lower rank of imposition tend to lead the refusers to use the *excuse, reason, explanation* strategy. It seems that by applying such a strategy, the refuser focuses more on the content of the message rather than an effort to cater for the feeling of the requester.

## 5.2 Suggestion

Based on the findings of the study, there are two suggestions proposed for further researches. The first suggestion is regarding the data collection. Since the data of the present study were only gathered from the Discourse Completion Test (DCT), due to the time constraint and efficiency of the research, the responses of the participants of the study could be artificial. The result may be different if the data are collected through direct observations or interview, so the data will be more natural. It is therefore suggested that future researches may collect the data through direct observation to the society or interview. The second suggestion is related to the data analysis. The tool of analysis of the present study is limited to

the refusal classification proposed by Takahashi and Beebe (1987), in which this tool of analysis has been widely used by many previous researchers. So, to gain an up-to-date results, it will be much better if future studies use other tool of analysis instead of using the Takahashi and Beebe's, for example the types of refusal strategy proposed by Joan Rubin or other experts.