EXPRESSIONS OF DISAGREEMENT IN ENGLISH BY INDONESIAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AND AUSTRALIAN LEARNERS

Elya Aprilia Ramadhani

ABSTRAK

Penelitian yang berjudul "Ekspresi Ketidaksetujuan dalam bahasa Inggris oleh Mahasiswa Indonesia dan Mahasiswa Australia ini bertujuan untuk mempelajari dan membandingkan persamaan dan perbedaan ekspresi ketidaksetujuan oleh mahasiswa Indonesia dan penutur asli bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini juga menggali penggunaan *semantic formulae* sebagai strategi yang digunakan oleh kedua penutur terhadap lawan bicara dengan dipengaruhi oleh tingkat keakraban, status, dan usia. Untuk mengumpulkan data, digunakan kuisioner dalam bentuk DCT (Discourse Completion Task) dengan melibatkan 40 responden, terdiri dari mahasiswa sastra Inggris UGM, mahasiswa Australia yang sedang belajar di INCULS, FIB, UGM. Data yang terkumpul selanjutnya dianalisa menggunakan teori pengelompokan Beebe. Kedua kelompok penutur memiliki beberapa persamaan dan perbedaaan dalam mengekspresikan ketidaksetujuan. Kedua kelompok penutur menggunakan satu set strategi yang hampir sama dalam penggunaan formula semantik tetapi keduanya berbeda dalam hal rangking dan frekuensi dari formula semantik yang digunakan. Terdapat beberapa bukti mengenai formula semantik yang sering muncul, rangking serta frekuensi yang digunakan dalam kaitannya dengan tingkat keakraban, perbedaan status dan perbedaan umur.

Kata kunci : ketidaksetujuan, formula semantik, tindak tutur, kesopanan, budaya

ABSTRACT

This research entitled "Expressions of Disagreement in English by Indonesian learners of English and Australian learners" intends to study and compare the similarity and difference between Indonesians and native speakers of English in expressing disagreements. This research also examines the choice of semantic formulae that both groups used toward different interlocutors influenced by familiarity, status and age. To collect data, questionnaires in the form of DCT (Discourse Completion Task) are used. This research involves 40 respondents consisting of 20 Indonesian students of English Department, 20 Australian students from Indonesian Language and Culture Learning Service (INCULS) program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, UGM. The data are analyzed by using Beebe's Classification. Both groups share some similarities and differences in expressing disagreements. Both groups employ a similar set of strategy (semantic formulae) but they differ from each other in the ranks and frequencies of semantic formulae used. There are evidences of mostly semantic formulae used, ranks and frequencies of those in relation to the degree of familiarity, status difference and age difference.

Keywords: disagreement, semantic formulae, speech act, politeness, culture

INTRODUCTION

Language as a communication tool plays a significant role which could not be ignored in human's life. Language is important because it enables humans to communicate each other so that one can relay the message to the other people. Successful communication requires the understanding of language use and also the knowledge of social norms, social values and relations between individuals. Those seem crucial because the lack of those norms and values may cause impoliteness, misinterpretation, cultural shock, and even communication breakdown.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which studies how language is used for communication within a certain context. One of its concerns is speech act. Native speakers communicate to each other with different purposes and they use speech acts in certain context and situation. Every speech act has its own function for example speech acts for the purpose of apologizing, requesting, refusing, offering, etc.

Among those speech acts, speech act of disagreeing is interesting to study since it is regularly used and it may cause some negative reactions or feeling in interpersonal communication. Expressions of disagreement are used when people have different ideas or opinions about the arguments, opinions, or views figured by other speakers. In everyday life native speakers talk, discuss, and assess things or events. Their interlocutors may agree or disagree with them.

When people express disagreement they will employ some strategy since they have to consider politeness and interlocutor's feeling. In stating disagreement, they also have to take into account some variables such as social status, family relation which will affect their choice of words, what they say and how they say it. In particular contexts, speakers tend to use the combination of some speech acts and certain strategies. So, an expression of disagreement may have one or more speech act. Semantic formulae as quoted in Nadar (2009) refers to "the means by which a particular speech act is accomplished in terms of primary content of an utterance, such as reason, an explanation, or an alternative (Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1991:48, following Fraser, 1981; Olshtain and Cohen,1983; Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz,1990)

The understanding of cultural differences is also important for language users. Indonesian culture and culture of English native speakers differ not only in the way of life, of thinking but also ways of saying things or using language (Nadar, 2009). The influence of culture can also be seen through the way different native speakers state their disagreement to their interlocutor. This research is intended to investigate patterns of disagreement in terms of choice of semantic formulae used by Indonesian learners of English and Australian learners. It focuses on the choice of semantic formulae used in disagreements by two groups of subjects, Indonesian learners of English and Australian learners. The choice of semantic formula is discussed in term how often a particular semantic formulae used in such categories affected by familiarity, status difference and age difference.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In a conversation, speaker cannot relay his message unless the hearer cooperates

with him. Grice (1975: 45) states that every participant of an utterance should give contribution in particular level needed and which are suitable with the goal expected. Grice proposes that in ordinary conversation, speakers and hearers share a cooperative principle. Relating to politeness Leech (1983: 31) stated that politeness concerns a relation between two participants who called self and other. That is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

Politeness strategies relate to face of image possessed by everybody includes negative face and positive face (Brown and Levinson 1987). They argue that face, the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserve, rights to non distraction-i.e. to freedom of action and freedom of imposition. (b) Positive face: the positive consistent self image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants. "

People take to preserve both kinds of face, for themselves and the people they interact with, add up to politeness. In fact, any speech act may impose on this sense, and therefore it is called Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). Brown and Levinson (1978) also consider disagreement a highly face threatening speech act that requires indirect delivery.

Disagreement is defined as having different idea or opinion about something and arguing slightly. Searle (1969) argues that expression of disagreement belongs to the illocutionary act of expressive because dis-

agreement comes up as a result of psychological state. Sacks (1973) and Pomerantz (1984) as quoted in Chen (2009) stated that the act of disagreement is usually regarded as a dispreferred action compared with agreement as a preferred since disagreement may jeopardize interpersonal relationship while agreeing with one another can be supportive, reinforcing and sociable. Heritage (1984) as quoted in Chen (2009) argued that refusal and disagreement are largely destructive of social solidarity.

Expression of disagreement is threatening positive face act by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not care about the hearer's feeling, wants, etc. (S indicates that he thinks H is wrong or misguided or unreasonable about some issues, such wrongness being associated with disapproval).

In direct speech acts, the speaker says what she/he means while in indirect speech acts, the speaker means more than she/he says. Speakers perform one illocutionary act implicitly by way of performing another illocutionary act explicitly. Relating to the politeness strategies, instead of saying "I disagree", speaker could save the hearer's face by using indirect speech act. The form of speech acts which are usually used to perform disagreement are term of address, prohibition, reason, suggestion, apology, opinion, etc.

PREVIOUS STUDY

Mulyani (2009) conducted a research on how family relation and social status influence Indonesian undergraduate students in expressing disagreement with their interlocutor. The data were gained from DCT which provides several context of situational. The sub-

jects were students of non-English Department and English Department Students. As the conclusion, both students of non-English department and English department consider about the influence social status and family relation and both of them tend to used indirect disagreement. English students also tend to use more single speech act that non-English. Both of them showed some similarity that is they tend to apply more principle and strategies towards interlocutor with higher status while they tend to be more straightforward towards older interlocutor.

THE STUDY

Focuses on two different native speaker of language, Indonesians and Australians as participant both undergraduate ranging in age from 19-25 years old, this research involved 40 participants consisting of 20 Indonesian learners of English and 20 Australian learners. All Indonesian learners were students of English Department 2008 ranging in TOEFL score from 500-550 and GPA of 3.00-3.60. They were selected since the consideration that they have studied English as their major and they have a good proficiency of English. All of Australian learners were students of Monash University 2010 in Indonesian Language and Culture Learning Service (INCULS) program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, UGM.

The DCT has 10 situations each of has variable of familiarity, status difference and age difference. Participants were asked to give their response to the certain situation given. The method of sampling focuses on the use of purposive sampling in which the included groups are selected according to specific characteristics that are considered to

be important as related to vulnerability. www. acaps.org

This study is intended to identify the semantic formulae used for disagreement that both Indonesians and natives English used. There must be cross cultural differences which cause the way Indonesians and natives English differ in stating disagreement since both of them have different background culture especially in performing disagreement relating to the politeness. By means that this research focuses on strategies of disagreement, the choice, forms and contents were analyzed. Therefore this research adapts the theory of speech act refusal classification proposed by Beebe et all (1990) in consideration that this research also takes a speech act as its concern.

The data analysis was conducted based on the research questions, objectives, and theoretical base. The patterns of disagreement expressions were analyzed in terms of semantic formulae and politeness strategies. The data from questionnaire were coded, categorized, classified, counted and analyzed. The analysis used qualitative method to see the patterns, similarity and difference. The results were extracted to qualitative conclusion.

The analysis is done by taking the data and then put them into categories according to Beebe's classification. The example is as follows:

*I am sorry to hear **(SR)** but I have read all about this college and from my findings I am very pleased with his reputation. **(SE)** What makes you believe it is not good? **(SAC)***

[SR-SE-SAC] means the code for order semantic used. From the data above, the order

of semantic formulae is: statement of regret, statement of specific reason for non compliance, statement of asking for clarification.

CHOICE OF SEMANTIC FORMULAE IN OVERALL

Both Indonesian learners of English (ILE) and Australian learners (AL) show different results on the amount of data gained. Each groups of subject are expected to require 200 data from the questionnaire. ILE show less data by producing 166 data and AL show more data by producing 184 data. However, in term of semantic formulae used, ILE provide greater amount of semantic formulae than AL (527 single semantic formulae for ILE and 498 single semantic formulae for AL). In their use of semantic formulae as strategy of making disagreement ILE exceed AL.

As illustrated in Table 1, two groups use *statement of specific reason for non compliance* as most frequently semantic formulae used. However, AL make more *statement of specific reason for non compliance* than ILE to disagree with their interlocutors.

Australian native speakers of English use *statement of asking clarification* as second most frequently, while native speakers of Indonesian use *term of address* in the second rank. In the third rank, AL do not use *statement of regret* as frequently as ILE but AL use more *statement of negative feeling* than ILE. Moreover, in making *suggestions,* both AL and ILE put these expressions as their fourth rank. ILE are closer to AL in their use of *statement of self defense.* Similarly, in *offering alternative*, AL and ILE have closer frequency (4.21% for AL and 4.10% for ILE). The use of *expression of positive opinion or feeling* appears more frequently in AL than ILE while in the use of *statement of negative opinion or feeling*; both of them have closer frequency.

THE SIMILARITIES OF SEMANTIC FORMULAE USED BY INDONESIAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AND AUSTRALIAN LEARNERS

Disagreement belongs to FTAs (Face Threatening Acts) in which the speakers need some strategy (semantic formulae) to state

Table 1 Rank and frequency of most frequently used semantic formulae

Rank	AL	ILE
1	Statement of specific reason for non compliance (31.72%)	Statement of specific reason for non compliance (26.57%)
2	Statement of asking for clarification (9.32%)	Terms of address (13.85%)
3	Statement of negative feeling (6.02%)	Statement of regret (8.35%)
4	Suggestion (5.42%)	Suggestions (6.26%)
5	Statement of self defense (4.81%)	Statement of negative feeling (5.88%)
6	Statement of principle (4.41%)	Statement of self defense (5.69%)
7	Offer alternative (4.21%)	Offer alternative (4.17%)
8	Expression of positive opinion/feeling (4.01%)	Directive statement (3.23%)
9	Statement of philosophy (3.21%)	Statement of asking for clarification (2.85%)

these expressions. In choosing these strategies, there were a lot of things to be considered as familiarity, status, age of the interlocutors and also cultural background. From the previous sections, some similarity and difference are found between the two groups of AL and ILE.

In stating disagreement, AL and ILE have some similarity in their use of semantic formulae. Both AL and ILE in the amount of semantic formulae number used, they have similar pattern. First, in relation to the familiarity, the similarity appears in their use of semantic formulae as strategy to deliver disagreement. The amount of semantic formulae number used seems to be clearly dependent on familiarity such that when interlocutors' status changes from familiar to unfamiliar, both AL and ILE tend to use less number of semantic formulae that means less strategy were used to unfamiliar interlocutors (FR>UFR).

Second, in relation to the status of interlocutors, again, ILE are closer to AL in their amount of semantic formulae number used. Ranging from to higher status interlocutors, to equal status interlocutors, and to lower status of interlocutors, both AL and ILE apply more semantic formulae to interlocutors of higher status, followed by less use of semantic formulae to interlocutors of lower status then used the least number of semantic formulae to interlocutors of equal status (IHS>IES<ILS). Third, in relation to interlocutors' age, same pattern is also applied by AL and ILE in term of amount of semantic formulae number used. AL like ILE, use more semantic formulae as strategy in stating disagreement to older interlocutors, while to younger interlocutors, they tend to use fewer semantic formulae (older>younger).

In overall choice of semantic formulae used by AL and ILE both groups of subjects show a similar usage of strategy particularly the pattern of semantic formulae used though the frequency used in each semantic formula is different. To indicate disagreements, both AL and ILE use *statement of unwillingness, statement of inability, statement of specific reason for non compliance, statement of principle, statement of philosophy, statement of self defense, statement of negative feeling, and statement of asking for clarification* while to minimize their disagreement, both of them use *statement of regret, suggestions, offer alternative, statement of acceptance, expression of positive feeling or opinion, statement of gratitude, and terms of address*. Even for certain semantic formulae, ILE are closer to AL in the frequency use. It seems that when AL and ILE face certain situations in which they cannot accomplish full agreement, they tend to deliver their disagreement but at the same time, they also use some strategy to minimize their disagreement so that they can maintain the harmonious relationship.

Moreover, both AL and ILE are affected to some extent by familiarity, status, and age of the interlocutors. In relation to some extent by familiarity, to unfamiliar interlocutors, AL are closer to ILE in their use of *statement of specific reason for non compliance,* that is both of them use more reasons to show that they disagree because had clear reasons. Similarly, they also use more *suggestions* and *offer alternative* to unfamiliar interlocutors. Further, to unfamiliar interlocutors, AL and ILE show an increase in their use of *statement of acceptance* and *statement of limited acceptance*.

On the other hand, both AL and ILE when dealing with familiar interlocutors, they tend

to use more *statement of principle* and *statement of philosophy* in sense that they try to show disagreement without having direct reference to their interlocutors. In showing respect, AL like ILE tend to use more *statement of positive feeling or opinion* and *terms of address* to familiar interlocutors. In making *statement of self defense*, both AL and ILE tend to use these expressions frequently to familiar interlocutors.

For the second variable used, that is status of interlocutors, ILE are closer to AL in their pattern of certain semantic formulae ranging from higher status interlocutors to lower status interlocutors. In their use of *statement of specific reason for non compliance*, both AL and ILE show an increase (IHS<IES<ILS) while in making *suggestions,* a similar pattern is used by AL and ILE as appears in pattern of IHS< IES>ILS which means that both AL and ILE, similarly, use *suggestions* most frequently to equal status interlocutors. The use of *statement of negative feeling* in both AL and ILE show an increase that is to higher status of interlocutors, both of the group used fewer *statement of negative feeling.* When stating disagreement to higher status interlocutors, both AL and ILE also use *statement of self defense* frequently while to equal and lower status interlocutors they do not use those expressions. Further, to higher status interlocutors, ILE are closer to AL in their use of *statement of acceptance* by using those expressions more frequently. To lower status interlocutors, ILE like AL use *hedging* more frequently than to higher status interlocutors.

Furthermore, in relation to age of interlocutors, AL and ILE show some similarity. To older interlocutors, both of groups show more respect by using *statement of regret*, *statement of gratitude* and *terms of address* more frequently. Both AL and ILE use *statement of principle* and *statement of philosophy* to older interlocutors which they do not used to younger interlocutors. To state disagreement, all groups tend to be more direct to younger interlocutors by using *statement of unwillingness* and *statement of specific reason for non compliance* more frequently.

In addition, to younger interlocutors, AL is similar to ILE by using *suggestions* and *offer alternative* more frequently. Further, both AL and ILE also tend to use *conditional offer* more frequently to younger interlocutors. It seems that when disagreeing to younger interlocutors, both AL and ILE simply show their concern to younger interlocutors.

It can be concluded that the similarity of disagreement made by AL and ILE appeared in their use of semantic formulae pattern. The same pattern can be seen in such overall use of semantic formulae particularly in the amount of semantic formulae number and usage pattern of semantic formulae although in a carefully look, both of them have different frequency in their usage of semantic formulae.

THE DIFFERENCES OF SEMANTIC FORMULAE USED BY INDONESIAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AND AUSTRALIAN LEARNERS

In terms of choice of semantic formulae, AL differ from ILE particularly in their rank and frequency of semantic formulae used. The prominent difference appears in their frequency use of *statement of regret, statement of principle, statement of philosophy, expres-*

sion of positive feeling or opinion, statement of gratitude, terms of address and *statement of asking for clarification.* ILE tend to use *statement of regret, statement of gratitude and terms of address* more frequently compared to AL. However, AL exceed ILE in their use of *statement of principle, statement of philosophy, expression of positive feeling or opinion* and *statement of asking for clarification*.

In overall use, ILE exceed AL in their use of *statement of regret*. ILE use *regrets* more frequently compared to AL. Relating to familiarity, ILE use more *statement of regret* to unfamiliar interlocutors and use fewer of those statements to familiar interlocutors while AL seemed not to show much difference that is they apply the same frequency of *regrets* either to familiar or unfamiliar interlocutors.

In relation to status of interlocutors (ranging from higher to lower status interlocutors) ILE differ from AL in their frequency use of *regret*. While ILE show a decrease use, AL use *regrets* in equal frequency to interlocutors of higher status and lower status then show less use of those expressions to interlocutors of equal status.

Moreover, ILE use *statement of gratitude* more frequently in comparison with AL. In relation to status of interlocutors, AL differ from ILE that is while ILE use *statement of gratitude* most frequently to higher status of interlocutors, AL do not use those expressions in stating their disagreement to interlocutors of different status. Similarly, in their use of *terms of address*, ILE show a greater frequency than AL. In relation to status of interlocutors, ILE show a decrease that is they tend to use *terms of address* more frequently to higher status interlocutors while AL do not use these expression to interlocutors of different status.

On the other hand, in using *statement of principle and statement of philosophy*, AL show a greater use of those expressions compared to ILE. The difference can be seen clearly in relation to status of interlocutors. AL use *statement of principle* most frequently to higher status interlocutors while ILE use those statements most frequently to equal status interlocutors. Next, in their use of *statement of philosophy*, AL use those statements most frequently to equal status interlocutors while ILE do not use those statements in stating disagreement to interlocutors of different status.

Further, in their use of *expression of positive feeling or opinion,* AL use those expressions more frequently than ILE. In relation to some extent by status of interlocutors, whereas AL use *expression of positive feeling or opinion* most frequently to higher status interlocutors, followed by less use to lower status interlocutors and least use to equal status interlocutors, ILE use these expressions most frequently to lower status interlocutors, followed by less use to higher status of interlocutors. ILE do not use *expression of positive feeling or opinion* to interlocutors of equal status.

In overall use, AL exceed ILE in their use of *statement of asking for clarification*. AL use these expressions more frequently compared with ILE. In relation to some extent by status of interlocutors, AL use *statement of asking for clarification* most frequently to higher status interlocutors while ILE do not show much difference in their use of these expressions to different status of interlocutors. In other hand, relating to age of interlocutors, AL do not show much difference in their use of these expres-

sions to different age of interlocutors while ILE use *statement of asking for clarification* more frequently to younger interlocutors.

ILE also differ from AL in their use of forms and contents of certain semantic formulae to state their disagreement. In using *statement of asking for clarification,* AL exceed ILE by using these expressions more frequently. These expressions can be seen through AL use of words such as "really?", "how come?", "why?", "how could?" ,have you?" which are used also by ILE. Then both AL and ILE use longer *statement of asking for clarification.* ILE prefer to use such expressions of "What is the problem?", "what you mention about?" while AL prefer to use "what makes you say that?", "what's wrong with it?", why don't you think it's not good?".

Similarly, in their use of *statement of regret*, AL and ILE are similar in their use of expressions "sorry", "I am sorry". However, ILE tend to have more varied expressions of regret such as "excuse me", "forgive me", "pardon me", "apologize me" even longer expressions such as " I want to say sorry before", "I beg your pardon" which AL do not use. In making *suggestion,* ILE tend to use *suggestion* more frequently than AL. The data show that both group similarly use "it is better…", "it would be better…","it is best…","you should…". However, AL and ILE differed in that ILE used "I guess it would…","you can…","you might…", while AL used "I suggest…","you need…","you would…","can you…". Sometimes, both AL and ILE also avoid to mention pronoun "you" in their *suggestion* as in ILE use "it is a good way…","… are better ways" while AL use"maybe there is…". Another difference appears in ILE used "how

about.., perhaps?" as in "How about stopping in the next station and taking bus, perhaps?" and "why don't you..?", while AL do not make suggestion in this way.

Act of disagreeing belongs to FTAs since expression of disagreement is threatening positive face act by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not care about the hearer's feeling, wants, etc. ILE are closer to AL in the frequency use of *statement of negative feeling*. An expression such as "you are wrong" is used for both AL and ILE. However, unlike AL, ILE do not use pronoun "I" to express *negative opinion or feeling* as in "I wouldn't say that". ILE tend to use pronoun "you" such as "you should not…" as in "you should not do that" and "you can't do that". Some adjectives with negative tendency also exist in AL such as "disgusting" and "ridiculous" as in "That is disgusting!", "That is ridiculous!" which do not exist in ILE but ILE used adjectives of "not appropriate", "irrational", and "unnecessary" instead.

It can be concluded that in making disagreement, the differences between AL and ILE appear in their choice, forms and contents of semantic formulae. In terms of choice of semantic formulae, AL differ from ILE particularly in their frequency of semantic formulae used. Different influence also appears between ILE and AL in relation to some extent by familiarity, status and age of interlocutors.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this research show that ILE and AL are similar in their production of disagreements that is they prefer to use strategy which has been described as semantic formulae. The two groups of subjects realize

the need to give some strategies when dealing with disagreement which belongs to face threatening acts (FTAs). As the result, most of subjects from the two groups similarly prefer to use of combination of certain semantic formulae in stating their disagreements.

Another similarity appears in the fact that ILE and AL share the same set of strategy (semantic formulae usage pattern) although they differ from each other in the ranks and frequencies of semantic formulae used. To indicate disagreements, both AL and ILE use *statement of unwillingness, statement of inability, statement of specific reason for non compliance, statement of principle, statement of philosophy, statement of self defense, statement of negative feeling, and statement of asking for clarification* while to minimize their disagreement, both of them use *statement of regret, suggestions, offer alternative, statement of acceptance, expression of positive feeling or opinion, statement of gratitude, and terms of address*.

ILE differ from AL in terms of ranks and frequency of semantic formulae used. It can be seen that *statement of specific reason for non compliance* dominates the ranks in both groups followed by *terms of address, statement of regret, suggestions* for ILE, while *statement of asking for clarification, statement of negative feeling* and *suggestions* for AL.

Both ILE and AL are also affected to some extent by familiarity, status difference and age difference although the two groups tend to show their consideration to these variables in different ways. In certain semantic formulae used, both ILE and AL tend to be strongly affected by familiarity. Meanwhile, AL tend to be less strongly affected by status of interlocu-

tors as compared to ILE. Further, in relation to age difference, both AL and ILE tend to be equally affected. In most situations, the assessment of each variable given by ILE and AL appear to be different.

Politeness becomes the next issue in which ILE differ from AL. In stating disagreement, both ILE and AL feel the need to give more *statement of specific reason for non compliance* as clear excuses of what makes them disagree. However, ILE employs *statement of regret* and *terms of address* more frequently that AL do. In such situations when ILE do have to make disagreement, they may bring out their disagreement along with *statement of regret*, and *terms of address* as their part of politeness strategy. Meanwhile, unlike ILE, AL use more *statement of asking for clarification* and *statement of negative feeling* to reinforce their disagreement. In terms of forms and contents, ILE are closer to AL through their use of modals in the past forms, length of utterance as intentions in considering politeness.

Nevertheless, this research does not support the general assumption that AL are less polite than ILE in stating disagreement. In some cases, particularly when disagreeing to unfamiliar interlocutors, the contrary appears as ILE show less respect to unfamiliar interlocutors by using more *statement of negative feeling* and using more *statement of self defense* to interlocutors of higher status.

Later, it should be noted that this research is limited in some ways. Further research is therefore, necessary to employ more data, wider scope, and deeper analysis including more variable combined with interviews may provide a greater insight as to why the

speaker state disagreement in such way they did. The DCT forms can not reflect detailed sound intonations and face expression of the respondents so that face to face interactions supposed to be better.

Despite the limited scope, however, this research may still be used as a basis for some recommendation. The understanding of pragmatics competence as a part of communication should be given more portions especially those of which belong to face threatening acts which occur in different culture. It will be useful for students to know the important part of cultural identity to prevent communication from some failure and misunderstanding.

REFERENCES

Akmajian, Adrain. 1979. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication.* London: MIT Press.

Austin, J.L. 1962*. How to Do Things With Words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Burhanudin, Ahmad. 2006. "A Comparative Study on Refusals in English by Indonesians Learners and Native Speakers of English ." *Unpublished Material.*

Chen, Miao-tzu. 2006. *An Interlanguage Study of The Speech Act of Disagreement made by Chinese EFL Speakers in Taiwan.* http://elt-china.org/. 18 May 2011.

Crystal, David. 1980. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* www.universaltheacher.org.uk/lang/pragmatics.htm. 29 May 2011.

Finegan, Edward. 1992. *Language, its Structure and Use.* Marrickville: Harcout Brace Jovanovich Group Ply Ltd.

Geoffrey, Leech. 1993 *Principle of Pragmatics.* New York: Longman.

http://www.holah.karoo.net/quantitativequalitative.htm. 1 January 2012.

Huong, Kieu Thi Thu. 2006. http://tainguyenso.vnu.edu.vn/jspui/bitstream. 18 May 2011.

Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics-An Introduction.* Cambridge Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher.

Liang, Guodong and Han Jing. 2005. *A Contrastive Study on Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American English and Mandarin Chinese.* www.scribd.com. 18 May 2011.

Mulyani, Apri. 2009. "Expressions of Disagreement Made by The English Department and Non English Department Student: a Pragmatics Study." *Unpublished Material.*

Nadar, F.X. 2009. *Investigating Sociopragmatics and Cultural Transfer in the Production of Refusals.* Yogyakarta: Unit Penerbitan Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, UGM.

Nadar, F.X. 2009. *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Rasekh, Vahid Parvaresh and Abbas Eslami. 2009. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature andCulture..* http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol/11/iss4/11. May 2011.

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

Searle, John. 1975. *Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds). Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press.

Verschueren, Jeff. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics.* London: Arnold.

www.acaps.org. 10 April 2012.

Xuehua, Wu. 2006. "A Study of Strategy Use in Showing Agreement and Disagreement to Others Opinion." *Celea Journal*: 7-29.