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The purpose of the study is to investigate the content and ordering of semantic formulas in refusals made by English major students of UBRU. The researcher examines what the students would do when refusing a request, an offer, a suggestion, and an invitation in different situations as compared with that of native speakers of American English. The study examined 15 Americans and 15 Thai students by using the open-ended of Discourse Completion Test questionnaire. Data analysis that is used in this study is Mode.

The results of this study indicated that the order and contents of refusal formats between American native speakers and UBRU students, on the basis of Mode statistic, are quite different. Thai students tend to be affected by L1 transfer.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the rationale of the study, the research question, the purpose, and the significance of the study. It also provides definitions of key terms.

1.1 Rationale

Most communication between Asians and Westerners takes place in English but it does not mean that using English in communication by both parties will lead to the same understanding or the same feeling. In situations where people come from different cultural backgrounds, the assumptions about the needs of others may differ from individual to individual, and the potential for misunderstanding increases greatly.

According to the current educational curriculum, Thai students are given compulsory 12 years of English Language instruction. It is expected that this curriculum helps students to communicate well in the target language.

The opportunity to join English teaching courses as a co-teacher for the third year students of Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University inspired the researcher to do this study. The researcher noticed that most English major student’s English communication was quite poor. It was frequently found that the way they spoke did not match the norm of the native speakers. Most of them answered a request with only “yes” or “no”.

The researcher would like to find out what caused students to give such short single word answers. The focus question is whether their L1 influences the answers. To shed further insight on these issues, the researcher felt compelled to undertake a comparative study of English refusals made by native speakers of American English and by English major students at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University (UBRU).
1.2 Research question

Are refusals made by UBRU students and those by native speakers of American English different in terms of the order and content of their semantic formulas?

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the content and ordering of semantic formulas in refusals made by UBRU students majoring in English. The researcher would like to examine what the students would do when refusing a request, an offer, a suggestion and an invitation in different situations as compared with native speakers of American English.

1.4 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that the English major students at UBRU make different refusals from the native speakers of American English in terms of the order and content of the semantic formulas and the differences are due to L1 transfer.

1.5 Scope of the study

The study focuses on the comparison of the order and content of semantic formula in refusals made by UBRU students majoring in English with those made by native speakers of American English. It covered four different stimulus types; refusing a request, an offer, a suggestion and an invitation of interlocutors of different social status.

1.6 Significance of the study

It is very important to examine the problems students have in making refusals in English. Such examination may lead to more effective classroom teaching because if problems are found, the study will accentuate the need to focus on teaching cultural norms of native speakers when teaching students how to make appropriate refusals in L2. This would allow the students to communicate more effectively.
1.7 Definitions of key terms

DCT : the Discourse Completion Test, which is a written role-play questionnaire consisting of 12 situations. Each situation contains a blank for open-ended refusal answer to be written

Semantic formula : the language used in refusals and justification for refusals

Order of refusals : the order of various semantic formulas that make up refusals; i.e., what comes first, next, or last
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses previous studies of semantic formulas of Thai and English refusals, the order of refusals of Thai and English formulas, what affects formulas and order of refusals, and pragmatic transfer.

2.1 Semantic formulas of Thai and English refusals

Different studies have been conducted on refusals in English. The results generally show that in making refusals, native speakers of American English use excuses, suggestion alternatives, pause fillers, statement of gratitude, and appreciation (Leslie M. Beebe et al., 1985; Sadler & Eroz, 2001). They also use reasons, expressions of regret and apology (Kitao, 1996).

As for the semantic formulas of Thai students, it has been found that they use indirect answers (Sairhun, 1999) when they refuse requests and offers. Refusal formulas of Thai students also include using intensifiers in apologies, hedging, using the pattern “yes, but.....” in expressing positive remarks, giving reasons based on family and personal matters, and using intensifiers in thanks.

2.2 The order of refusals of Thai and English formulas

The order of refusal produced by native speakers of American English is commonly a positive opinion first, an apology second, and an excuse third with unequal status conversants. For the equal status, the native speakers of American English tend to use only apology and excuse (Leslie M. Beebe et al, 1985, p. 58-59). However, a statement of regret may precede or follow the reasons or excuses (Beebe et al., 1990 and Sadler R. W. & Eroz, B., 2001).

As for the order of refusal formats produced by Thai learners, to the researcher’s knowledge, there is no study which has investigated this. Therefore, the orders of Thai refusal formats are still unknown.
2.3 What affects semantic formulas and order of refusals

There are many factors that may affect formulas and order of refusals. These may include the social status of the interlocutors (role relationships), situations, and topics.

Hierarchical social structure is important for an individual to realize her place in the social structure and behave accordingly (Brown and Levinson 1978; 1987).

Thai people, for example, tend to give reasons and employ such strategies as hedging, apologizing and expressing positive remarks when the interlocutors are higher in social status (Sairhun, 1999).

2.4 Pragmatic transfer

L1 transfer plays a significant role in L2 learning. Students tend to rely on the first language in every linguistic level, including pragmatics (the use of language in contexts). Many researchers have found the influence of L1 pragmatics on L2 production. (Leslie M. Beebe et al. 1985. p. 56), for instance, claim that pragmatic transfer exists in the order, frequency, and content of semantic formulas of Japanese ESL learners’ refusal.

Sairhun (1999) also has claimed that Thai learners of English performed the speech act of refusing in English in a similar manner as when they performed the same speech act in their native tongue. Similarly, Ikoma, T., & Shimura, A. (1993) found that negative transfer occurred among advanced-level American learners of Japanese (fourth-year students of the university of Hawaii). Moreover, Al-Issa (2003) also found that socio-cultural transfer appeared to influence the Jordanian EFL learners’ selection of semantic formulas, the length of their responses, and the content of the semantic formulas.

As we can see, to make refusals in L2 is complex. It involves semantic formulas, order of formulas, social factors, and pragmatic transfer. All of these aspects are very interesting to examine and they are the key question for this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology which includes the subjects, the instruments, and procedures employed in the study as well as data analysis.

3.1 Subjects

The subjects of this study were divided into 2 groups: 15 native speakers of Thai and 15 native speakers of American English. The 15 Thai subjects were selected from the six classes of the third year students majoring in English in the regular program and the opportunity expansion program at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University. They were chosen on the assumption that they had good command of English; They got grade A from the course of “Listening and Speaking 3” which they completed in the previous semester.

The 15 American English native speakers were teachers in Ubon Ratchathani educational institutes, including UBRU and in other neighboring provincial universities. All of them have worked in Thailand for 3-6 years.

3.2 Instruments

The instrument used for the study was the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) which was a written role-play questionnaire consisting of 12 situations adapted from Leslie M. Beebe, Tomoko Takahashi, and Robin Uliss-Weltz (1985). The names of the places in the questionnaire were changed to make them more familiar to the Thai students. The Thai subjects also answered the questionnaire in Thai of which the data was used for comparative purpose (See appendix B).

The 12 DCT situations in which the subjects had to make refusals to interlocutors of different social status were four stimulus types: three requests, three invitations, three suggestions, and three offers. The subjects were required to make English refusal in writing in 12 situations as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers' Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>refusing a worker's request for a raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>refusing a friend's request to borrow lecture notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>refusing a boss' request to spend an extra hour to finish up work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>refusing a salesman's invitation to a restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>refusing a friend's invitation to join a dinner party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>refusing a boss' invitation to a party at his house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>refusing a student's suggestion to give them more practice in conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>refusing a friend's suggestion to try a new diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>refusing a boss' suggestion to clear the desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>refusing a cleaning lady's offer to pay for a broken vase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>refusing a friend's offer to have a piece of cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>refusing a boss' raise and offering promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire was piloted before presented to the subjects. (See appendix A)
3.3 Procedure

The research procedure was as follows.

The Thai subjects were allowed an hour to finish the DCT. Each student was required to write his or her refusals in response to a person with higher status, equal status, and lower status interlocutor in each situation in the questionnaire. Three weeks later, the same subjects took the same test written in Thai.

The native speakers of American English were asked to give refusal responses to the same questionnaire.

3.4 Data Analysis

The Thai and English responses of the Thai students were also compared in order to find out differences or similarities by using mode. Both the first and second groups’ answers were compared in terms of the content and order of refusal formats.

The content of semantic formulas and the order of the refusals by native speakers of American English and those by the Thai students were statistically compared by using mode. For the part of DCT, grammatical accuracy was not examined; the focus of the study was on the order and content of the semantic formulas the UBRU students used in making refusals.

The criteria used in analyzing the data were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Nothing in common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>1 slot in common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>2 slots in common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
<td>3 slots in common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are 4 sections in this chapter. The first section (4.1) presents the comparison between the order and content of semantic formulas in refusals in Thai and English made by the Thai students. The second section (4.2) presents the comparison between the order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English as the norm. The third section (4.3) is the discussion, and the last section (4.4) is pedagogical implications.

4.1 Thai students’ refusals in English and Thai

The 4 tables below show comparison of the order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students in Thai and English. The results are based on the criteria of order and content of semantic formula in refusal provided in Table 2 of Chapter 3.

Table 3 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formula of refusals between Thai and English made by the Thai Students regarding request.

Table 3 Thai students’ refusals to request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology Direct “no” Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Excuse Direct “no” Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Excuse Promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows both English and Thai versions of request refusals made by the Thai students are very similar in terms of both order and content when the refuser is in higher or lower status. But for equal status, the order is quite different while the content is very similar. L1 transfer seems to play a major role here.

Table 4 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formula of refusals between Thai and English made by the Thai students regarding invitation.

**Table 4** Thai students’ refusals to invitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology Excuse -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Apology Excuse Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology Excuse -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that both English and Thai versions are very similar in terms of both order and content. For higher status refusers, both order and content are exactly the same. L1 transfer is prominent here too.
Table 5 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formula of refusals between Thai and English made by the Thai students regarding suggestion.

**Table 5  Thai students’ refusals to suggestion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Positive Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the previous two stimulus types, the results show that the order and content of semantic formula of both English and Thai versions are exactly the same when the refuser is in higher social status. For equal status refusers, they produced very similar order and content of semantic formula of Direct “no”, and Excuse, respectively. But for lower status refusers, they produced quite differently. There is only Excuse in the second order, which is the same as higher and equal status.

When we examine the results from this table holistically based on order and content of semantic formula, L1 transfer still occurs, as in the 2 previous tables.
Table 6 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formula of refusals between Thai and English versions made by the Thai students regarding offer.

Table 6  Thai students’ refusals to offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Excuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike other stimulus types, the results show quite different order and content of semantic formula of refusals. However, some similarities are found. For instance, the first order of higher status refuser, Empathy is produced, and the second order of lower status refuser, Excuse is produced in both Thai and English versions. These show that L1 transfer may still occur.

To holistically summarize all the previous 4 tables of the chapter, it can be claimed that the Thai students are influenced by L1 transfer in terms of both content and order when they refuse in English.
Table 7 below shows the summary results of order and content of semantic formula of refusals between Thai and English versions made by the Thai students.

**Table 7** Summarizing table of Thai students’ refusals in English and Thai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Types</th>
<th>Refusers’ status</th>
<th>Order of refusal format</th>
<th>Content of refusal format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Request</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invitation</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suggestion</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offer</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Thai versus English refusals

The 4 tables below show the comparison of order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English. The results are based on the criteria of order and content of semantic formula in refusal provided in Table 2 of chapter 3.
Table 8 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English to request.

**Table 8 Native speakers of American English and Thais' request refusals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Positive Excuse Direct “no” Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Opinion Apology Empathy Excuse Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Empathy Excuse Direct “no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology Excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Apology Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the order and contents of semantic formula in refusal between the two groups of the refusers show both similarities and differences. However, there are more differences than similarities.

For higher status refusers, the orders of refusal made by both groups are different. Excuse is produced in both groups of the refusers, but in different orders.

For equal status refusers, the orders and content of semantic formula of refusal made by both groups is quite different, except the second order of Excuse that is produced in both groups of the refusers.

For lower status refusers, the first and the second order and content of semantic formula of refusal is very similar. Apology and Excuse are produced, respectively.

Another interesting point is that most of the native speakers produced only two contents of refusals, while the Thai students produced three.
Table 9 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formula in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English.

**Table 9** Native speakers of American English and Thais’ invitation refusals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look at the table above, the productions of native speakers of American English and the Thai students in terms of the order and contents of semantic formula in refusal are very similar in both order and content of all the statuses.

As we can see, the first and the second order and content of semantic formula of refusal of higher and equal status of both groups of the refusers are Apology and Excuse respectively. In addition, for lower status refusers, Excuse and Direct “no”, are produced, respectively in the second and third orders.

The interesting point is that the refusers of all statuses provided Excuse in the second order of refusal.
Table 10 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English to suggestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers' Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>Positive Opinion Direct “no” Excuse Offer Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>Apology Direct “no” Gratitude -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>Attempt to dissuade Positive Excuse Promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the results of both groups of the refusers in higher and lower status are quite different. It is only Excuse in the second order that is the same.

For equal status refusers, the results show that the order and content of semantic formula of refusal are totally different.

But one interesting thing is that the equal status refusers of both groups did not have the third content of semantic formula of refusal.
Table 11 below shows the comparison of order and content of semantic formulas in refusals made by the Thai students and the native speakers of American English to offer.

**Table 11 Native speakers of American English and Thais’ offer refusals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Type</th>
<th>Refusers’ Status</th>
<th>DCT Item</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Order and Content of Refusal Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>1 Attempt to dissuade Excuse 3 Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>2 Direct “no” Excuse Gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>American Thai</td>
<td>3 Positive Opinion Excuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the results of both groups of the refusers in the higher status show that the order and content of semantic formula of refusal are quite different. There is only Excuse in the second order that is the same.

For equal status refusers, the results show that the order and content of semantic formula of refusal are different.

However, for lower status refusers of both groups, the order and content of semantic formula of refusal are the same. Positive opinion and Excuse are produced, respectively.

Another interesting point is that only the Thai students of higher status produced the semantic content of refusal format of condition in the third order, while the native speakers of American English of all status did not produce anything.
Table 12 below shows the summary results of order and content of semantic formula of refusals made by Thai students compared with native speakers of American English.

**Table 12** Summarizing table of Thai students' refusals in English comparing with native speakers of American English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus Types</th>
<th>Refusers' status</th>
<th>Order of refusal format</th>
<th>Content of refusal format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Request</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invitation</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suggestion</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offer</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
<td>Quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
<td>Exactly the same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Discussion

The outcomes of the study show that language transfer occurs in refusals made by Thai students. The refusal contents and their orders in Thai and English of these students are very similar. (see Table 7) This similarity of both Thai and English versions produced by Thai students in aspect of order and content of refusal formats can be inferred that their L1 influences L2. In other words, the language transfer occurs in this phenomenon. This study confirms the study of Sairhun (1999) that the Thai learners of English performed the speech act of refusing in English in a similar manner as when they performed it in their native tongue.
In general, most of the refusal formats tend to be the “Apology” in the first order. In the second order, it shows that “Excuses” are mostly found.

Moreover, different status of refusers also influences the order and content of the refusal formats in both cultures. As we can see from all of the tables, the comparison of the order and content of refusal formats generally shows the difference of language production of both Thai and American speakers of English when the social status of the refuser differs.

Most of the order and refusal formats in all the 12 situations produced by both Thais and Americans are different, especially in the first order and content of the refusal formats as shown in Table 12. There are 8 out of 12 situations (about 67%) that are different in aspects of order and content of the refusal formats that they produce.

Anyway, both Thai and American speakers of English produce the second order and content of the refusal formats very similar. An “Excuse” is given in this order at 87.50% or 21 out of 24 possible answers from both Thai and American speakers of English as shown in Table 12.

The results of the study, in terms of the second order of refusal format of both Thai and American English speakers, revealed that the Excuse that is frequently found in almost all situations have got some differences when compared with the results of the study of Leslie M. Beebe et al. (1985) which pointed out that the order of refusal produced by the native speaker of American English revealed that native speakers of American English made their Positive Opinion first, Apology in the second order, and the third one was Excuse with unequal status. However, for the equal status, American native speakers of English tended to produce two contents of refusal. They are Apology and Excuse.

However, the native speakers of American English, in this study perform somewhat differently from the native speakers of American English in the study of Leslie M. Beebe et al. (1985).

The difference is especially found in the content of the second orders of refusal when the interlocutors are in different status. That is, in this study, they use excuses like Thais do while in Beebe’s they used apology.

These may be because the English native speakers in Thailand have been influenced by Thai cultural norm. The long period of 3 – 6 years that these Americans have worked in Thailand
might affect the order and semantic contents of refusal formats. They might absorb the Thai culture.

For social status, the differences of social status are examined. The responses of the higher, equal, and lower status of American and Thai refusers are compared in aspect of the order and content of the refusal formats. They show differences. It could be inferred that people from different social cultural backgrounds respond differently to certain situations of language socialization. This result supports the findings of the previous study of Al-Issa (2003), which states that socio-cultural factors appeared to influence the speakers’ selection of semantic formulas, the length of responses, and the content of the semantic formulas.

In addition, the reason why the subjects of both Thai and American are likely to use Excuse in all social status might concern the way to safe face or to soften the feeling between the two parties. These sociolinguistic factors are also mentioned in the study of Leslie M. Beebe et al. (1985), Al-Issa (2003), and Susan M. Gass & Larry Selinker (1993).

Based on the results of this study, we may, therefore, conclude that Thais and Americans are quite different in making refusals. The differences are influenced by the cultural differences between the two cultures: Thai students also tend to transfer the pragmatic aspects of their L1 to their L2 production.

4.4 Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study that Thai students and American native speakers are different in terms of the order and content of the refusal formats are useful for classroom instruction. If we want our students to produce native-like English, the differences of producing the first order and content of refusal formats would require teachers to emphasize practicing such order and content of the refusal formats more frequently. In contrast, the second order and content of refusal formats that is quite the same in both Thai students and American native speakers can be inferred that this point of the target language can be less emphasized than the first one.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the conclusion of the study, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further study are provided.

5.1 Conclusion

The result of the study shows that the order and the semantic formulas in refusal made by Thai students and native speakers of American English were quite different. That is, Thai students seem to rely on L1 pragmatic rules. Furthermore, it could be inferred that the social status of interlocutors influenced both Thai students and native speakers of American English in making refusals. This can be seen from the content and order of the semantic formulas in their refusals.

5.2 Limitation of the study

This study has some limitations as follows:

1. There was only Thai students group of UBRU. It should be, in fact, other groups of Thai students from other places around Thai institutes.

2. The authenticicity of the answer might deviant by the pace of answering time. The questionnaire provided Thai students the convenient pace to answer. In contrast, the real life conversation does not allow much time to think before answering.

3. The newcomers of Native speakers of American English were rarely found. At that point of time, only the 15 foreigners who have lived in Thailand for 3 - 6 years were selected for the study. By this reason, all of them are exposed to Thai culture for a long period of time.
5.3 Recommendations for further study

Since the study has some limitations as stated above, it is suggested that further study should be conducted by involving students from different places, having the subjects speak instead of write the answer. The study should also investigate the native speakers of English who have just recently arrived Thailand.
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Appendix A

Discourse completion test
DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST

Instructions:

Please read the following 12 situations. After each situation you will be asked to write a refusal in the blank provided after “you.” Make refusals as you would in actual conversation.
Which words that you do not know, you can ask the teacher. Data collected will be kept strictly confidential and will not be revealed to public but will be analyzed and be presented as an overall view only.

1. You are the owner of a bookstore. One of your best workers asks to speak to you in private.

Worker: As you know, I’ve been here just a little over a year now, and I know you’ve been pleased with my work. I really enjoy working here, but to be quite honest, I really need an increase in pay.

You: ..........................................................
..........................................................
..........................................................

Worker: Then I guess I’ll have to look for another job.

2. You are a junior in college. You attend classes regularly and take good notes. Your classmate misses a class and asks you for the lecture notes.

Classmate: Oh God! We have an exam tomorrow but I don’t have notes from last week. I am sorry to ask you this, but could you please lend me your notes once again?

You: ..........................................................
..........................................................
..........................................................

Classmate: O.K., then I guess I’ll have to ask somebody else.
3. You are the president of a printing company. A salesman from a printing machine company invites you to one of the most expensive restaurants in Bangkok.

**Salesman**: We have met several times to discuss your purchase of my company's products. I was wondering if you would like to be my guest at Dusit Thani restaurant in order to firm up a contract?

**You**: ...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

**Salesman**: Perhaps another time.

4. You are a top executive at a very large accounting firm. One day the boss calls you into his office.

**Boss**: Next Sunday my wife and I are having a little party. I know it's short notice but I am hoping all my top executives will be there with their wives.

**You**: ...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

**Boss**: That's too bad. I was hoping everyone would be there.

5. You're at a friend's house watching T.V. He/She offers you a snack.

**You**: No thanks. I've been eating like a pig and I feel just terrible.

I've been gaining a long of weight recently.

**Friend**: Hey, why don't you try this new diet food I've been telling you about?

**You**: ...............................................................

...............................................................

...............................................................

**Friend**: You should try it anyway.
6. You’re at your desk trying to find a report that your boss just asked for. While you’re searching through the mess on your desk, your boss walks over.

   Boss: You know, maybe you should try and organize yourself better. I always write myself little notes to remind me of things. Perhaps you should give it a try!

   You: .................................................................
       .................................................................
       .................................................................

   Boss: Well, it’s an idea anyway.

7. You arrive home and notice that your cleaning lady is extremely upset. She comes rushing up to you.

   Cleaning lady: Oh God, I’m so sorry! I had an awful accident. While I was cleaning I bumped into the table and your china vase fell and broke. I feel just terrible about it. I’ll pay for it.

   You: (Knowing that the cleaning lady is supporting three children.)

   You: .................................................................
       .................................................................
       .................................................................

   Cleaning lady: No, I’d feel better if I paid for it.

8. You’re a language teacher at a university. It is just about the middle of the term now and one of your students asks to speak to you.

   Student: Ah, excuse me, we have discussed among our classmates recently and we kind of feel that the class would be better if you could give us more practice in conversation and less on grammar.

   You: .................................................................
       .................................................................
       .................................................................

   Student: O.K., it was only a suggestion.
9. You are at a friend's house for lunch.

Friend : How about another piece of cake?
You :

Friend : Come on, just a little piece?
You :

10. A friend invites you to dinner, but you really can't stand this friend's husband/wife.

Friend : How about coming over for dinner Sunday night? We're having a small dinner party.
You :

Friend : O.K., maybe another time.
You :

11. You've been working in an advertising agency now for some time. The boss offers you a raise and promotion, but it involves moving. You don't want to go. Today, the boss calls you into his office.

Boss : I'd like to offer you an executive position in our new offices in Phuket.
It's a great town—only 3 hours from here by plane. And, a nice raise comes with the position.
You :

Boss : Well, maybe you should give it some more thought before turning it down.
12. You are at the office in a meeting with your boss. It is getting close to the end of the day and you want to leave work.

   Boss : If you don’t mind, I’d like you to spend an extra hour or two tonight so that we can finish up with this work.

   You : .................................................................

   .................................................................

   .................................................................

   Boss : That’s too bad. I was hoping you could stay.
Appendix B

Discourse completion test (in Thai)
แนวสอบงาน

คำชี้แจง

ให้นักศึกษาอ่านสถานการณ์จังหวะที่กำหนดให้ รวม 12 สถานการณ์ หลังจากนั้น ให้นักศึกษาเขียนตอบปฏิสัมพันธ์ของข้อความที่กำหนดให้แต่ละข้อความดีใจของนักศึกษาโดยอัตโนมัติโดยใช้ข้อมูลพื้นฐานของการสนทนาระหว่างนักเรียนที่ได้จากการตอบแบบสอบถามจะถูกถือเป็นความถูก และจะไม่ทำการผิดแต่สำหรับวิชาที่จะนำไปเป็นข้อมูลประกอบการวิเคราะห์ในภาพรวม

1. คุณเป็นเจ้าของร้านหนังสือแห่งหนึ่ง มีพนักงานในร้านหนังสือต้องการที่จะเริ่มจากการสั่น

พนักงาน) อย่างที่ทำตามระบบที่กำหนดไว้ที่ 1 ปิดแล้วว่าทำง่งใจใน
ผลการทำง่งของตน ตัวผมเองก็รับใจที่ได้ทำง่งอยู่ที่นี่ แต่เรียนตามความ


c) ข้อความ

พนักงาน) ดีกว่านั้น ผมก็จะต้องดูให้ดีให้

2. คุณเป็นนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 3 คุณเข้าร่วมเรียนอย่างสนุกสนานและมีความสุขในการเรียนได้ดี

กับเพื่อนร่วมชั้น

(ข้อ) อย่างไร่ แต่จะดีกว่านั้น แต่ที่นี้ไม่ได้เจรจาทางเรียนการสอนของ

ับมากที่จะต้องมีบทบาทของอาจารย์ ๆ แต่จะขอความมีความสุขให้ได้

กุ่ย

(ข้อ)

เพื่อร่วมชั้น) โอ.เค. ดีอย่างนั้น นั่นไปให้ยิ้มเพื่อคนอื่นให้ได้

3. คุณเป็นประธานกรรมการบริษัทเครื่องพิมพ์ มีพนักงานขายหนังสือจากบริษัทผลิตเครื่อง

พิมพ์ชั้นนำ ที่มุ่งสู่ไปรษณีย์อากาศในร้านที่พักที่สุดของกรรมการพัฒนา

พนักงานขาย) ทำเช่นนี้กับหนังสือในร้านที่พักที่สุดของกรรมการพัฒนา

บริษัทเรา ที่นี่จะต้องมีบทบาทของอาจารย์ที่สุดของ

ตัวอักษรที่ดีอาจารย์คุณคือ

คุณแก่คุณสำเร็จในการทำให้เป็นเรื่องที่

กุ่ย

(ข้อ)

พนักงานขาย) ถ้าเป็นเช่นนั้น ถ้าเอาไว้โอกาสหน้าก็ได้ครับ
4. คุณเป็นผู้บริหารระดับสูงของบริษัทบัญชีที่มีชื่อเสียงแห่งหนึ่ง วันหนึ่งเข้าเยี่ยมคุณเจ้าหน้าที่ (เจ้าหน้าที่) วิทยากรคิดข้ามหน้ากระดาษมองเข้ามา เล่าเรื่องที่มีอยู่ ที่บ้าน แต่เรื่องราวแต่ละเรื่องนั้นเป็นเรื่องที่มีเหตุการณ์ที่สั้น แต่สรุปได้ในหนึ่งหน้ากระดาษ แต่เมื่อเร็วๆนี้ก็มีเรื่องที่ยาวนานเกินกว่าหนึ่งหน้ากระดาษไป ร่วมงานนี้หรือกับพานักงานไปด้วย

(เน้น).....................................................................................................................................................

(เน้น) แต่เรื่องนี้จะไปร่วมงานเลี้ยงมีได้ชะอีก

5. คุณก้างของทุกที่ที่บ้านเพื่อน เที่ยวของทุกครอบครัวจะมีให้คุณทาน

(เน้น) ขอคุณเน้นแต่ถ้าไม่ทานดีกว่า ตอนนี้มีเรื่องที่ยาวนานเกินกว่าหนึ่งหน้ากระดาษ แต่เรื่องนี้มีเรื่องที่รู้สึกอยากเล่าให้เห็นทำไม่ได้ เพราะว่า แต่เรื่องนี้มีเรื่องที่ยาวนานเกินกว่าหนึ่งหน้ากระดาษ แม้นั้น เรื่องนี้จะไปร่วมงานเลี้ยงมีได้ เน้น...

(เน้น).....................................................................................................................................................

(เน้น) อังใจถือกันจะลงกระดาษดูขัดขวาง

6. คุณก้างของทุกที่ที่บ้านและกำลังกว่าคุณต้องการจะทราบที่บ้านของคุณตามถึง ขณะที่คุณก้าวตามร้านอาหารของคุณและทำให้ได้ของคุณจะไปบัตรคู่อีกนี้ เล่าเรื่องของทุกคนที่คุณติดต่อกับ

(เน้น) คุณรู้ไหม แม้ว่าคุณจะลงกระดาษและวิวัฒนาการบริษัทของคุณให้คุณติดต่อกับเรื่องนี้ แต่เรื่องนี้ก้าวตามร้านอาหารของคุณและทำให้ได้ของคุณจะไปบัตรคู่อีกนี้ เน้น...

(เน้น).....................................................................................................................................................

(เน้น) ดีแล้ว... ถ้าคุณไม่เชื่อคนก็แล้วไป

7. คุณก้าวตามบ้าน และเสียกวาดคุณทำตาม@emailบ้านของคุณก้าวตามบ้านของคุณก้าวตาม@emailอย่างมาก เสียบวิจ

(เน้น) คุณทำตาม@email คุณเข้าไปที่บ้านของคุณใด ๆ แต่ละ คือว่า ขณะที่คุณกลับที่บ้าน สะดวกอยู่แต่ไม่ได้ไปบัตรคู่อีกนี้ ทำให้คุณก้าวตาม@email แต่เรื่องนี้จะเสียบวิจ คุณจึงจะไปบัตรคู่อีกนี้

(เน้น) คุณทำตาม@email คุณจึงจะไปบัตรคู่อีกนี้ จับเป็นบัตรคู่บัตรคู่บัตรคู่อีกนี้

(เน้น).....................................................................................................................................................

(เน้น) ไม่เสียบวิจ คุณจะมีสิทธิ์ให้ผู้อื่นได้ชิ้นได้ตาม@emailให้กับคุณผู้สิทธิ์
8. คุณเป็นอาจารย์สอนที่มหาวิทยาลัย ประมาณช่วงกลางเทอม มีนักศึกษาคนหนึ่งมีขอพบคุณ

นักศึกษา) หนูขอโทษนะอาจารย์ คือว่า มีเพื่อน ๆ บางคนได้ชูคูณปีกตาหมาหรือกิน
หลังจากที่เรียนวิชาของอาจารย์เสร็จแล้วเมื่อไร ๆ นั้นว่า พวกเรารู้สึกว่ามันจะคง
จะดีกว่าถ้าอาจารย์จะให้พวกเรศึกษาพบแทนนานกว่านี้ และสอนเรื่อง
วิทยากรเรื่องปักกล

คุณ) ........................................................................................................................................

นักศึกษา) โอเค ขอโทษดีแล้วอาจารย์จะพิจารณานะคะ

9. คุณอยู่ที่บ้านเพื่อนและกำลังรับประทานอาหารเพื่อนสามี

เพื่อน) นี่เธอ ลองทานแลกขี้กราสขี้หน่อยไหม?

คุณ) ........................................................................................................................................

เพื่อน) แน่นะ แต่ขี้ดีกว่านะ

10. เพราะของคุณเข้าไปที่ทางอาหารสูงด้วยกัน แต่คุณไม่ขอขอบหน้าสามีของเขาเป็นอย่างมาก

เพื่อน) เธอมั่นใจที่คุณไม่ยินดุกันที่บ้านนั้นนะคะ เราจะจัดงานเลี้ยงเล็ก ๆ ไว้รอ

คุณ) ........................................................................................................................................

เพื่อน) ได้ใจ... ถ้าอย่างนั้น เราให้ระหว่างนั้นกันเลยค่ะ

11. คุณทำงานอยู่ที่ต่างประเทศของบริษัทแห่งหนึ่ง เจ้าหน้าที่คุณแนะนำที่จะชี้แจงเรื่องให้คุณ เทค

มีความเกี่ยวข้องกับการคัดเลือกสถานที่ทำงานไปอยู่กี่ที่หนึ่ง คุณไม่ขอเรื่องไป และยังนั้นเจ้าหน้า

ของคุณเรียกคุณเจ้าหน้า

เจ้าหน้า) คุณขอแนะนำคัดเลือกคู่บริหารให้คุณที่สำคัญงานแห่งใหม่ของเราที่เจาะจงด้วยคุณ

คุณแนะนำเพื่อนคนที่ 3 ชิ้นไปจากที่นี่ก็ยังแล้ว คุณมีความสนใจคิด ๆ ที่จะตามมา

พร้อมด้วยเจ้าหน้าใหม่นี้ด้วยค่ะ

คุณ) ........................................................................................................................................

เจ้าหน้า) โอ้... ถ้าอย่างนั้นนะคะ ผมอยากให้คุณกลับไปพบทางการคัดเลือกของคุณอีกทีแล้ว

ค่อยให้คุณตอบแม่บ้านหลักก็ได้
12. คุณกำลังประจำอยู่กับเจ้าหน้าที่ของคุณที่ทำงาน มันให้ได้เวลาลิ้มงานเดิมที และคุณก็อยากกลับบ้านแล้ว

เจ้าหน้าที่: คุณไม่ว่างอะไร ผมอยากขอเวลาคุณอีกครั้งหรือไม่ สองชั่วโมงก็เพียงพอค่ะ ท่านจะทำงาน

เจ้าหน้าที่: ขอโทษเลย... คุณคาดหวังว่าคุณจะอยู่ช่วยท่านค่อนจะมากนิดนี้
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