

## 外国語要旨

A Research on Refusal to Invitation: Comparison between native speakers of Japanese and Manado Malay

YOSHIDA Yoshimi

Keywords: refusal, semantic formula, indirect refusal, adjuncts to refusals, information request

This dissertation aims to elucidate the features in communications of refusal to invitation which are conducted among native speakers of Japanese (hereafter “JNS”) and among those of Manado Malay (hereafter MNS) in their respective native language settings and in equal relationships.

The dissertation consists of 5 researches: Research I analyzed speech acts leading to refusals: Research II analyzed “first refusal” observed right after an invitation: Research III analyzed further refusals that appear after “second refusal” which is observed when a re-invitation has occurred: Research IV analyzed each sequence of refusal: Research V described development patterns of discourses of refusal. As the framework of analysis, “semantic formula” was adopted wherewith components in utterances of refusal are classified by functions, not by forms, of expression. Semantic formulas include “direct refusal” (i.e. explicit denial), “indirect refusal” (i.e. excuse, apology), and “adjuncts to refusals” (i.e. “filler”, astonishment). Here, the utterances of refusal were classified into these semantic formulas to be further analyzed.

Research I confirmed that, while JNS showed wide range of semantic formulas such as “information request”, “filler”, “wish”, and “information confirmation”, MNS, in most cases, produced information request.

Analyses in Research II focused on the following three points; the number of used semantic formulas, first-appeared semantic formulas, and appearance patters of the formulas. For first refusal in Research II, MNS used more semantic formulas than JNS did, indicating that MNS use more functions to express refusal than JNS do. As for first-appeared semantic formulas, JNS used indirect refusal and adjuncts to refusals, while most of MNS used adjuncts to refusals. Adjuncts to refusals were, however, delivered in different semantic formulas in

JNS and MNS, namely, the former used “repetition” and “wish”, and the latter “filler” and “astonishment”. Concerning appearance patterns of semantic formulas, the following features were observed: JNS tended to use independent indirect refusal to convey their intention, expecting the inviter to read the refuser’s mind; MNS used direct refusal together with a combination of adjuncts to refusals and indirect refusal that were inserted before and after the direct refusal, or, they just used a series of adjuncts to refusals, thus specifically expressing refusal with the use of multiple functional expressions.

In Research III, which focused on second refusal, most of JNS produced only one refusal, appearance of a second refusal being rare. MNS, on the other hand, had a high appearance ratio of second (or more) refusal, sometimes allowing even a fifth refusal.

Research IV analyzed the sequences of refusals produced by MNS. The result showed that MNS develop refusal discourses with the use of adjuncts to refusals and indirect refusals. The observed sequences included many of the followings: sequences with items in the same category: sequences with decreased use of adjuncts to refusals and increased use of indirect refusals: and sequences with decreased use of direct refusals and increased use of adjuncts to refusals. Decrease in indirect refusals was scarcely observed, which implies that indirect refusal plays a core role in sequence of refusal.

Research V attempted to explicate the sequences of refusal. In the samples which closed discourse only with a first refusal, it was implied that JNS recognized refusal was complete even with few uses of semantic formulas, while MNS did not take it literally when uses of semantic formulas were few, or when a disapproval was not expressed. It was only when expressions of refusal appeared more than 3 times that MNS were observed to converge the discourse by increasing uses of semantic formulas or making persuasion.

From the above data, JNS refuser presented refusal with few words and in brief, demanding the inviter to perceive his/her intention of refusal. It is indicated that the communication style of JNS is, regardless of the content of refusal, to settle acceptance of refusal and converge the conversation as immediately as possible. MNS, on the other hand, conveyed intentions of refusal in more specific expression with the use of multiple functions, showing commitment to the inviter’s approach by frequently posing information request. Even after a presentation of a refusal, MNS refuser produced multiple refusals in response to re-invitations from the inviter. Then, MNS make a sequence of refusals with a combination of adjuncts to refusals and indirect refusal, the latter playing a core role, and in the end, they transmit the intention of refusal and converge the discourse either by persuasion or by

increased use of semantic formulas.

The significance of this research is that its analyses cover, beyond mere utterances of refusal, speech acts that preceded refusal, and sequences and development patterns of refusal, thus depicting refusal comprehensibly to create new possible field in contrastive research. JNS and MNS have respective features in the flow of refusal communication, and it is indicated that, to facilitate smooth intercultural communication, both parties need to be aware of the difference when they are engaged in discourses.