

SPEECH ACT OF REFUSAL ON VERTICAL LINE LEVELS IN JAPANESE AND INDIAN CULTURES

Ninik Elika¹, Oktiva Herry Chandra²

^{1,2} Master Program of Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

Email: ninikelika@gmail.com, herrychandra67@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the refusal speech acts of Japanese and Indian people in the context of vertical relationship lines. The research employs a cross-cultural pragmatic approach with a qualitative descriptive paradigm method. Data collection was carried out using the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) method on native Japanese and Indian speakers. Data were analyzed using Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and Ochi Suzuki's refusal strategies, presented through a descriptive analysis model. The results indicate differences in the refusal speech acts of Japanese and Indian people within vertical relationship lines. Japanese people, in this context, tend to use indirect refusals, employing various methods to show respect and avoid offending the interlocutor. This is influenced by factors such as social status, social distance, kinship relations, and the speaker's age. Indirect refusals often involve expressions of apology and the use of different language forms. There are slight differences between male and female refusal speech acts in Japanese culture. Women are more careful in choosing words to refuse, showing a higher regard for the feelings of the speaker. In contrast, Japanese men tend to provide straightforward reasons for their refusals but still choose their words cautiously. In the case of Indian people within vertical relationship lines, the majority use direct refusals, as evidenced by their speech. Social factors such as social status and social distance also play a role. Both Indian men and women tend to deliver refusals straightforwardly, assertively, and directly (to the point).

KEYWORDS Refusal Speech Acts, Apologies, Cross-Cultural Pragmatics, Japan, India



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

INTRODUCTION

Language is a system of sound symbols used by humans for communication. Humans perform actions through words in speech acts directed at interlocutors, known as speech acts. The theory of speech acts was first introduced by J.L. Austin

How to cite: Ninik Elika, Oktiva Herry Chandra. (2024). Speech Act Of Refusal On Vertical Line Levels In Japanese And Indian Cultures. Journal Eduvest. 4 (7): 6007-6024
E-ISSN: 2775-3727
Published by: <https://greenpublisher.id/>

and later developed by his student, Searle, in his book "Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language." Speech acts are a branch of pragmatics that focuses on speech acts/utterances. Austin divided speech acts into three categories: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts are the act of saying something, illocutionary acts are used to influence the interlocutor to do something, and perlocutionary acts have a persuasive effect and impact on the interlocutor.

Communication between speakers and interlocutors can vary, including commands, advice, offers, requests, invitations, and so on. The response of the interlocutor to the speaker when receiving an invitation, request, or command can result in different reactions, such as agreement or refusal. Refusal, according to the KBBI (Indonesian dictionary), is a way to express disagreement with a particular statement. Bebbe et al., as cited in Novitasari (2020), stated that refusals can be expressed directly or indirectly. Refusal speech acts vary greatly between countries, such as Japan and India. Japan is an East Asian archipelago country neighboring China. The national language used by Japanese people is Japanese, which has a hierarchical structure leading to various language forms. There are three types of language forms in Japanese: futsuugo (ordinary form), teineigo (standard polite form), and sonkeigo (honorific form). These forms are used based on the speaker, the interlocutor, and the context of the speech, considering social factors such as distance, power, and social relationships between the speaker and the interlocutor.

Several cultural concepts exist in Japanese society, such as *tatema*, *uchi soto*, *chinmoku*, and *ikigai*. *Tatema* is a concept where Japanese people prioritize others' well-being over their own feelings. *Chinmoku* refers to the Japanese concept of silence in communication. This concept was discussed by Roger J. Davies and Osamu Ikeno in their book "The Japanese Mind" (2002). Silence/*chinmoku* is used to maintain a position and hide perceived wrongness to avoid hurting the interlocutor's feelings. Davies and Ikeno, as cited in Martawijaya (2016), stated that in Japanese communication, when expressing disagreement or refusal, people use indirect, unclear, or ambiguous sentences. Japanese people use ambiguous refusal speech acts, influenced by social factors such as social status, social distance, age, and the closeness of the speaker and interlocutor. They often begin refusals with apologies to show respect and avoid offending the interlocutor. Refusal expressions in Japanese are called *kotowari hyougen*. The concept of *uchi soto* mentioned earlier divides interaction patterns into *uchi* (insiders) and *soto* (outsiders), affecting how Japanese people interact with others, both among fellow Japanese and with foreigners, which is evident in their refusal speech acts.

India is a South Asian country geographically close to Pakistan and Afghanistan. India has two official languages: Hindi and English. Most Indians use Hindi, written in the Devanagari script, for communication. Hinduism is the predominant religion in India, which includes a caste system dividing society into rigid hierarchical groups. Although the caste system has been abolished, the social hierarchy influenced by the caste system still affects various aspects of life, such as occupations, social status, and social distance in relationships among Indians. Social relationships are categorized into vertical and horizontal lines. Vertical relationships are based on differences in status, such as between superiors and

subordinates, and between speakers and interlocutors with different levels of power, where one has more power than the other. Horizontal relationships occur among members of equal status, such as between teachers or between students, where power is equally distributed.

In refusal speech acts, speakers are very cautious in choosing the right words to ensure the meaning and feelings are well represented and understood without offending the interlocutor. Politeness in refusal expressions among Japanese and Indian people in vertical relationships is the focus of this research. Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that speech acts involve two parties: the speaker and the interlocutor. Their politeness principles revolve around two notions: positive face and negative face. Positive face refers to the desire to be appreciated for one's actions and possessions as good. Negative face refers to the desire to be unimpeded and free to act without being obligated to do something.

Previous research on refusal speech acts includes three studies relevant to this research. The first study by Asep Saifudin on the variations of politeness in Japanese apology expressions discusses the variations determined by social factors, predominantly within the uchi group, represented using ordinary, polite, and humble language forms. The second study by Dewi Novitasari on refusal speech acts in Japanese by former "kenshuusei" (trainees) found that they generally expressed refusals using apologies and aizuchi (listener responses). The third study by Raman (2016) investigated communication patterns among Indians. The findings showed that Indians use indirect refusal patterns to communicate with higher-status interlocutors to avoid awkward situations, while they use direct, straightforward, and brief (to the point) refusals as a general characteristic.

The difference between these studies and the current research lies in the objects of study. The first two studies focus on Japanese language, while the third study examines Indian language. The present research uses both Japanese and Indian societies as objects, comparing their refusal speech acts, which makes it unique. This study aims to describe the refusal speech acts of Japanese and Indian societies, find similarities and differences, and explore the cultural meanings behind the refusal speech acts in these countries. Japan and India are both Asian countries with distinct cultures, which this research aims to uncover.

Theoretical Framework

Cross-cultural pragmatics derives from two units: "pragmatics" and "cross-cultural." Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics used to analyze meaning by considering the context of utterances, while cross-cultural refers to interactions between different cultures that influence each other. Pragmatics is used by foreign language learners in research to understand meaning in a foreign language. According to Kasper and Rose in Novitasari (2020:182), cross-cultural pragmatics consists of three main components: speech acts, implicatures, and politeness.

Ochi and Suzuki (2013:138) analyze the process of refusal utterances into three stages: pre-refusal, main refusal, and post-refusal.

1. Pre-refusal, which can take the form of apologies or hopes.
 - "I apologize, sorry": apology
 - "Actually, I want to accept this invitation, but": hope, expressing a

- desire to help if possible.
2. Main refusal, which contains the reason for refusing a request.
 - "I can't go to your home because my son is sick": explaining the reason for not being able to go to the speaker's house due to a sick child.
 3. Post-refusal, which offers future proposals and resolutions.
 - "How about next week?": a future offer.
 - "I'm so sorry": a resolution.

Refusal strategies are categorized into two groups:

1. Direct refusal

Direct refusal is clearly stated, indicating that the speaker cannot fulfill the request without ambiguity. Utterances are categorized as direct refusal when they contain performative or non-performative verbs, such as:

- Performative verbs: "I decline"
- Non-performative verbs: "no," "I can't"

2. Indirect refusal

Indirect refusal is not clearly stated, containing ambiguity and vagueness, indicating that the speaker cannot fulfill the request. Indirect refusal strategies include:

- a. **Apology expressions:** The speaker responds with an apology to be accepted by the listener. Example: "sorry," "sumimasen," "gomenasai" (apology).
- b. **Reasons, causes, explanations:** The speaker provides reasons, causes, or explanations for not being able to fulfill a request. Example: "I have a math test tomorrow."
- c. **Promises of future acceptance:** The speaker promises to accept the request in the future as a replacement for the current refusal. Example: "How about next week?"
- d. **Statements of hope:** The speaker expresses a desire to help. Example: "I wish I could help you."
- e. **Alternative statements:** The speaker refuses a request but tries to offer something else. Example: "I prefer this one."
- f. **Conditions of future and past acceptance:** The speaker refuses by making statements related to the past and future. Example: "If I had enough money..."
- g. **Principle statements:** The speaker refuses an invitation by stating their principles. Example: "I never drink sake after dinner."
- h. **Philosophical statements:** The speaker refuses a request by stating a philosophy. Example: "No one wants to take that risk."
- i. **Efforts to prevent the listener:**
 1. Threats/negative statements to the listener. Example: "If I knew you would do this to me, I wouldn't have accepted it."
 2. Expressing guilt. Example: "It's my fault for this issue."
 3. Criticizing the speaker's request. Example: "That's a crazy/strange suggestion."
- j. **Responses that function as refusals:**
 1. Uncertain responses. Example: "Hmm, I don't know yet."

2. Unenthusiastic responses. Example: "I'm not interested in doing that."
- k. **Avoidance:**
1. Non-verbal: silence, hesitation, doing nothing, then leaving.
 2. Verbal:
 - 1) Changing the topic. Example: "Hey, the watermelon is delicious."
 - 2) Joking. Example: "In your eyes, I'm always wrong; how about if I'm in your nose?"
 - 3) Repeating previous requests.
 - 4) Limiting. Example: "I'll let you know later."

RESEARCH METHOD

This research utilizes a cross-cultural pragmatic approach with a descriptive qualitative paradigm. The data collection method employs the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) technique for native Japanese speakers using social media (LINE) and Indian speakers, with the responses then copied and transcribed into document form. Social media is used due to the distance between the researcher and the Japanese and Indian informants. Social media is considered appropriate because of its flexibility and the ability to coordinate timing between the researcher and informants. The DCT technique is commonly used in cross-cultural pragmatic research to collect data in the form of questionnaires. There are two types of DCT: written-DCT and oral-DCT.

In this study, the researcher used the written-DCT method because it is more flexible and allows informants to complete it at their convenience. The advantages of the DCT technique include the ability to collect contextually relevant data (desired situations), gather a large amount of data quickly, and obtain unexpected additional results. The situational questionnaires are presented descriptively in Japanese (for Japanese informants) and Hindi, supported by English for Indian informants. The DCT is written in kana-kanji for Japanese informants and Devanagari script for Hindi, supported by English alphabet writing. The data collected through the DCT technique are then transcribed into Indonesian.

There are four Japanese informants: two males and two females, aged between 21 and 54, who are students and company employees. There are also four Indian informants: two males and two females, aged between 21 and 45, who are directors and company employees. The situations presented in the DCT are limited to vertical relationships only. Although limited to vertical relationships, the contexts are varied.

Six contexts/conditions are presented, such as: the relationship between lecturer and student (vertical), the relationship between company boss and company employee (vertical), the relationship between mother and child (vertical), and family relationships between siblings and grandparents (see the appendix). The data are analyzed using Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and Ochi Suzuki's refusal strategies, considering the context and culture inherent in the utterances of each Japanese and Indian informant in their respective languages. The data are presented using descriptive analysis methods, elaborated in chapter 4 of the results and discussion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Speech Acts of Refusal by Japanese in Vertical Hierarchies

The following Table 1 illustrates the percentages of refusal utterances based on various variables. According to the table, the data on the pre-main-post refusal process amounted to 50%, pre-main to 17%, and main-post to 35.7%. Direct refusals accounted for 17%, while indirect refusals made up 83%. Refusal strategies included giving reasons (29%), alternative statements (25%), principle statements (8%), and future offers (21%). Politeness strategies involved 83% FSA (Face-Saving Acts) and 17% FTA (Face-Threatening Acts), with 8% employing ambiguous reduction of FTA, 71% using straightforward positive politeness, and 21% using straightforward negative politeness.

Table 1: Refusal Speech Acts by Japanese in Vertical Hierarchies

	VERTICAL (JEPANG)	%
Refusal Process	Pre-main-post	50
	Pre-main	17
	Main-post	33
Form of Refusal	indirect refusal	83
	direct refusal	17
Refusal Strategies	Reason	29
	Alternative statement	25
	Hope	17
	Principle statement	8
	Future offer	21
Politeness Strategies	FSA	83
	FTA	17
FTA Reduction Strategies	Ambiguous	8
	Straightforward + positive	71
	Straightforward + negative	21

Refusal Speech Acts by Japanese in Vertical Hierarchies within Families

Context 1:

DCT：故郷帰った時にお祖父さんが市場に誘ってくれました。嬉しくて一緒に行きました。暑いからお祖父さんが「帽子を買おうか」と言いました。帽子屋さんで、お祖父さんから目立つ帽子を選んでもらいました。お祖父さんは目立つ色が大好きけどあなたは目立つのはすごく嫌いです。お祖父さんにどう言って断りますか？

“Furusato kaetta toki ni ojiisan ga ichiba ni sasotte kuremashita. Ureshikute issho ni ikimashita. Atsui kara ojiisan ga ‘boushi o kaou ka’ to iimashita. Boushiyasan de, ojiisan kara medatsu boushi o erande moraimashita. Ojiisan wa medatsu iro ga daisuki kedo anata ha medatsu no wa sugoku kirai desu. Ojiisan ni dou itte

kowowarimasuka ?”.

Data 1

おじいちゃん選んでくれてありがとう！私はあっちの方が好きかな～。あっちの帽子を買ってもいい？。

“Ojiichan erande kurete arigatou! Watashi wa acchi no hou ga suki kana~. Acchi no boushi wo katte mo ii?”.

‘Grandpa, thank you for choosing me. But I prefer that one, can I just buy that one?’. Analysis: Data (1) found 2 rejection processes, namely the main rejection strategy (watashi wa acchi no hou ga suki kana~) and post-rejection (acchi no boushi o katte mo ii?).

The phrase (ojiichan erande kurete arigatou gozaimasu) 'grandfather thank you for choosing a hat for me' is a potential politeness used by speakers to respect and appreciate what their speaking partner, their grandfather who has chosen a hat for speakers (FSA), has done.

The speaker's strategy to mitigate the FTA involves speaking directly while employing positive politeness. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is vertical, within the family context between grandfather and grandchild (uchi), indicating their close social distance, as evidenced by the use of the futsuugo form of Japanese (ordinary language or everyday speech).

Data (1) shows the status/power dynamic between the speaker and the addressee, where the speaker, the grandchild, is relatively powerless compared to the powerful addressee, the grandfather. Therefore, the refusal speech act used by the grandchild towards the grandfather is more likely to be an indirect refusal. Considering the gender of the speaker is female and the addressee is male, Data (1) reflects the nuanced way in which the female speaker carefully chooses her words to respect and avoid hurting the feelings of her grandfather.

The primary refusal strategy is found in the utterance (watashi wa acchi no hou ga suki kana) 'I think I prefer that one,' where the speaker rejects the chosen hat by suggesting an alternative more preferred by the speaker. Because the utterance involves presenting an alternative offer, it is considered an indirect refusal, as it does not use direct refusal verbs like (ie) 'no,' (kotowarishimasu) 'I refuse,' etc. The particle "kana" in Data (1) represents an indirect request, expressing the speaker's uncertainty or concern, and serves to soften the refusal of the hat chosen by the grandfather by presenting an alternative preferred by the speaker.

The post-refusal strategy in the utterance (acchi no boushi katte mo ii?) 'Can we buy that one instead?' indicates a resolution to the refusal by expressing hope, as shown in the utterance. The speaker hopes the grandfather will permit the purchase of the hat preferred by the speaker. The phrase (katte mo ii?) 'Can we buy?' reflects the speaker's mood and is used to soften the speech act to avoid offending the grandfather.

Context 2

DCT : あなたはお弟ちゃんです。あなたとお姉ちゃんが夏休みに海へ行きたいです。お姉ちゃんが海へ行くのを誘ってくれましたがその日にあなた

が風邪をひいて海へ行けなくなりました。どんな断り方をしますか？
“Anata ha otoutosan desu. Anata to oneechan ga natsuyasumi ni umi e ikitai desu. Oneechan ga umi e iku no o sasotte kuremashita ga sono hi ni anata ga kaze o hiite umi e ikenakunarimashita. Donna kotowarikata o shimasuka ?”.
‘You’re a little brother. You and your older sister want to go to the beach in the summer. You get an invitation from your brother to go to the beach but on that day you get the flu. What would you say to refuse your brother’s invitation?’.

Data 2

風邪をひいてしまったから海はまた別の日にしない？ ごめんね。
“Kaze o hiite shimatta kara, umi ha mata betsu no hi ni shinai ? gomen ne”.
‘I caught the flu, can’t we reschedule the beach trip for another day? Sorry’.

Analysis: In Data (2), three refusal strategy processes are identified: pre-refusal (kaze o hiite shimatta kara), main refusal (umi wa mata betsu no hi ni shinai?), and post-refusal (gomen ne). Pre-refusal strategy uses a reason statement in (kaze o hiite shimatta) ‘I caught the flu’, indicating that the speaker (younger sibling) is stating their poor physical condition. This provides a specific reason for refusing the addressee’s (older sister’s) invitation to the beach.

The main refusal strategy is in the sentence (umi wa mata betsu no hi ni shinai?) ‘Can’t we reschedule the beach trip for another day?’, which offers a future alternative. The speaker suggests rescheduling the beach trip with the older sister to another day. This future offer demonstrates that the invitation from the addressee (older sister) has not been fulfilled. The utterance in the main refusal is an indirect refusal because it does not use performative verbs like ‘no’ or ‘I refuse’.

The post-refusal strategy involves an apology in (gomen ne) ‘sorry’. The phrase gomen ne is an informal version of gomennasai, meaning sorry in Japanese (Matsuura, 1994:437). The word gomen is usually used by people who are close or when someone with more power apologizes to someone with less power. In this context, the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is vertical within the family. From a power perspective, the speaker, the younger brother, has less power compared to the older sister, who has more power. The use of gomen ne here does not mean the speaker is positioning themselves higher than the addressee or lowering the addressee’s status but rather represents the close social distance between the speaker and the addressee (uchi). The speaker uses gomen ne to express an apology post-refusal, conveying the speaker’s regret to the addressee for rejecting the invitation to the beach.

In the given context, the speaker and addressee are siblings with close social distance and familiarity, evidenced by the use of futsuugo (ordinary language) in Japanese. Analyzing the speech by gender, it is spoken by a male, and Data (2) shows that male speech in refusals is more straightforward, explaining the reason for rejecting an offer, with a future offer and apology as resolution. The speech in Data (2) results in an FTA (Face Threatening Act) because an invitation is rejected. The FTA mitigation strategy in Data (2) involves speaking directly and stating the reason in the main refusal strategy (kaze o hiite shimatta kara) ‘I caught the flu today’, which is a strategy of giving a reason for refusal, and by apologizing and offering an alternative, showing respect for what the addressee has done by inviting

and making a future offer to go to the beach another day. This falls under positive politeness, where the speaker respects the addressee's actions by offering another opportunity to fulfill the invitation.

Context 3

DCT : 家族で、北海道旅行をしています。北海道でずっと歩いたから足が痛くなってしまいました。お父さんが電車に乗ろうかと言って、駅に行きましたが、駅は混雑していました。タクシーでホテルに戻りたいです。お父さんに何と言って断りますか？

“Kazoku de, Hokkaido ryouko o shite imasu. Hokkaido de zutto aruita kara ashi ga itaku natte shimaimashita. Otousan ga densha ni norou ka to itte, eki ni ikimashita ga eki ha konzatsu shite imashita. Takushii de hoteru ni modoritai desu. Otousan ni nan to itte kotowarimasuka?”

‘You are sightseeing in Hokkaido with your family. In Hokkaido you walk quite a lot and your feet hurt. Your father invited you to take the train, when you arrived at the train station it was very crowded. You want to go back to the hotel by taxi. How do you refuse your father's invitation to take the train?’

Data 3

ごめん,足痛すぎてホテル戻りたいんだけど、いい? 1人で戻れるからみんなと楽しんできて!

“Gomen, ashi itasugite hoteru modoritain dakedo, ii ? hitori de modoreru kara minna to tanoshinde kite!”

‘Sorry, my foot hurts a lot, can I just go back to the hotel? I'll return to the hotel on my own, so have fun with the others.

Analysis: Data (3) found 3 rejection processes, namely pre-rejection on the word (gomen), main rejection (ashi itasugite hoteru modoritain dakedo, ii?) and post-rejection (hitori de modoreru kara minna to tanoshinde kite!). The strategy in the pre-rejection is in the form of an apology expression, namely 'gomen'. The word gomen is an informal form of the word gomennasai which means sorry in Japanese (Matsuura, 1994:437). The word gomen is commonly used by people who are already familiar, as well as for someone with greater power to his subordinates. The expression sorry is used as a prefix before entering the main rejection.

The strategy for the main refusal is in the form of a statement of reason, namely the speaker's leg is sick "ashi ga itasugite" which shows that there is a specific reason why the speaker's father's offer to take the train to continue the journey by taking the train has not been fulfilled. The post-rejection strategy in the form of an alternative statement is found in the speech "minna to tanoshinde kite" "have fun with others". The speaker offers an alternative statement whereby giving his father the freedom to have fun continuing the journey by train because the speaker wants to go back to his own hotel is evidenced by the speech "hitori de modoreru" "I will go to the hotel myself".

The 'n' particle in the word 'modoritain' confirms to the speaker's partner that the speaker wants to return to the hotel because his leg hurts. Looking at the social factors in the data (3), the speaker is a child with relatively lower power or less

power compared to his father with full power. On the gender side, the speech was uttered by a woman where it shows in the speech of the rejection of the data (3) the woman gave a clear reason why the father's request was rejected but by asking for permission whether it is allowed or not is proven in the word "hoteru modoritain dakedo, ii?" 'May I just go back to the hotel?' also represents the power of the speaker who is powerless.

The social distance between the speaker is a daughter and the speaking partner is the father who has a closeness in social distance is represented by the use of a variety of futsuigo (a common form of Japanese variety) in the speech. The word gomen is commonly used by people who are already familiar, as well as for someone with greater power to his subordinates. In the speech above, the relationship between the speaker and the speaking partner is a vertical relationship in the family. The use of gomen ne speech here does not mean that the speaker is positioned higher than the speaking partner or makes the status of the speaking partner lower but represents the close social distance or closeness between the speaker and the speech partner between the father of the child fund (UCHI). Speech data on the main rejection is in the form of indirect refusal because it does not use verbs.

Refusal Speech Acts of Japanese People in Vertical Work Hierarchies (Superiors and Subordinates)

Context 4

DCT : 仕事終わってから社長に飲み会に誘われました。体の為にあなたはビールやお酒などを飲まないようにしています。社長にどんな断り方をしますか？

“Shigoto owatte kara shachou ni nomikai ni sasowaremashita. Karada no tame ni anata wa bi-ru ya osake o nomanai you ni shite imasu. Shachou ni donna kawarikata o shimasuka?”.

‘After work, your boss invites you to a nomikai (a drinking party). However, you have started avoiding beer and sake for your health. How would you refuse your boss’s invitation?’.

Data 4:

誘ってくれてありがとうございます！私じつはお酒が飲めないんです。申し訳ございません！今度ランチでも行きましょう！

“Sasotte kurete arigatou gozaimasu. Watashi jitsu wa osake ga nomenain desu. Moushi wake gozaimasen. Kondo ranchi de mo ikimashou!”.

‘Thank you for the invitation, but actually, I cannot drink sake. I’m sorry. Let’s go for lunch sometime instead’.

Analysis: In Data (5), two refusal processes are identified: the main refusal (watashi jitsu wa osake ga nomenain desu) and the post-refusal (moushi wake gozaimasen). Main Refusal Strategy: The main refusal strategy involves a statement of principle, as demonstrated by "watashi jitsu wa osake ga nomenain desu" (‘actually, I cannot drink sake’). The speaker refuses the invitation by stating their principle to the addressee. The speaker declines the boss's invitation to a nomikai

due to their personal principle of not drinking sake. This strategy shows that the request remains unfulfilled. This is a direct refusal because it uses the non-performative verb form "nomenai" ('cannot drink'), derived from the verb "nomu" (to drink) → "nomeru" (can drink) + ~nai (negative form) → "nomenai" (cannot drink).

Post-Refusal Strategy: The post-refusal strategy involves an apology, as shown in "moushi wake gozaimasen" ('I'm sorry'). The expression "moushi wake gozaimasen" is a polite form of "sumimasen" (sorry), indicating respect from the speaker to the addressee. In this context, the addressee is the company boss. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is a vertical one, with the speaker being an employee and the addressee being the boss. The social distance is significant, as evidenced by the use of sonkeigo (respectful language) in the speech, indicating a distant social relationship. Gender: The utterance in Data (5) is spoken by a male. Data (5) shows that male refusal speech acts tend to be more explicit about the reasons for declining a request or invitation and include future offers as a sign of respect towards the addressee.

Positive Politeness: The phrase "sasotte kurete arigatou gozaimasu" ('thank you for the invitation') is an example of positive politeness, as the speaker acknowledges and appreciates the boss's invitation. This strategy aims to reduce the FTA (Face-Threatening Act) by offering an apology and a future alternative, reflecting a straightforward yet respectful approach with positive politeness.

Refusal Speech Acts of Japanese People in Vertical Work Relationships (Professor + Student)

Context 5

DCT: あなたは大学の先生です。学生に「今日の 12 時までに記事を机の上に置いておくように」と言いました。次の日の昼、一人の学生が急いであなたの部屋に来ました。提出が遅れたので、その記事を受け入れたくないです。どんな断り方をしますか？

“Anata wa daigaku no sensei desu. Gakusei ni ‘kyou no juu ni ji mae ni kiji o teburu no ue ni oiteokuyouni’ to iimashita. Tsugi no hi, hitori no gakusei ga isoide anata no heya ni kimashita. Teishutsu ga okureta node, sono kiji o ukeiretakunai desu. Donna kotowari kata o shimasuka?”.

‘You are a university professor. Today you told your students to place their articles on your desk by 12 o’clock. The next day, one student rushes into your office to submit the article. Because it is past the deadline, you do not want to accept it. How do you refuse?’.

Data 5:

受け取ってあげたいけど、提出期限が過ぎてるので受け取れません。

“uketotte agetai kedo, teishutsu kigen ga ugiteru node uketoremasen”.

‘I would like to accept it, but since the deadline has passed, I cannot’.

Analysis: In Data (6), two refusal processes are identified: the pre-refusal (uketotte agetai kedo) and the main refusal (teishutsu kigen ga sugiteru node

uketoremasen). Pre-Refusal Strategy: The pre-refusal strategy expresses a desire to help, shown in "uketotte agetai kedo" ('I would like to accept it'). This strategy softens the refusal by indicating a willingness to assist if circumstances allowed. The verb "agetai" ('would like to give') demonstrates this intention, originating from "ageru" (to give) + ~tai (desire form) → agetai (would like to give). This hopeful expression aims to mitigate any offense to the addressee.

Main Refusal Strategy: The main refusal involves giving a reason, as demonstrated by "teishutsu kigen ga sugiteru node uketoremasen" ('but since the deadline has passed, I cannot accept it'). This statement provides a specific reason for the refusal, emphasizing that the request remains unfulfilled. This direct refusal uses the non-performative verb form "uketoremasen" ('cannot accept'), derived from "uketorimasu" (to accept) + ~e (potential form) → uketoremasu (can accept) + ~masen (negative form) → uketoremasen (cannot accept).

Social Distance: The social distance between the speaker (professor) and the addressee (student) is significant, as indicated by the use of polite language (masu-kei). The professor-student relationship is vertical, with the professor holding more power (powerful) compared to the student (powerless). Politeness: The phrase "uketotte agetai" ('I would like to accept it') represents positive politeness, acknowledging and appreciating the student's effort in creating and attempting to submit the article, even though it was late. This strategy aims to reduce the FTA (Face-Threatening Act) by providing an apology and a conditional offer, reflecting a straightforward yet respectful approach using positive politeness.

Gender: The utterance in Data (6) is spoken by a male. It indicates that male refusal speech acts often include clear reasons for the refusal and a potential future offer as a sign of respect towards the addressee. FTA Mitigation: The strategy in Data (6) employs straightforward communication with positive politeness to mitigate the FTA, acknowledging the student's effort while firmly refusing the late submission.

Refusal Speech Acts of Indian People at the Vertical Line Level

Table 2 below shows the percentage of refusal speech acts based on various variables as follows. According to the following table, data on pre-main refusal processes amount to 67%, main refusal processes amount to 33%. The form of direct refusal is 83%, indirect refusal is 17%. Refusal strategies in the form of reasons using negative forms amount to 83%, refusal strategies using alternative statements amount to 17%. Politeness strategies: FSA 17%, FTA 83%, and reduction strategies of FTA by speaking frankly without beating around the bush amount to 83%, reduction strategies of FTA by speaking frankly with positive politeness amount to 17%.

Table 2 Vertical Line Indian Rejection Speech

	VERTIKAL (INDIA)	%
Refusal Process	pre-main	67
	main	33
Refusal Form	indirect refusal	17

	direct refusal	83
Refusal Strategy	reasons + negative form	83
	alternative statement	17
Politeness Strategy	FSA	17
	FTA	83
FTA Reduction Strategy	Frankly without further ado	83
	frankly + positive	17

Refusal Speech Acts of Indian People at the Family Domain Level

Context 1

DCT : जब आप घर लौटे, तो आपके दादाजी ने आपको बाजार में आमंत्रित किया है। तुम खुश हुए और उसके साथ चले गए। आपके दादाजी ने कहा, "क्या आप टोपी खरीदना चाहेंगे?" क्योंकि आज बहुत गर्मी थी। टोपी की दुकान पर, आपके दादाजी ने एक ऐसी टोपी चुनी जो सबसे अलग हो। आपके दादाजी उन रंगों से प्यार करते हैं जो बाहर खड़े हैं, लेकिन आप वास्तव में उनसे नफरत करते हैं। आप अपने दादा से कैसे कहते हैं?

"jab aap ghar laute, to aapake daadaajee ne aapako baajaar mein aamantrit kiya hai. tum khush hue aur usake saath chale gae. aapake daadaajee ne kaha, "kya aap topee khareedana chaahenge?" kyonki aaj bahut garmee thee. topee kee dukaan par, aapake daadaajee ne ek aisee topee chunee jo sabase alag ho. aapake daadaajee un rangon se pyaar karate hain jo baahar khade hain, lekin aap vaastav mein unase napharat karate hain. aap apane daada se kaise kahate hain?"

When you returned home, your grandfather has been invite you to the market. You was happy and went with him. Your grandfather said, "Would you like to buy a hat?" Because today was so hot. At the hat shop, your grandfather chose a hat that stands out. Your grandfather loves the colors that stand out, but you really hate them. How do you say to your grandfather?

Data 6

आई एम सॉरी दादा लेकिन वह टोपी मुझे शोभा नहीं देगी।

"aeee em soree daada lekin vah topee mujhe shobha nahin degee".

I'm sorry grandfather but that hat won't suit me.

Analysis: In data (7), two processes of refusal were found, namely pre-refusal (aeee em soree daada) and main refusal found in the utterance (lekin vah topee mujhe shobha nahin degee). The pre-refusal strategy takes the form of apology as evidenced by the utterance "aeee em soree daada" 'sorry grandfather'. The use of the word "sorry" in pre-refusal is used as an introduction or entry into the main refusal. The main refusal in data (7) is indicated by the utterance "lekin vah topee mujhe shobha nahin degee" 'but this hat won't suit me' in the form of a reason. The reason stating that the hat is not suitable for the speaker indicates a specific reason why the speaker rejects the interlocutor's request, in this case, the grandfather's suggestion of a colorful hat. The reason in the main refusal shows that the interlocutor's request has not been fulfilled.

The main refusal takes the form of direct refusal, as evidenced by the use of

negative words such as "nahin" 'not' in the sentence "nahin degee" which means 'won't suit me'. Direct refusal in data (7) uses non-performative verbs with the use of the word "nahin" meaning 'not'. The utterance in data (7) contains a Face Threatening Act (FTA) because the refusal is direct. The strategy to reduce FTA in data (7) uses speaking frankly, as evidenced by the speaker clearly stating that the hat is not suitable for them.

The relationship between the speaker, who is the granddaughter with relatively less power, and the interlocutor, who is the grandfather with full power, shows that in data (7), the speaker with less power speaks frankly and clearly in direct refusal to reject the hat chosen by her interlocutor, the grandfather. Considering the gender, the speaker is female in data (7). The social distance in data (7) is the distance between the grandfather and granddaughter, who have a close relationship represented through the use of straightforward language without beating around the bush.

Context 2

DCT : तुम छोटे भाई हो। आप और आपकी बहन गर्मी की छुट्टियों में समुद्र में जाना चाहते हैं। मेरी बहन ने मुझे समुद्र में जाने के लिए आमंत्रित किया, लेकिन उस दिन तुम्हें सर्दी हो गई और तुम समुद्र में नहीं जा सके। आप किस तरह का इनकार करते हैं?

“tum chhote bhaee ho. aap aur aapakee bahan garmee kee chhuttiyon mein samudr mein jaana chaahate hain. meree bahan ne mujhe samudr mein jaane ke lie aamantrit kiya, lekin us din tumhen sardee ho gae aur tum samudr mein nahin ja sake. aap kis tarah ka inakaar karate hain?”.

You are a young brother. You and your sister want to go to the sea during the summer vacation. My sister invites me to go to the sea, but on that day you getting a cold and couldn't go to the sea. What kind of refusal do you do?

Data 7

मुझे क्षमा करें, लेकिन मैं बीमार हूँ इसलिए मैं आज आपके साथ नहीं आ सकता।

“mujhe kshama karen, lekin main beemaar hoon isalie main aaj aapake saath nahin aa sakata”.

I'm sorry, but I'm sick so I can't come with you today.

Analysis: In data (8), two processes of refusal were found, namely pre-refusal indicated by the phrase (mujhe kshama karen) 'please forgive me', and main refusal in the sentence (lekin main beemaar hoon isalie main aaj aapake saath nahin aa sakata) 'but I am sick so I cannot come with you today'. The strategy in pre-refusal takes the form of an apology as evidenced by the utterance "mujhe kshama karen" which means 'forgive me'. The apology is used to begin before entering into the main refusal.

The main refusal strategy is in the form of a reason as evidenced by the utterance "lekin main beemaar hoon isalie main aaj aapake saath nahin aa sakata" 'but I am sick so I cannot come with you'. This reason shows a specific reason why the speaker rejects the offer from the interlocutor. The reason proves that the speaker's offer has not been fulfilled.

The refusal in data (8) takes the form of direct refusal (direct refusal) where the refusal uses non-performative verbs in the form of "nahin aa sakata" which

means 'I cannot' in the sentence I cannot go with you. The utterance in data (8) contains a Face Threatening Act (FTA) because the refusal is direct. The strategy to reduce FTA in data (8) uses speaking frankly, as evidenced by the speaker clearly stating that they are sick and therefore cannot go to the beach with their brother. The relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor is that of an elder sister and younger brother (vertical line), where the interlocutor has greater power or is more powerful than the speaker, the younger sibling with relatively less power. However, in data (8), it is found that the speaker with less power speaks frankly and clearly in direct refusal to decline the invitation to go to the beach with their brother/interlocutor due to being sick.

Regarding gender, the speaker is male. Data (8) shows that the act of refusal expressed by a male is straightforward, to the point, and without beating around the bush. The social distance in data (8) is the distance between the elder sister and younger brother where they have a close relationship represented through the use of language that is straightforward, without beating around the bush.

Japanese Refusal Speech at the Vertical Line Level of the Job Domain (superiors + Subordinate)

Konteks 3

DCT : आप एक नियोक्ता हैं। काम के बाद, राष्ट्रपति आपको पीने के लिए आमंत्रित करते हैं। आप अपने शरीर के स्वास्थ्य के लिए बीयर या शराब न पीने की कोशिश करें। आप राष्ट्रपति को क्या कहेंगे?

“aap ek niyokta hain. kaam ke baad, raashtrapati aapako peene ke lie aamantrit karate hain. aap apane shareer ke svaasthy ke lie beeyar ya sharaab na peene kee koshish karen. aap raashtrapati ko kya kahenge?”

You are an employer. After work, the president invites you for a drink. You try not to drink beer or alcohol for health of your body. What would you say to the president?

Data 8

आई एम सॉरी सर लेकिन मैं अपने स्वास्थ्य को लेकर चिंतित हूँ इसलिए मैं शराब का सेवन नहीं करता।

“aare em soree sar lekin main apane svaasthy ko lekar chintit hoon isalie main sharaabka sevan nahin karata”.

I'm sorry sir but because I'm concerned about my health I don't consume alcohol.

Analysis: In data (11), two processes of refusal were identified: preliminary refusal indicated by the phrase (aare em soree sar) and main refusal indicated by the phrase (lekin main apane svaasthy ko lekar chintit hoon isalie main sharaab ka sevan nahin karata). The strategy in preliminary refusal takes the form of an apology as evidenced by the utterance "aare em soree sar" meaning 'sorry boss'. This apology is used to precede the main refusal. The strategy in the main refusal in data (11) is exemplified by the utterance "lekin main apane svaasthy ko lekar chintit hoon isalie main sharaab ka sevan nahin karata" which translates to 'but I do not drink alcohol because I am concerned about my health', taking the form of a reason. This statement provides a specific reason why the interlocutor's request is declined

by the speaker. The main refusal with this reason demonstrates that the interlocutor's request has not been fulfilled. The refusal in data (11) is a direct refusal because the utterance contains a non-performative verb in direct refusal, 'not' indicated by the word 'nahin' which means 'not'.

The relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor in data (11) is a vertical relationship between an employee (speaker) and the company boss (interlocutor) where the speaker has relatively less power and the boss holds full power. However, in data (11), it is found that the speaker with less power speaks frankly and clearly in a direct refusal to decline the invitation to drink from the company boss. Considering social distance, the distance between the speaker and the interlocutor in data (11), between the company employee and the company boss, appears significant.

Regarding gender, the speaker is male, and the language variety used is straightforward and clear in stating the refusal without beating around the bush. The utterance in data (11) contains a Face Threatening Act (FTA) because the refusal is direct. The speaker directly refuses the interlocutor's request by stating that he does not drink alcohol for the sake of his health. The strategy to mitigate FTA in data (11) is by speaking frankly, as evidenced by the speaker clearly stating his refusal to drink with the company boss due to his decision not to consume alcohol for health reasons.

Japanese Rejection Speech at the Vertical Line Level of Work (Lecturer + Student)

Context 4

DCT : आप विश्वविद्यालय के शिक्षक हैं। आपने अपने छात्रों से कहा, "कृपया आज 12 बजे अपने डेस्क पर लेख छोड़ दें।" अगले दिन, एक छात्र आपके कमरे में भागता है। आप लेख को स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहते क्योंकि सबमिशन अतिदेय था। आप किस तरह का इनकार करते हैं?

“aap vishvavidyaalay ke shikshak hain. aapane apne chhaatron se kaha, "krpaya aaj 12 baje apane desk par lekh chhod den." agale din, ek chhaatr aapake kamare mein bhaagata hai. aap lekh ko sveekaar nahin karana chaahate kyonki sabamishan atidey tha. aap kis tarah ka inakaar karate hain?”

You are a university teacher. You told to your students, "Please leave the article on your desk at 12 o'clock today." The next day, a student rush to your room. You don't want to accept the article because the submission was overdue. What kind of refusal do you do?'

Data 9

मुझे खेद है, लेकिन आपने देर कर दी, मैं इसे स्वीकार नहीं कर सकता।

“mujhe khed hai, lekin aapane der kar dee, main ise sveekaar nahin kar sakata”.

I'm sorry but you are late I can't accept it.

Analysis: In data (12), two processes of refusal were identified: preliminary refusal indicated by the phrase (mujhe khed dai) and main refusal indicated by the phrase (main ise sveekaar nahin kar sakata). The strategy in preliminary refusal takes the form of an apology as evidenced by the utterance "mujhe khed hai"

meaning 'I apologize'. This apology in preliminary refusal is used to precede the main refusal. The main refusal strategy in data (12) takes the form of a reason as indicated by the statement "lekin aapane der kar dee, main ise sveekaar nahin kar sakata" which translates to 'but you have delayed, so I cannot accept it'. This statement provides a specific reason why the interlocutor's request is declined by the speaker due to being late beyond the previously set deadline. This reason demonstrates that the interlocutor's request has not been fulfilled.

The refusal in data (12) is a direct refusal because the utterance contains a non-performative verb in direct refusal, 'not' indicated by the word "nahin" which means 'not' in the sentence "lekin aapane der kar dee, main ise sveekaar nahin kar sakata" 'but I cannot accept it because you were late'. The relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor in data (12) is a vertical relationship between a lecturer (speaker) who has greater power or is power full, and a student as the interlocutor who has relatively less power or is power less. Thus, the power or full power that exists in the speaker in communication in data (12) shows the speaker with full power speaks frankly and clearly in direct refusal to decline the student's request to submit an article beyond the submission deadline, utilizing the power to control and manage speech in communication that is apparent in data (12). Considering social distance, the distance between the speaker and the interlocutor in data (12) between the lecturer and the student appears significant.

Regarding gender, the speaker is male, and the language variety used is straightforward and clear in stating the refusal without beating around the bush. The utterance in data (12) contains a Face Threatening Act (FTA) because the refusal is direct. The speaker directly refuses the interlocutor's request by stating that the submission deadline has passed. The strategy to mitigate FTA in data (12) is by speaking frankly, as evidenced by the speaker clearly stating his refusal to allow the student to submit his article beyond the deadline without unnecessary elaboration.

CONCLUSION

Refusal speech act is a response of disagreement by the speaker to the interlocutor. Japan and India are countries both located in Asia. The results of this study show differences between Japanese and Indian people in terms of refusal speech acts. Refusal speech acts by Japanese people in the vertical dimension in family and work contexts (employer-employee relationships and lecturer-student relationships) mostly employ indirect refusal. Refusal speech acts are influenced by social factors such as power/status, social distance, and so forth. Refusal utterances between men and women in Japan differ slightly, where women tend to carefully choose their words to refuse while valuing the speaker's feelings, whereas men in Japanese society more often use direct reasons to refuse as a response to their interlocutors, carefully selecting their words.

Meanwhile, in the case of Indian people in the vertical dimension within family and work contexts (employer-employee relationships and lecturer-student relationships), the majority use direct refusal. Refusal speech acts are influenced by social factors such as power/status, social distance, and so forth. Refusal utterances between men and women in India are nearly the same, with both genders expressing

refusal directly, firmly, and clearly (to the point).

REFERENCES

- Dyah, Wahyuning. 2015, Permohonan Maaf Dalam Film Ichi Ritoru No Namida : Kajian Kesantunan Berbahasa. Jurnal. Soshum Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora, Vol. 5, No. 2, Juli 2015.
- Davies, J. Roger. Ikeno, Osamu. 2002Tha Japanese Mind. Tokyo : 3A Corporation Press.
- Elika, Ninik. Soelistyowati, Diah. 2021, Analisis Pelanggaran Maksim Sopan Santun Dan Tindak Tutur Direktif Dalam Anime Himouto Umaru Chan. Jurnal. J-Litera : Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya Jepang. Vol. 3 (2) pp. 55-61.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1993. Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik. Jakarta : Universitas Indonesia.
- Matsuura, Kenji. 1994. Kamur Jepang-Indonesia. Jakarta : PT. Gramedia Pustaka
- Novitasari, Dewi. Aryanto, Bayu. Tindak Tutur Penolakan Bahasa Jepang oleh Mantan Kenshuusei (Pekerja Magang di Jepang). Jurnal. Japanese Research on Linguistics, Literature, and Culture. Vol. 2, No. 2 May 2020.
- Saifudin, Akhmad. 2017, Variasi Kesantunan Penggunaan Ungkapan Permohonan Maaf Dalam Bahasa Jepang. Jurnal.
- Searle, J.R. 1971, Speech Acts : An Essay in the Philosophy of language (Oxford Readings in Philosophy), London: Oxford University Press.
- Dewi, F.A.I. 2014. Perbandingan Kesantunan Pada Wacana Tulis Dalam Karya Sastra Dan Non Sastra. Jurnal. Seminar Nasional Prasasti (Pragmatik : Sastra dan Linguistik).