

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section deals with the summary of the study and the second section deals with the suggestions to the next researchers.

5.1 Summary

This study is a sociolinguistic study in which the aims are finding the refusal and politeness strategies in refusing an invitation. The writer chose ten English Department students as the subjects of this study.

In analyzing the result of the study, the writer used three theories as the parameter. The first theory related to language and gender, the second theory related to refusal strategies developed by Beebe et al (1985), and the third theory related to politeness strategies developed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

Here, the writer found that female subjects applied giving statement of regret, giving reason, giving statement of alternative, giving promise of future acceptance and verbal avoidance of indirect refusal strategy; and also using non-performative statement of direct refusal strategy. On the other hand, male subjects applied giving statement of regret, giving reason and verbal avoidance of indirect refusal strategy; and also using non-performative statement of direct refusal strategy.

There are nine politeness strategies applied by female subjects in refusing the invitation. They are notice-attend to H, exaggerate, presuppose/ assert common ground, offer-promise, be optimistic and give reason of positive politeness strategy and also be indirect, question-hedge and apologize of negative politeness strategy. Male subjects, on the other hand, applied only seven politeness strategies. They are notice-attend to H, exaggerate, be optimistic and give reason of positive politeness strategy and also be indirect, question-hedge and apologize of negative politeness strategy.

Having analyzing the data, the writer found that both female and male subjects tend to apologize and give reason to refuse the invitation. This may happen due to the norm they have had in the society. Since they are Indonesian who regard apologize as the main important part in refusing, the subjects mostly apologize not to accept the invitation. Also, in order not to make the interlocutor misunderstanding with the refusal, the subjects explain the reason why they can't approve the invitation.

Another finding related to the study is that female subjects tend to be more direct than male subjects. Since women fill the different roles in the society, it makes them change a lot. In the past, women are regarded to have the secondary role in the society since all they can do only teach their children while men are regarded to have more roles in the society since all men fill the different position in business or any society role. However;

nowadays, both women and men share the same role in the society and it leads to the condition that women be blunter in their speaking.

5.2 Suggestions

The writer realizes that this study is far from perfect as what has been expected. The writer expects that the English Department students can gain more knowledge related to refusal and politeness and apply those strategies to refuse to any offers or invitations.

Since refusal can be used to refuse to: (1) requests, (2) invitation, (3) offers, and (4) suggestions, the writer expects that the next study will not be related to refuse to invitation only but also to refuse to requests / offers / suggestions.

Then, the writer suggests the lecturers of the English Department especially the lecturers of Sociolinguistic to teach refusal and politeness strategies in the class. This means that the lecturers do not only teach politeness in general but also explain the kinds and examples of politeness.

The lecturers can also teach kinds and examples of refusal strategy. Besides, refusal can be taught in the speaking class. The lecturers can teach how to refuse politely during the speaking class so that the students are able to know how to refuse politely.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown P, and Levinson, Stephen C. 1978. *Politeness some Universals in Language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, J. 1986. *Women, Men and Language*. London: Longman.
-
- Kana, Marit. 1982. *Saying NO in English*. RELC Journal Volume 13 (pp 29-49), 1 June 1982
- Kawulich, Barbara B. 2005. *Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method*. Available at: <http://www.fhi.org/NR/rdonlyres/ed2ruznpftevg34lxuftzjiho65asz7betpqigbbyorggs6tetjic367v44baysyomnbdjkdtsium/participantobservation1.pdf>. Accessed on 2008, March 3.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1991. *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Teori dan Metodologi*. Jakarta:Rajawali.
- Neuman, W.Lawrence. 1999. *Social Research Methods-Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, fourth edition*. USA.
- Peccei, Jean Stilwell. 1999. *Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- *Politeness Theory*. Available at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/communication>. Accessed on 2007, December 23.
- *Pragmatics and Speech Acts*. Available at: <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics/kondo.htm>. Accessed on 2008, March 3.
- *Refusals*. Available at : <http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/refusals/research>. Accessed on 2007, December 20.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1998. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Wahyuni, Wida. 1999. *A Study on the Politeness Strategies in Refusals between English Native Speakers and Indonesian Speakers based on Status*. Unpublished Thesis of Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Wolfson, Nessa. 1989. *Perspectives Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Wood, J. 2001. *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture 4th Editio*). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.