

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Approach

The writer main purpose in investigating this study is to find out the most frequently used refusal strategies of the native speakers of American English and the Indonesians speaking English in refusing an invitation or an offer. The writer believes that the most suitable approach used to conduct this investigation is by using descriptive method. Surakhmad (1982:139) argued that descriptive method explains, analyzes, and classifies investigation by using survey, interview, questionnaire, observation, or by using case study, comparative study, cooperative study. Because the writer used questionnaires in the form of Discourse Completion Task (DCT) to compare the responses of the both group respondents, this descriptive method is considered to be the most appropriate one to be used in this study.

3.2. Method of Data Collection

In this section the writer wants to explain about the respondents and the instruments used to conduct this investigation as well as the procedure used by the writer to gather the data from the respondents.

3.2.1. Respondents or subjects

This research is mainly investigating the way native speakers of American English and Indonesians speaking English express their refusal to an invitation or an offer. Therefore, the respondents of this research must also be the native speakers of American English and Indonesians speaking English. In this case, the writer chooses university students as her respondents because she believes that they have attained a high level of education; therefore, they are considered to be competent participants in this research.

The writer asked a technical assistance from her Indonesian friends studying in the United States and her American friend to help her gather the responses from the native speakers of America. The writer was doing this way because she could not find enough native speakers of American English in Indonesia. Moreover, the writer had chosen university students from Indonesia as her respondents. Thus, in order to have a comparable data, the writer must use the same group of respondents, which are university students.

The writer got 25 American students (17F, 8M) who are studying at University of Georgia (14F, 8M); at California State University, Fullerton (2F); and at California Poly, Pomona (1F). All of them have various range of age between 18 to 25 years old. They are all native speakers of American English because they were born and have been living in the United States.

The Indonesian respondents are students of Faculty of Letters at Petra Christian University. The writer chooses these respondents because she believes they have the competence to speak English well. Moreover, most of the

respondents are senior students who have been learning English in the Faculty of Letters for more than three years; therefore, they are considered to have enough knowledge in interacting in English. From the 26 students taken randomly, there are 15 female students and 11 male students. The range of age is between 18 to 25.

3.2.2. Instrument

The writer used Discourse Completion Task (DCT) to collect the data from both groups' respondents. The questionnaires given to the American students were the same as those given to the Indonesian students because the writer wanted to get a comparable data for the purpose of cross-linguistic study. The respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaires that were provided by the writer. There were ten different situations in the questionnaire besides five questions asked in the section of personal details. The respondents were asked to imagine themselves being in those situations and write the exact answers that they may say in each situation. Both groups' respondents had to answer the situational questions in English.

Generally, the ten situations could be grouped into four kinds of social factors. The first three situational questions were related to Age. In Situation 1, the respondents were asked to give their refusal to the older subjects who were also their relatives. In Situation 2, the respondents were asked to refuse his or her classmate who had the same age with them. In Situation 3 the respondents had to deal with their ten-year-old cousin. The second group of situations concerned with

Sex. Situation 4 was conditioned for the respondents to react to a male subject, while Situation 5 was to a female. Thus, in Situation 4 and 5 the respondents were dealing with their opposite or same sex.

The third kind of social factor, that is Social Status, was reflected in Situation 6,7 and 8. In Situation 6, the respondents had to confront with their teacher who had higher level of status in the society. While in Situation 7 the respondents had to refuse their classmate who was considered to be in the same level of social status, in Situation 8, the respondents had to reject the invitation of a person who came from lower level of status in the society. The last kind of social factor that was reflected in Situation 9 and 10 is Social Distance. Situation 9 was conditioned for the respondents to refuse an invitation from a person who had a very close relationship with them, while Situation 10 was to refuse an invitation from a person who had a distant relationship with the respondents.

Although there were many social factors that may influence the respondents to choose the strategies and patterns of refusals, the writer believed that these four social factors were the most dominant ones. As stated by Holmes that the solidarity-social distance scale and status scale were relevant factors in linguistic choice (1992:13). Holmes also argued that the sex and age of the speaker seem to be influential factors accounting for speech patterns.

3.2.3. Procedure

The distributions of the questionnaires were done in two ways. First, the writer herself collected the data from the Indonesian respondents and secondly,

the writer's American friend and Indonesian friends studying in the United States assisted the writer to distribute the questionnaires. The writer really needed the help of her friends to gather the data from American student respondents because of the limited time and budget of the writers to go to the United States herself as well as the lack of American citizens living in Surabaya, especially university students.

The writer distributed the questionnaires to the students of the Faculty of Letters at Petra Christian University at random. Before giving out the questionnaires to the respondents, the writer asked them if they were the students of English Department at Petra Christian University. If they were, then the writer asked their willingness to fill out the questionnaires. If they were willing to do it, the writer then explained them about the research that the writer has been working on and about how to answer the situational questions in the questionnaires. The writer has also put a clear instruction in the questionnaire to be a guide for them. Moreover, they were free to ask the writer if they did not understand the questions. After they finished filling out the questionnaires, they gave the forms back to the writer.

To gather the data from the American respondents, the writer asked for help from her American friend and her Indonesian friends studying in the United States. The writer sent the questionnaire through an attachment file along with an electronic mail explaining about how to distribute and answer the questionnaire. After they received the email, they printed it out and made some copies of the questionnaire before distributing it to the American students. Since the writer's

American friend was a part-time teacher on Linguistics at University of Georgia. she distributed the questionnaires to her students in class. While the writer's Indonesian friends gave out the questionnaire to their American friends randomly. After all the questionnaires gathered, the writer's friends sent all the questionnaires back to the writer in Indonesia via airmail. These questionnaires then were gathered with the data from the Indonesian respondents to be analyzed.

3.3. Method of Data Analysis

To analyze the data, the writer would firstly give the general idea of the findings. In this section, five most frequently used strategies of refusal by both group respondents would be shown in a table. The writer would show the frequency of the five most dominant strategies as well as the percentage of the frequency in a table. The table will be seen as follows:

STRATEGIES	AMERICANS		INDONESIANS		TOTAL	
	Σ	$\Sigma\%$	Σ	$\Sigma\%$	Σ	$\Sigma\%$

The table above will answer the first and second statement of problems. After reporting the calculation of the findings, the writer would go deeper in discussing each dominant strategy, starting from the top most frequently used strategy to the least dominant strategy, and compare the strategies used by the American respondents to those of the Indonesian respondents. In the discussion, the writer

also talked about the most frequently used strategies by each group of respondents.

After having a general view on the strategies in all given situations, the writer would analyze the initial strategies in each situation since the situations reflected the social factors. The writer believed that the social factors influenced the choice of the strategies. Therefore, she would like to go through the analysis of the influence of the social factors in the refusal strategies. Both the American data and the Indonesian data would be presented in this section.

In the part of the influence of the social factors, the order of the factors described is insignificant. The first social factor explained is Age. In this part, the writer would explain the influence of Age in the choice of the refusal strategies. Since the influence of Age is seen in the first three situations, the result of the strategies used would be put in a table as follows:

Situation	Criteria	Initial Strategies	“but”	Additional Strategies
1	Younger → Older Relatives			
2	Similar Age Non Relatives			
3	Older → Younger Relatives			

The second social factor is Sex. The writer would also give an explanation on the influence of sex in the choice of the refusal strategies. The influence of Sex is attempted to be seen in Situation 4 and 5; therefore, the refusal strategies used would be presented in a table below:

Situation	Criteria	Initial Strategies	“but”	Additional Strategies
4/5	Same Sex Female → Female Male → Male			
4/5	Different Sex Female → Male Male → Female			

Furthermore, the influence of social status can be seen by comparing the strategy used by the respondents to a higher status subject, to a same level of social status, and to a lower status subject. The table used to compare the data is seen as follows:

Situation	Criteria	Initial Strategies	“but”	Additional Strategies
6	Lower → Higher Non-Relatives			
7	Same Status Non-Relatives			
8	Higher → Lower Non-Relatives			

Lastly the comparison of the refusal strategies used to socially close addressees and to socially distant addressee would explain the influence of the social distance in the choice made by the respondents. The table would appear like this:

Situation	Criteria	Initial Strategies	“but”	Additional Strategies
9	Socially close Non-Relatives			
10	Socially distant Non-Relatives			

After comparing all the strategies, the writer would then give a conclusion on the general finding as well as on the influence of the social factor in the choice of the refusal strategies.