Investigating Students' Strategy on Making Invitation and Refusal to the Invitation at LB LIA Bukittinggi

Dian Eka Putri[1], Hamzah[2], Refnaldi[3]

Graduate Program of English Education at Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

Abstract: *The study aimed to identify the strategies that the students used in making invitation and refusal to the invitation at LB LIA Bukittinggi. The study was conducted at LB LIA Bukittingi. The population of this research was the students from elementary level at LB LIA Bukittinggi. The sample for this study was chosen by using cluster random sampling in which class B was selected. The study revealed that the students used Head Act Interrogative strategy mostly in making invitation and in refusal to the invitation the students used statement of regret and excuse/reason.*

Keywords: Strategy, Invitation, Refusal to Invitation

1. Introduction

English is a compulsory subject in high school. This is evidenced by the inclusion of the subject in the most desiveive exam, the National Examination. Having English in the National Examination ensures that every student in high school learns English. The goal is that students have a good level of understanding and ability to use English. English lessons at school usually focus on student organizational competencies (grammar and textual). They tend to ignore pragmatic competencies (illocutionary and socio-linguistic). Organizational and pragmatic competencies must be in line. The lost will affect the unsuccessful communication.

Pragmatic competence is very important in communication. Students must be made aware that inadequate levels of pragmatic competence will lead to misunderstandings that make the judgment of the other person wrong. Native speakers tend to forgive the grammatical or phonological mistakes that are made but when they find a pragmatic error they will call it unfriendly, rude or rude. Obviously, pragmatic competence plays an important role in communication.

Students need to be introduced to pragmatic competence as early as possible. The earlier they get pragmatic competence, the better they will face it in the future. Pragmatic competencies will help them to communicate smoothly and avoid all sorts of miscommunications and misunderstandings.

Interlanguage is speech produced by language learners when they are between languages. They use the target language (L2) with their first language rule (L1). In this situation, their pragmatic competence is very limited. During their years at school, students will develop their pragmatic competencies. Therefore, making teachers aware of the importance of pragmatic competence is a must. Incorporating pragmatic competencies in classroom activities is something teachers must do. This is only to help students reach a good level of English, in speaking skills to be more specific.

Interlanguage is a situation where language learners develop their language knowledge in the target language. Interlanguage includes features of the student's first language and their target language. Pragmatics between languages are important in second language learning. [11] Describe Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) as a combination of L2 acquisition research and pragmatic research. [12] Defines Interlanguange Pragmatics as "the study of native speakers", understanding and production in the target language. The ILP field is dedicated to studying the behavioral behavior of native speakers.

Many researchers have investigated the ILP field. Studies of ILP show that language learners tend to use pragmatic systems that are different from those used by native speakers [3]. Some studies show that even among advanced L2 students, their pragmatic competence is lacking [13], [15]. Most of the studies above believe that misunderstandings in communication do not occur because of the inability to hear or analyze sentences, but because of failure to understand the attention of the speaker.

Misunderstandings in conversation are very dangerous. This can cause many problems in the future. To avoid misunderstandings, pragmatic knowledge is very important. Invitations and rejection of invitations are two of the many speech acts. They are regularly used in everyday life. It is important to see how students understand the pragmatics of these speech acts. It is also important to look at what strategies students use to convey their invitations and their rejection of invitations to see if they use their L1 or L2 rules and to see if they develop along with their experience using language. Another reason for conducting research is that there is little research that has been done in accordance with the invitation and rejection of the invitation. Most of the research conducted only includes invitations or rejections. It is important to see the flow of the conversation instead of stopping at only one point. Therefore this research needs to be done.

This research was conducted at LB LIA Bukittinggi. The reason for choosing LB LIA is because this institution specializes in learning English. This divides students into

several levels. This uses the Placement Test to divide students into their levels. This institution has also been around for 57 years. These qualities seem to be a good reason for conducting research in pragmatic development between student languages.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Speech Act

Speech acts are used by people to express their actions through speech or speech. [19] defines speech acts as "actions carried out through speech" which can be classified into apologies, complaints, praise, invitations, promises, or requests. When a speaker says something, he hopes that the listener will be affected by his words. For example, when the speaker conveys an invitation to listeners, he wants listeners to take the time to join the party.

There are many types and classifications of speech acts. The author uses the classification of speech acts based on Searle's speech theory. The following explanation presents the theory of speech acts and classification.

2.2 Speech Act Classification by Searle

Searle in [18] states that there are five types of speech acts. They are declarative, representative, expressive, directive, and commissive. That is explained further below.

The first is declarative speech acts. Declarative speech acts when a speaker wants to change the world through his speech. To make the declaration correctly, the speaker must have a special institutional role in a particular context that can be used to express it.

The second is representative speech acts. The purpose of a speaker in doing representation is to commit himself to the belief that the propositional content of speech is true. Statement of facts, statements, conclusions, and descriptions, are examples of this type of speech act. In using representatives, the speaker makes the words fit the world.

The third is expressive speech acts. Expressive is a speech act that states what the speaker feels. This can be caused by something done by the speaker or listener. They state psychological conditions and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, likes or sorrows. Complaints, the main topic of research, is a kind of expressive speech act. The speakers expressed their feelings (disagreement, dissatisfaction, anger, etc.) through the classification of this speech act.

The fourth is directive speech acts. In direction, the speaker tries to make the listener do something. Referrals reveal what the speaker wants. Orders, commands, requests, suggestions are forms of directives.

Fifth is a commissive speech act. When a speaker uses commissives, one can assume that the speaker will take an action in the future. That can be in the form of promises, threats, rejections, and promises. These actions can be carried out by the speaker himself, or by the speaker as a member of the group.

2.3 Invitation Strategy

The act of inviting can be defined as an effort to get the intended person to attend or participate in a particular event or take an action. The speaker is bound to potential future actions that involve allowing or facilitating an event in which the recipient will take the actions stated in the invitation (going to parties, etc.). The speaker advises the listener to consider carrying out some actions and, at the same time, promises the listener that he will approve the actions to be taken by the listener. For example: "Are you free to come to our party this weekend?" In addition, social norms as well as the grammatical structure of language form the invitation speech law.

In general, invitations are basically assigned to directives or illocutionary commissive categories ([1]; [16]). [10] believe that Searle has created a type of rigid illocutionary category in which hybrid illusions have no place. He observed that certain types of speech acts, such as threats, invitations or offers, had been forced into certain categories of illocutionary categories where they were not fully included. To overcome this, he suggested the existence of a hybrid category of direct-directive. [2] also thought that there was a need to create a hybrid category for the ilocution.

The act of speaking can be done either directly or indirectly. It was said that choices made to use direct or indirect speech acts were based on the face management and relative status of the speaker. The choices made by the speaker will encode the social information.

There are several strategies that are usually used by Americans in making invitations. These strategies were collected by Suzuki in his research. strategies are shown in the table below:

Table 1: Invitation strategy by Toshihiko Suzuki (2009)

No.	Strategy Classification
1	Address
2	Supportive move (description of event)
3	Head act (interrogative)
4	Head act (hypothetical + interrogative)
5	Preparatory act (query on h's plan)
6	Head act (hypothetical + declarative)
7	Preparatory act (specification of reason)
8	Head act (declarative)
9	Supportive move (encouragement)
10	Head act (present option)

Address is an expression used to get attention h or to remind h. This includes several different types of speech acts such as vowels, interjections, etc. For example: a) Yellow, b) Hi friends.

Supportive move (description of event) is a strategy used by S to clarify what program you want to attend H. This strategy usually uses future tense in the sentence. The structure will be more commonly used than capital. For example: a) I had a party at my house this Friday. b) I and some girls go to the movies at 5pm.

2.4. Refusal to the Invitation Strategy

Making and rejecting invitations threatens the faces of listeners. invitation is a type of request and thus, by saying it "the speaker violates the listener's claim for freedom of action and freedom of imposition" ([5]). Similarly, rejecting an invitation means "telling the listener something he doesn't want to hear" ([4]). And because it threatens the person needs to be approved. For this reason, the right rejection strategy is needed.

The act of denial of speech occurs when the speaker directly or indirectly says 'no' to the request, or offer. Rejection is an action that threatens the face of the listener / person who offers something because it is against his expectations. This is often realized through indirect strategies. Therefore, a high level of pragmatic competence is needed ([6]).

According to Morkus, three strategies rejected the invitation. First is direct rejection. This can be divided into two: a) performative and b) non-performative. The first is the actual use of the expression of rejection. For example: I refuse. The latter can be divided into two: a) not flat (say no) and b) negative will (I can't or I won't).

Indirect ways to reject invitations are usually found in everyday life. This is used to minimize violations of the positive face of the other person. There are five sub-strategies that indirectly reject invitations: a) reasons / reasons (I am really busy) b) remorse statements (I apologize) c) delays (maybe later) d) hope (I hope I can) e) set the conditions of acceptance (Maybe if you told me beforehand).

The last one is adjunct. This is not a form of rejection, but a modification of rejection that allows the other person to speak to secure his positive face by showing solidarity. This can be divided into three: a) expression of gratitude (thank you very much). b) positive statement of opinion (Very tasty) c) statement of empathy / concern (sorry you have a problem).

3. ResearchMethodology

This research can be included in quantitative descriptive research. There are several characteristics of quantitative research. [8] Defines quantitative research as a type of research that explains a phenomenon by collecting numerical data analyzed in certain statistics. [7] Argue that quantitative research is social research that tries to show the case in the real world. This study reflects the characteristics of Creswell's quantitative research and the definitions proposed by Cohen. In conclusion, quantitative methods are the appropriate method for this study.

To get this research in its journey, the data used for this study was the DCT results from students at Bukittinggi LB LIA which included invitations and rejection of invitations. There are three classes involved in this study, each class contains between 8 and 22 people. Classes are divided based on their level in English. The levels in this study are the basic, middle and high levels.

The data for this study are utterances from students which include inviting and rejecting invitations. To collect data, the author uses DCT. DCT includes various contexts and situations that must be worked out by the participants based on the given situation. There are 6 different contexts with different power relations, social distance and coercion included in role play. In this study the researcher acted as a key instrument.

4. Results and Discussion

To find the strategies used by LB LIA elementary school students in inviting and rejecting invitations, researchers looked into the DCT results conducted by elementary school students and counting. the strategies used by them. The strategy for invitations is based on the invitation strategy table by [17]. The rejection strategy is based on [4]. Below is a table of calculation strategies for inviting elementary school students.

Table 2: Elementary Students' Tally of Elemental Invitation Strategy

Invitation strategy classification	Total tally per number										Total	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Address	7	8	10	10	8	8	8	8	7	6	80	38,5
supportive move (description of event)	4	4			2	2	1	2	1	2	18	8,65
head act (interrogative)	9	6	10	10	10	7	9	9	7	8	85	40,9
head act (hypothetical + interrogative)	2	3				1	1	3	1	1	12	5,77
preparatory act (query on h's plan)											0	0
head act (hypothetical + declaratice)											0	0
supportive move (directions)											0	0
head act (declarative)	1	3	1	1	1	2	1		2	1	132	6,25
supportive move (encouragement)											0	0
head act (present option)											0	0
total											208	100

There were 11 pairs of students in the elementary class who took the test. The table shows that the two most dominant strategies used by students are interrogative actions with and addresses (voc / intj / etc). However, other strategies are used by students with very low percentages, namely: supportive steps (event descriptions); head (declarative) and head (hypothetical + interrogative) actions. The rest of the strategy, such as preparatory action (request on plan h), head (hypothetical + declarative) action, supportive step (direction) supportive step (push) and head action (current option), are not used among students. Primary students only use 5 types of strategies in their invitation. The following paragraph will discuss the strategies used by students.

The most widely used strategies for elementary students to make invitations are interrogative actions. Most students in the elementary usually do and can make invitations. They do not distinguish whether the situation is formal, semi-formal or non-formal. They just throw a do or can and that's it, invitation. not many variations are found in the strategies used by students.

The second most used strategy in making invitations is the address (voc / intj / etc). This strategy is used to act as a diversion from the invited to the invited. Elementarystudents use hi, followed by the name of the person invited, hello, hello followed by the name of the person invited, excused, and sorry.

Head act (declarative) is also used by students in making invitations. Only a few students use this strategy in inviting their friends. Most students who apply this strategy in their invitation to use I want to invite you ... ... in their words.

Table 3: Elementary Students' Tally of Elemental Refusal to the Invitation Strategy

Refusal to the invitation strategy		Total tally per number											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	total	%
Direct	Performative											0	0
	Flat no	1		1	1	3	3	1		2	2	14	5,88
	Negative willingness	7	6	7	5	6	7	5	4	5	2	54	22,7
Indirect	Excuse / reason	5	9	9	8	8	7	10	9	7	8	80	33,6
	Statement of regret	10	10	10	9	7	7	8	11	8	6	86	36,1
	Postponement											0	0
	Wish											0	0
	Setting condition of acceptance											0	0
Adjunct	Expression of gratitude			1	3							4	1,68
	Statement of positive opinion											0	0
	Statement of empathy / concern											0	0
total												238	100

There are three strategies that are often used to reject invitations in the base class. They are: statement of remorse: reason / reason and negative will. then flat does not only get little use among students while other strategies such as: performative, delay, desire, regulation of conditions of acceptance, statement of thanks, statement of positive opinion and empathy / attention statement get 0 percent usage.

The most widely used strategy to reject invitations is a statement of regret. Students use forgiveness at the beginning of their rejection. They use some sorry variations. Some of them only apologized, some apologized combined with the name of the invitee and others I apologized.

The second strategy that is most widely used by elementary students is the excuse / reason. Some students combine excuse / reasons with sorry.

The strategies used by elementary students to make invitations are Head Act (interrogative) and addresses. For rejection of invitations, students use statements of regret, excuse / reason and negative willingness.

5. Conclusion

The result of this research shows that elementary level students at LB LIA Bukittinggi tend to use several strategies in making invitation and refusal to the invitation. In making the invitation the students mostly use head act (interrogative) and address. In refusal to the invitation the students use statement of regret, excuse/reason and negative willingness.

6. Acknowledgement

References

[1] Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.
[2] Bach, K. And Harnish, R. 1979. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.* Cambridge: MIT Press.
[3] Bardovi-Harlig, K & Hartford, B. 2005. Interlanguage Pragmatics: exploring Institutional Talk. London: Routledge.
[4] Bebee, L. M. Takahashi, T. And Ulliss-Weltz, R. 1990. Pragmatic Transfer in ESL pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition.* 8, 165-179.
[5] Blum-Kulka, S. &Olshtain, E. (1984). Request and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 196-213.
[6] Chen, H. J. 1996. *Cross-cultural comparison of Enflish and Chinese metapragmatics in refusal.* Indiana University.
[7] Cohen, L., and Manion, L. 1980. Research Methods in Education, London: Groom Helm Ltd.
[8] Creswell, J.W. 1994. Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches, London: Sage Publications.
[9] Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. 2005. Indirect and Politeness in Mexxican Requests. *Hispanic Linguistic Symposium (pp. 66-8)*
[10] Hancher, M. 1979. The Classification of Cooperative Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society, 8:1-14.*
[11] Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. 1993. Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford: oxford University Press.
[12] Kasper, G. 1998. Variation in Interlanguage Speech Act Realization. Oxford: oford University Press.
[13] Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(2), 149-169.
[14] Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.
[15] Rueda, Y. T. 2006. Developing Pragmatic Competence in a Foreign Language. *Theoretical Discussion Papers.* 169-182
[16] Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.
[17] Suzuki, Toshihiko. 2009. *How Do American University Students "Invite" others?: A Corpus-based Study of Linguistic Strategies for the Speech Act of "Invitations".* 9, 85-106)
[18] Trosborg, A. 1995. *Interlanguage pragmatics: requests,*

complaints and apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
[19] Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics.* Oxford Univeristy Press.

Author Profile

Dian Eka Putri, the first author is a graduate students in UniversitasNegeri Padang majoring in English Education.

Hamzah, the second author is a lecturer in Language and Art Faculty at UniversitasNegeri Padang.

Refnaldi, the third author is a lecturer in Language and Arts Faculty at UnivesitasNegeri Padang