POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POLITENESS IN REFUSALS
IN THREE AMERICAN DRAMA MOVIES

Arie Charismawati

INTISARI

Skripsi ini meneliti kesopanan positif dan negatif dalam penolakan pada tiga film drama Amerika. Secara khusus, penelitian ini bertujuan mengidentifikasi dan mengklasifikasi strategi kesopanan positif dan strategi kesopanan negatif yang digunakan dalam mengekspresikan penolakan di dalam film. Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah dialog yang mengandung penolakan yang mengekspresikan penggunaan strategi kesopanan positif dan negatif yang diutarakan oleh *Brown and Levinson* (1987). Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukan bahwa terdapat 73 ucapan yang mengandung penolakan, 31 ungkapan (42.5%) ditemukan di film *Legally Blonde*, 22 ungkapan (30.1%) di film *Yes Man* dan 20 ungkapan (27.4%) di film *He's Not That Just into You*. Dari 73 ungkapan penolakan yang ditemukan, 32 (43.8%) penolakan diekspresikan menggunakan strategi kesopanan positf, sementara itu sisanya sebanyak 41 (56.2%) penolakan diekspresikan menggunakan strategi kesopanan negatif. Di dalam penelitian ini ditemukan bahwa strategi kesopanan positif strategi #13 yaitu *give (or ask for) reason* dianggap sebagai strategi yang paling umum digunakan oleh penutur di dalam film. Strategi ini digunakan sebanyak 7 kali (21.8%). Sementara itu di dalam strategi kesopanan negatif, strategi #1 *be conventionally indirect* muncul sebagai strategi yang paling sering digunakan dalam memberikan penolakan dalam film. Strategi ini digunakan sebanyak 18 kali (43.9%).

Kata kunci   : penolakan, kesopanan, kesopanan positif dan negatif.

ABSTRACT

This research paper attempts to investigate positive and negative politeness of refusal in three American drama movies. In particular, it attempts to identify and classify the positive and negative politeness strategies used to express refusal in the movies. The data used in this research were dialogues containing refusal expressed by the use of positive and negative politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Based on the data analysis, 73 refusal utterances were found: 31 utterances (42.5%) were found in *Legally Blonde*, 22 utterances (30.1%) in *Yes Man*, and 20 utterances (27.4%) in *He's Not That Just into You.* From 73 refusals found, out of 32 (43.8%) were expressed using positive politeness strategy, and remaining 41 (56.2%) refusals were expressed using negative politeness strategy. It was found in this research that positive politeness strategy 13 *give (or ask for) reason* is considered as the most commonly used positive politeness strategy in the movies. This strategy was used 7 times (21.8%). Meanwhile, in negative politeness strategy, strategy 1 *be conventionally indirect* appears as the most frequently strategy used in giving refusal in the movies. This strategy was used 18 times (43.9%).

Key words : refusal, politeness, positive and negative politeness

INTRODUCTION

Communication is highly necessary in society, as it is only through the exchange of ideas and co-operation that a society can grow and develop. As stated by Gartside (1986: 1), in sharing ideas and feelings, communication has an important role, particularly for a mutual understanding since it is considered as the art to share anything. Thus, in order to make a successful communication, an understanding between the speaker and the hearer is needed. Refusals are one of speech acts that frequently encountered in communication. A refusal is a complex speech act that requires not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements but also "face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act" (Gas and Houck, 1999: 2). A refusal expression can be used when the speaker is unable to fulfill the interlocutors' request, suggestion, invitation or offer. In uttering a refusal, the speaker should understand that his/her utterance potentially threatens the hearer's face. There are a number of ways of expressing refusals. First, a refusal can be expressed directly without any attempt to reduce the threat. Second, there is also a refusal expressed directly with an attempt to save the hearer's positive face. Positive face is the need to be appreciated and accepted, to be treated as the member of the same group, and to know that his/her wants are shared by others (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). Third, there is also a refusal expressed directly with an attempt to save the hearer's negative face. Negative face is basic claim to territories, freedom of action and freedom imposition – wanting the actions not to be constrained or inhibited by others (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). Finally, a refusal can be expressed indirectly. The speaker uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing.

It is interesting to investigate how people refuse and what strategy they use to mitigate their refusal. This paper attempts to address the question what positive and negative politeness strategies are used by the characters in three American drama movies entitled *Yes Man*, *He's Not That Just into You* and *Legally Blonde* to express refusals. In particular, it attempts to identify and classify the positive and negative politeness strategies used to express refusals in the movies.

The data for this research were collected from the English subtitles of three American Drama movies *Yes Man* (YM) which was published in 2008 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/yes-man/eng-lish/528857), *He's Just Not That into You* (HJNTY) which was published in 2009 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/hes-just-not-that-into-you/english/749116) and *Legally Blonde* (LB) which was published in 2001 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/legally-blonde/english/891854); all of the subtitles were published by Subscene and accessed in 28 July 2013. To find the most accurate possible subtitles, the dialogues had to listen carefully. As stated before, the data were dialogues containing refusals expressing positive and negative politeness strategies. Every refusal expressions that convey negative and positive politeness were noted. Each was provided with the context of the dialogue. After all the data were collected, the data were classified according to the politeness strategies used by the characters in their refusal utterances using the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

Context

In addition to studying the speaker's meaning, according to Yule (1996: 3), "pragmatics involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said." Therefore, context plays an important role in pragmatics. Leech (1983: 13) says that context is a relevant aspect of the physical or social setting of an utterance. When a conversation takes place, the

speaker and the hearer must share the same understanding of what is being talked about.

Mey (1994:38) argues that context is understood as the surrounding, in the widest sense, that enables the speaker and hearer to interact in the communication process. Furthermore, Cutting (2002) classifies context into three types: situational context, background knowledge context, and co-textual context. Situational context refers to what speaker knows about what they can see around them. It is the situation where the conversation is going on. Background knowledge context refers to everything that the speaker and hearer know about each other. This can be cultural general knowledge about the speaker and hearer. Co-textual context refers to what the speaker and hearer know about what they have been saying. This deals with grammatical and lexical structures. Knowing the context will help to understand what is being refused, the meaning, and the possible reasons for the refusal.

Speech Acts

Austin (1962: 12) defines speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. He notices the fact that when a speaker says something, he is doing something. In every utterance, the speaker performs an act such as stating a fact or an opinion, confirming or denying something, giving advice, asking a question, thanking, greeting and so on.

Moreover, Austin (1962) indentifies three distinct levels of speech act: locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act is the act of saying something, i.e., the basic act of utterance or production of a meaningful linguistic expression. Illocutionary act is the act of doing something; what the speakers are doing with their words or the specific purpose the speakers have in mind. Perlocutionary act is the act performed by means of language, using language as a tool,

what is done by uttering the words. The effect on the hearer, or the hearer's reaction, is called perlocutionary effect. For example, *"Would you close the door, please?"* The surface form, and also the locutionary act of this utterance is a question. Meanwhile, the illocutionary act conveys a request on the part of the speaker and the perlocutionary act expresses the speaker's desire that the hearer should go and close the door.

According to Austin (1962), for speech acts to be appropriately and successfully performed, they have to meet some contextual conditions, generally known as felicity conditions. Moreover, Searle (1969) classifies felicity conditions into four types: propositional condition, prepatory condition, sincerity condition and essential condition. Propositional condition is any speech act has to have propositional content i.e., be expressed in a form conventionally associated with the speech act. For example, for a request, the content of the utterance must be about a future event and this future event will be a future act of the hearer. Prepatory condition is a condition that must exist for an act to be successfully carried out. For example, to felicitously perform a request, a speaker must believe that the hearer has the ability to perform the requested act and that the hearer would not perform the act unless requested to do so. Sincerity condition is a condition that requires the persons performing the act to have appropriate beliefs or feelings about what she or he is saying. If this condition is not met, the act is actually performed, but there is said to be an abuse. For example, for a request, a speaker must sincerely want the hearer to perform the act. Essential condition defines the act being carried out. If it is not met, the act has not really been carried out. For example, when making a request, the speaker must intend that the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do what is requested.

Furthermore, Searle (1976) divides speech act into five types according to their illocutionary force. They are representatives, directives, commisives, expressives and declarations.

1. Representatives: acts representing a state of affairs; acts reporting statements of fact certifiable as true or false. Claims, descriptions, suggestions, statement belong to this category. For example, the utterance *"I think you'd be better go with Sandy"* can function as a suggestion.

2. Commisives: acts committing the speaker to a future course of action. Promises, refusals, offers, vows belong to this catagory. For example, the utterance *"I'll love you dear. I'll love you"* can function as a promise.

3. Expressives: acts indicating or expressing the speakers' feeling or attitude. Greetings, apologies, thanks giving belong to this category. For instance, the utterance *"I'm sorry I can't join the party last night"* can function as an apology.

4. Directives: acts intended to get the hearer to do something. Commands, requests, invitations belong to this category. For example, the utterance *"Jane, could you come to my house tonight?"* can function as a request.

5. Declarations: acts bringing about a change in the state of affairs. Blessing, baptism, arrest, marrying belong to this category. For example, the utterance *"I baptize this boy John Smith."* can function as baptism.

According to their directness, speech acts can be divided into two types direct and indirect speech acts. Direct speech acts are acts whose functions are directly related to their forms, i.e., their clause or sentence types, declaratives functioning as statement, interrogatives as question and imperatives as orders or requests. On the contrary, when forms and function do not match they are called indirect speech acts. An indirect speech act does not communicate the litteral meaning of the utterance: the message, the speaker wants to convey it implied.

Refusal

Refusals have been defined as the "illocutionary denegation of an acceptance" (Vanderveken 1990: 195). A refusal is a complex speech act that requires not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements but also "face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the noncompliant nature of the act" (Gas & Houck 1999: 2). According to Searle (1976), refusals belong to the category of commisives. A refusal can be classified into direct and indirect refusals. A direct refusal is often a straight answer to refuse and often realized by means of a flat word *'no'*. On the contrary, an indirect refusal is an indirect way to refuse. The hearer does not directly refuse what the speaker wants but he uses a different way which is not directly related to the actual word the speaker utters. An indirect refusal often uses modifications to refuse through a combination of speech acts in one utterance, for example, gratitude, offer, apology, and suggestion.

Politeness

According to Hill et.al. (in Sifianou, 1992: 82), " politeness is one of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport". Meanwhile, according to Yule (1996), politeness depends on the concept of "face". Yule also states that face means the way a person is socially considered in terms of his/her self-image towards the other. So, in an interaction, politeness can be defined "as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face" (Yule 1996:59)

Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguish two aspects of face: negative face and positive face. Negative face is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves and rights to non distraction, i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 61). Positive face is the positive self image or personality. This includes the desire that this self image be appreciated and approved, to be treated as the member of the same group, and to know that his or her wants are shared by others. Politeness has a strong connection with the face management. Brown and Levinson (1987: 65) state that speech acts can damage or threaten another person face. These acts are known as face threatening acts (FTA). Some action might be interpreted as a threat to a person's face. Therefore, the speaker can say something to minimize the threat. This is called a face saving act; a face saving act that is concerned with the person's negative face will tend to show deference. This is called negative politeness. The opposite is positive politeness, a face saving act which is concerned with the person's positive face which tends to show solidarity.

Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) identify four main types of politeness strategies: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record (indirect).

Bald on record, positive and negative politeness are similar roof in that they belong to on record strategies. Bald on record strategy usually do not attempt to minimize the threat (imposition) to the hearer's face, although there are ways that bald on-record politeness can be used in trying to minimize FTAs implicitly. The use of this strategy might shock or embarrass the addressee. This strategy is most often utilized in urgency/efficiency or in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the addressee, such as family or close friend. Moreover, this strategy will be employed when there is an obvious power differential between the participant, where the speaker occupies higher position than the hearer.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 101) state that positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of the hearer, the positive self-image that he claims for himself. Positive politeness is used to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interest or possessions, and is most commonly used in situations where the audiences know each other fairly well. Brown and Levinson classify positive politeness into 3 sub strategies. The explanation of three sub strategies will be shown below.

1. Claim common ground

The way to investigate that the speaker is claiming the common ground is by indicating that the speaker and the hearer have and share a specifics wants including goal and value. Brown and Levinson (1987: 103) distinguish three ways to a claim. First, the speaker conveys that some of the hearer's wants is interesting to the speaker too. The second way is the speaker can stress common membership or group, so that it shows that both the speaker and hearer is a set of person that shares the same wants. Lastly, the speaker can claim common perspective with the hearer without necessarily referring to one in group identity. This sub-strategy gives the output of politeness strategies strategy #1 *notice/attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods),* strategy #2 *exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H),* strategy #3 *intensify interest to H,* strategy #4 *use in-group identity markers,* strategy #5 *seek agreement,* strategy #6 *avoid disagreement,* strategy #7

presuppose/raise/assert common ground, and strategy #8 *joke*.

2. Convey that S and H are cooperators

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 125), one way to convey that the speaker and the hearer are cooperate is by sharing their same goals in some domain. Moreover, the cooperation among the speaker and the hearer can be stressed by the speaker when he/she indicating his/her knowledge and gives sensitivity toward the hearers wants. Thus, this sub-strategy gives output of politeness strategies strategy #9 to strategy #14, those are, strategy #9 *assert presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's*, strategy #10 *offer, promise*, strategy #11 *be pessimistic*, strategy #12 *include both S and H in the activity*, strategy #13 *give (or ask for) reasons*, and strategy #14 *assume or assert reciprocity*.

3. Fulfill H's wants for some X

The last sub-strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson is fulfill *H's wants for some X.* Brown and Levinson (1987: 129) states " S deciding to redress H's face directly by fulfilling some of H's wants". This sub-strategy gives only one output of positive politeness strategies, that is, strategy 15 *give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation).*

On the other hand, negative politeness is oriented toward the negative face of the hearer. A face saving act is oriented to the hearer's negative politeness which tends to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time or concern and even include an apology for the imposition or interruption. This strategy presumes that the speaker will try to minimize the imposition and there is a lower potential for embarrassment than that in bald-on record strategies and positive politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson

outlined negative politeness into five sub-strategies that will be explained below.

1. Be direct

The first sub-strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is *be direct.* One way to build on record message is by convey it directly. This sub-strategy is aimed to minimize the imposition toward the hearer by saying straight to the point.

2. Don't presume/assume

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 144), one way to keep the distance between the speaker and hearer is by carefully avoiding presumptions and assumption toward the hearer's wants or that anything involved in the FTA is desired and believed by the hearer. This sub-strategy gives one output strategy, that is, strategy #2 *question, hedge*.

3. Don't coerce H

This strategy applied by the speaker in order to redressing the hearer's negative face. When conveys this sub-strategy, the speaker avoids coercing the hearer response and this is may be done by giving the hearer the option not to do the action. This sub-strategy gives fives outputs of negative politeness strategies; those are strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect,* strategy #2 *question, hedge*, strategy #3 *be pessimistic,* strategy #4 *minimize the imposition* and strategy #5 *give deference.*

4. Communicate S's wants to not impinge on H

This sub-strategy explains that the way to satisfy the hearer's negative face is by indicating that the speaker is aware and taking them into account in the hearer's decision in order to communicate the FTA. This sub-strategy gives output of negative politeness strategies number 6 to strategy number 9, those are, strategy #6 *apologize*, strategy #7 *impersonalize* S and H, strategy

#8 *state the FTA as a general rule,* and strategy #9 *nominalize.*

5. Redress other wants of H's

The last sub-strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson is redress other wants of H's. This sub-strategy explains the way to offer partial compensation for the face threat in the FTA by redressing some particular of the hearer's wants, including focus on narrow band of the hearer wants, a very narrow facet of his person. This sub-strategy gives output of negative politeness strategy #5 *give deference* and strategy #10 *go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.*

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the off record (indirect) strategy. This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing.

RESULTS

Table 1. The Frequency and Distribution of Refusals Expressing Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies in the Movies

Strategy	Yes Man		He's Not That Just into You		Legally Blonde		Total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Positive Politeness	8	25.8	9	29.0	15	48.3	32	43.8
Negative Politenes	14	33.3	11	26.2	16	51.7	41	56.2
	22		20		31		73	100

As shown in the table above, out of the 73 refusal utterances, 31 (42.5%) were found in *Legally Blonde*, 22 (30.1%) in *Yes Man*, and 20 (27.4%) in *He's Not that Just into You*. It can be seen that the difference of positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies is 7.9%. There is no significant difference between the use of positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies in three American drama movies.

Positive Politeness Strategies

From 73 refusals that were found, 32 were expressed using positive politeness strategies. As shown in Table 2 below, the most common strategy used in giving a refusal is strategy #13 *give (or ask for) reason*. In giving refusals, strategy #13 *give (or ask for)* reasons come out as the commonly used strategy in giving refusals. The higher number of the use of this strategy may be due to the relationship between the speaker and hearer that is close enough. This result also shows that in giving refusals, the speaker tends to explain the reason why he/she cannot fulfill the act proposed by the speaker. By explain his/her reasons, the speaker wants to assume his/her cooperation with the hearer so that he/she can save the hearer's positive face.

Table 2. The Frequency and Distribution of Refusals Expressing Positive Politeness Strategies in the Movies.

No	Strategies	No.	%
1	Notice/attend to H (his interest, wants, needs, goods)	2	6.3
2	Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)	0	0.0
3	Intensify interest to H	1	3.1
4	Use in-group identity markers	3	9.4
5	Seek agreement	1	3.1
6	Avoid disagreement	4	12.5
7	Presuppose/raise/assert common ground	0	0.0
8	Joke	0	0.0
9	Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	5	15.6
10	Offer, promise	3	9.4
11	Be optimistic	3	9.4
12	Include both S and H in the activity	0	0.0
13	Give (or ask for) reasons	7	21.8
14	Assume or assert reciprocity	0	0.0
15	Give gifts or sympathy to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	3	9.4
	Total	**32**	**100.0**

Give (or ask for) reasons

Of the 32 positive politeness refusals found in the movies, 7 refusals are expressed through the use of strategy *give (or ask for) reasons*. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this strategy draws another aspect of including the hearer into one activity that is for the speaker to give a reason to the hearer as to why he/she wants what he/she wants. By including the hearer into the practical reasoning, "H is thereby led to see the reasonableness of S's FTA (or so S hopes)" (Brown and Levinson 1987:128). The examples discussed below represent the use of the *give (or ask for) reason* strategy in giving refusals.

(39)   01:10:07 – 01:10:11 (HY. PP#13.02)

Alex and Gigi were on the phone. Alex invites Gigi to come to his party, but Gigi refuses it because she does not want to meet Connor. Gigi's relationship with Connor is not really good since Gigi thought Connor likes her but the fact is not.

Alex   : Right. Listen, I was just gonna leave a message. I'm having a party next weekend. You should come.

Gigi   : **Oh, I don't know. Won't Connor be there? Might be kind of awkward.**

(40)   01:13:01–01:13:08 (YM. PP#13.03)

Mary, Joshua, Bruce and Nathan were checking Jude's profile account in MySpace. Jude is a man that Mary knows and dates via MySpace. Mary tells her friends that that day Jude does not call her, then her friends suggests that she open her mailbox in order to check whether Jude leaves any message or not.

Mary   : I mean, we actually video iChatted while holding coffee. But, that's the same thing, right?

Nathan : Right. Right. Just call your voice mail.

Mary   : **Yeah, but he had a gig last night and he probably didn't get home till night.**

The two dialogues above illustrate the use of the *give (or ask for) reasons* strategy to express a refusal. In example (39), Gigi responds to Alex's invitation to come to his party by saying *Oh, I don't know. Won't Connor be there ? Might be kind of awkward.* It shows her reason why she will not attend the party. She does not want to meet Conor since she has bad memories with him. In example (40), the use of the sentence *Yeah, but he had a gig last night and he probably didn't get home till night* shows Mary's refusal to Nathan's suggestion. It shows that she employs *give (or ask for) reason* in giving refusal. She gives the reason why her boy friend does not call her. It might be because he is still asleep and forgot to call her. By using this strategy, although both Gigi and Mary refuse the hearers they to want assume cooperation among the speakers and the hearers so that they can save the hearers' positive faces.

Negative Politeness

Table 3. The Frequency and Distribution of Refusals Expressing Negative Politeness Strategies in the Movies

No	Strategies	No.	%
1	Be conventionally indirect	18	43.9
2	Question, hedge	6	14.6
3	Be pessimistic	12	29.3
4	Minimize the imposition	0	0.0
5	Give deference	0	0.0
6	Apologize	5	12.2
7	Impersonalize S and H	0	0.0
8	State the FTA as a general rule	0	0.0
9	Nominalize	0	0.0
10	Go on record as incurruing a debt, or as not indebting H	0	0.0
	TOTAL	41	100.0

The table above indicates that the most common strategy used in giving refusals is strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect*. This strategy was used 18 times (43.9%) throughout the movies. The higher number of the use of negative politeness strategies strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect* may be due to the fact that the distance of the characters in the movies are relative close enough and they are mostly in the same level or power.

Be conventionally indirect

Of the 41 negative politeness refusals found in the movies, 18 refusals are expressed through the use of strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect*. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 132), in this strategy the speaker expresses her/his wants indirectly in order to avoid the force to get the hearer to do something. Two examples of the use of this *be conventionally indirect* strategy are presented below.

(42)   00:37:29 – 00:37:31(LB. NP#01.17)

This dialogue happens in Harvard University class. That day, every student has to make a group in order to do an assignment. Elle who does not have a group asks Warner to joins in his group. But Vivian, Warner's group member, refuses it. Looking Vivian refuses Elle to joins with their group, Warner asks Vivian to gives a chance for Elle to joins with their group, but Vivian still refuses it.

Warner: Come on ~ we can make room for one more.

Vivian :**We've already assigned the outlines.**

(43)   00:13:49 – 00:13:54 (LB. NP#01.15)

In order to move to Harvard, Elle requests for suggestion from her advisor in her school. She tells her advisor the reason why she wants to move to Harvard. Elle feels so confident when she tells her advisor but her advisor's answer is not what she expects. Her advisor does not believe that Elle wants to move to top three universities.

Advisor: Harvard Law School?

Elle: That's right.

Advisor: **But it's a top three school**

The two dialogues above illustrate the use of strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect* to express refusals. In example (42), Vivian's response *we've already assigned the outlines* to Warner's request shows that she is employing strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect* in giving refusal to Warner's request. Vivian refuses Warner's request by saying that their group already assigned the outlines. Vivian does not say a direct refusal such as *we cannot accept you* because it will be impolite and too direct.

In example (43), the use of the sentence *but it's a top three school* shows

Elle advisor's refusal to her request. Her advisor doubts Elle's capability since she does not have any background study about law to get into Harvard. By saying so, Vivian in example (42) and Elle's advisor in example (43) want to communicate his/her intention indirectly in order to avoid the force that the hearers might get.

CONCLUSION

This research investigates the speech act of refusal expressed using positive and negative politeness in three American drama movies entitled *Yes Man, He's Not That Just into You* and *Legally Blonde.* Utterances that contain refusal expressions were classified and analyzed using negative and positive politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson theory (1987).

From the discussion in the previous chapter, out of the 73 refusal utterances, 31 (42.5%) were found in *Legally Blonde*, 22 (30.1%) in *Yes Man*, and 20 (27.4%) in *He's Not That Just into You.* Although the three movies that used in this research come from the same genre, they have differences of occurrence in each of them. *Legally Blonde* ranks the highest with an average refusal occurrence of 3.2 per 10 minutes. The second highest is *Yes Man*. This movie has an average occurrence of 2.1 per 10 minutes. The last ranking is *He's Not That Just into You* which has an average 1.5 refusals per 10 minutes.

The results also show that, from 73 refusals 32 (43.8%) were expressed using positive politeness strategy and remaining 41 (56.2%) were expressed using negative politeness strategy. Based on the findings, the most frequently used positive politeness strategy is strategy #13, *give (or ask for) reasons* which were used 7 times (21.8%). These results show that in giving refusals, the speaker tends to explain their reasons why they cannot fulfill the act proposed by the speaker in order to lessen the threat to the speaker's faces. As for, in the negative politeness strategy the most common strategy used in giving refusals is strategy#1

be conventionally indirect. This strategy was used 18 times (43.9%). the higher number of the use of negative politeness strategies strategy #1 *be conventionally indirect* may be due to the fact that the distance of the characters in the movies are close enough and they are mostly in the same level or power. In giving refusals, the speaker may threaten the hearer's face, so the speaker chooses this way to minimize the threat.

This research only focuses on the identification and classification of refusals expressed using positive and negative politeness strategies. It is admitted that the significance of this research is limited only to the three American drama movies entitled *Yes Man, He's Not That Just into You* and *Legally Blonde*. But there is possibility that the result of this research can be applied to other movies. However, the further research is needed to confirm or refute this finding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, John. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.

Cintas, Jorge Diaz et.al. 2007. *Media For All: Subtitling for the Deaf, Audio Description, and Sign Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gartside, L. 1986. *Modern Business Correspondent*. Jakarta: Bimaputra Aksara.

Gass, Susan, & Noel Houck. 1999. *Interlanguage Refusals: A Cross-Cultural Study of Japanese-English*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Liu, Si. 2004. *Pragmatic Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement: Chinese Culture in Higher Education.* Florida: Universal Publisher

Mey, Jacob. L. 1994. *Pragmatics:An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nadar, FX. 2000. *Pragmatic Study on Refusals in English by Indonesian-Javanese Learners*. Gadjah Mada University. Unpublished Research Report.

_____. 2009. *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Nadar, FX et.al. 2005. "Penolakan dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia". *Humaniora 17* pp. 166-178.

Rahmatika. 2013. *Refusals as Used in Drama Movies in English.* Universitas Gadjah Mada. Unpublished Graduating Paper.

Rizqiyah. Thaliatur. 2008. *Strategies of Refusal to Requests by Englsih Department Students of State University of Malang.* Universitas Negeri MalangUnpublished Graduating Paper.

Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1976. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts, Language in Society* 5 pp. 1–24.

Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece : A Cross Cultural Perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Subscene. 2013. *He's Not That Just into You*: New Line Cinema. Accessed on July 28 2013 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/hes-just-not-that-into you/english/749116).

_____. 2013. *Legally Blonde*: Metro Goldwyn Mayer. Accessed on July 28 2013 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/legally-blonde/english/891854)

_____. 2013. *Yes Man*: Warner Bross Picture. Accessed on July 28 2013 (http://subscene.com/subtitles/yes-man/english/528857).

Vanderveken, Daniel. 1990. *Meaning and Speech Act. Vol.1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2001. *Essays in Speech Act Theory.* Edited by Susumu Kubo. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press