

## THE SPEECH ACTS OF REFUSING FOOD ON TELEVISION SERIES “TETANGGA MASA GITU?”

**Farah Anjanillah**

Keminggris.id

*farah.anjanillah@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

In interpersonal communication, the speaker might use numerous speech acts to convey their intended meaning due to a particular reason. Under the domain of pragmatics, the researcher was attracted to explore the use of speech acts for refusing food. Hence, this study investigates the types of speech acts of refusing food performed by the characters on the TV series entitled “*Tetangga Masa Gitu?*” and uncovers the aspects underlying the use of speech acts. In terms of approach, this inquiry applied a descriptive qualitative method. In undergoing the analysis, the researcher employed Austin’s (1962), Searle’s (1976), Wijana’s (1996), and Parker’s & Riley’s (2014) notions on the speech acts types. To find out the aspects underlying the speech acts usage, the researcher implemented speech situation aspects and politeness maxims as proposed by Leech (1983) as well as Brown’s and Levinson’s politeness parameters (1987). The data were the utterances indicating speech act to refuse food and the underlying aspects. The data were obtained through “*Tetangga Masa Gitu?*” TV series. The results exhibit that the characters used direct non-literal and indirect non-literal speech act to refuse food. Meanwhile, the aspects propelling speech acts are politeness, distance, ranking of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987), and culture (Leech, 1983).

**Keywords:** speech acts, politeness, utterances, speech situation aspects, pragmatics.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Referring to Firth, Wijana (1996) explicated that a linguistic analysis should also take into account the situational context when the communication occurs to comprehend the speaker’s meaning. Therefore, Wijana (1996) pointed out that pragmatics refers to a study investigating a language structure externally. Thus, it deals with how a language meaning is integral with context (Wijana, 1996; Genetti, 2014; Parker & Riley, 2014; Rohmadi, 2017). In other words, pragmatics could be conceived as a context-dependent analysis (Genetti, 2014).

Pertaining to the concept of language and context in pragmatics, an utterance could be used to deliver an intention or even several intentions through various speech acts

(Rohmadi, 2017). Yule (1996, 2010) stated that when an utterance could lead to a particular type of action, it is called a speech act. A speech act is not always delivered straightforwardly, yet it could also be stated implicitly for some reason. Considering the interpersonal relationship, people often use speech acts by either fulfilling or violating the cooperative and politeness principle depending on the context (Wijana, 1996).

Standing from that point, the researcher was intrigued to answer two overarching problems: 1) "What are the types of speech acts used for refusing food on the TV series *"Tetangga Masa Gitu?"* and 2) "What are the facets which underlie the use of speech acts for refusing food?". The researcher considered it an interesting topic since, in the series, Bintang Howard Bornstein's character could not cook and always made unappetizing dishes. However, her IQ is 186 and she has graduated from Harvard University. She is Bastian's wife. Regardless of her weakness for not cooking well, her husband and her neighbor always attempt not to offend her feeling.

There have been growing interests in the grand theme of speech acts in literary works such as the studies carried out by Altikriti (2011); Dewi (2013); Muntiningsih (2013); Made et al. (2014); Oktadistio et al. (2018). Altikriti (2011) explored and compared speech acts in three short stories. Meanwhile, Dewi (2013) examined the functions of direct literal speech act in "Death Note" movie. Then, Muntiningsih (2013) further explored indirect speech acts in a novel by discussing felicity conditions to enrich the analysis. Similar to Alkitri (2011), Made et al (2014) also classified the types of speech acts found in "Habibie Ainun" movie. However, they elaborated the existing inquiry by discussing the reasons underlying the use of speech acts. Ultimately, the recent study which has been undertaken by Oktadistio et al (2018) concentrated on examining direct and indirect speech acts on a movie script.

It is noteworthy that those previous inquiries did not limit the speech act investigation under a specific topic. Thus, this study has filled this gap by specifying the topic of the speech acts analysis in terms of refusing food. Moreover, taking into account that only one inquiry among the existing studies explicating the motives underlying the use of speech acts, hence this point is still worth exploring. As the result, the present study endeavors to enrich and expand the former analyses by employing Leech's politeness maxims and speech situation aspects (1983) as well as Brown's and Levinson's politeness parameter (1987). The rationale is that the researcher postulates that the speaker's choice on using speech act is possibly underlain by politeness facet and other external factors such as setting, participant and so forth. Besides, none of those existing inquiries analyzed the external features underpinning the meaning behind the speech acts such as facial expression, gestures and intonation. Therefore, the present study has successfully filled this lacuna by utilizing external features to interpret the speech acts.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Speech Act

Crystal (2008) defined the terminology of speech act as a notion discussing how the utterances in the interpersonal interaction represent the speaker's behavior towards the addressee. Referring to Searle (1976), Parker & Riley (2014) explicated that there are six major categories of illocutionary acts: 1) representative refers to an utterance bonding the speaker to the truth of what he/she has said. For instance, admitting, stating, predicting, asserting, confessing, concluding, notifying, and so forth. 2) directive means an utterance for asking the addressee to do an action such as forbidding, advising, requesting, recommending, ordering, warning, insisting, etc. 3) question is defined as an utterance for asking information such as inquiring and asking. 4) commissive deals with an utterance bonding the speaker to commit anything he/she has said in the future. For example, offering, promising, guaranteeing, vowing, betting, volunteering, pledging, etc. 5) expressive refers to an utterance for expressing the emotion of the speaker, such as welcoming, thanking, condoling, apologizing, objecting, deploring, congratulating, etc. 6) declaration is an utterance for creating a new situation or status. For instance, resigning, appointing, arresting, naming, excommunicating, baptizing, etc.

### The Types of Speech Act

Austin (1962) categorized speech acts into several types such as direct vs indirect and literal vs non-literal speech act. When there is a conformity between the syntactic form (declarative, interrogative or imperative) and the communicative function or illocutionary force (statement, question or command/request), it belongs to the direct speech act (Yule, 1996, 2010; Parker & Riley, 2014). In other word, it involves a direct relation between the structure and function (Yule, 1996). For instance, when an interrogative utterance is used to ask a question, it is called as direct speech act. On the contrary, when there is unconformity between the sentence type and the illocutionary force, it is considered as indirect speech (Rohmadi, 2017). To illustrate, when a declarative is used to command the hearer to do something, it is classified as indirect speech act (Yule, 1996). Meanwhile, an utterance is regarded as literal speech act when what the speaker says is exactly what he/she means (Wijana, 1996). In contrast, when what the speaker means is in paradox with his/her utterance, it belongs to non-literal speech act (Wijana, 1996; Parker & Riley, 2014; Rohmadi, 2017).

For further extent, Wijana (1996) intersected those types of speech acts into more specific categories. The first type is that the direct literal speech act. It is a speech act in which the utterance construction's meaning is the same as the speaker's intention (Wijana, 1996). By way for illustration, when the utterance "*what time is it?*" is used to ask the time at that moment, thus, it belongs to direct literal speech act. This is because the syntactic form is an interrogative sentence and the communicative function is a question (Wijana, 1996). The second type is that the indirect literal speech act. It deals with the unconformity between the syntactic form and the function, yet the speaker's intention is in line with the

meaning of the words construction (Wijana, 1996). For instance, a mother says to her daughter *"the floor is dirty"*. Notwithstanding the form is a declarative sentence, it functions as an imperative. Moreover, the utterance's meaning strongly demonstrates the speaker's intention, in which to ask the hearer to sweep the floor because the floor is literally dirty. Hence, that utterance is categorized as indirect literal speech act.

Next, the direct non-literal speech act refers to the conformity between the syntactic form and the function, but the speaker's meaning is different from the words composition's meaning (Wijana, 1996). For example, when we have a friend who cannot sing well and we say *"your voice is good"*, actually the intended meaning is vice-versa. Therefore, the speaker's intention is in paradox with the utterance's meaning (Wijana, 1996). Nevertheless, taking into account that the utterance above belongs to declarative sentence and is used to give a statement, thus, there is a direct relation between the syntactic type and the communicative function (Wijana, 1996; Yule, 1996). Hence, it is classified as direct non-literal speech.

Finally, the indirect non-literal speech act deals with the unconformity among the syntactic form, the function as well as the speaker's intended meaning (Wijana, 1996). By way for illustration, when a mother said to her daughter *"the floor is really clean"* with a particular intonation, it might exhibit indirect non-literal speech act. This is because the syntactic form is declarative, but the function is actually an imperative. Furthermore, there is a contradictory between the speaker's intention and the composed utterance's meaning (Wijana, 1996). In other word, the speaker expects the hearer to sweep the floor. To provide more comprehensive understanding pertaining to the aspects underlying the use of speech acts, Leech's analytical framework (1983) on speech situation aspects is elucidated below.

### **Speech Situation Aspects**

Leech (1983) explicated that there are five aspects of speech situation. The first aspect deals with the speaker's and the addressee's age, social and economic background, gender, intimacy degree, and so forth (Wijana, 1996). The second facet is context. Linguistic context is called as intra-linguistic context or co-text (Rahardi, 2019). Meanwhile, the social, cultural, situational context is categorized as context or extra-linguistic context (Rahardi, 2019). Next, the utterance purpose deals with the way the speaker expresses a speech act for gaining a particular goal (Wijana, 1996). The fourth aspect is an utterance as an activity form, whereas the last facet deals with an utterance as a product of verbal act (Wijana, 1996). Besides the aforementioned five facets, politeness might also become another aspect propelling how the speakers opt their speech acts. Hence, the detail explanation is discussed subsequently.

### **Politeness Parameter**

Brown & Levinson (1987) classified that there are three parameters of politeness; Power, Distance, Ranking of imposition (PDR). Power deals with the relation between two

interlocutors either symmetric (equal) or asymmetric (disparate) (Meyer, 2009). The more asymmetric the power relation, the more polite or formal the language used (Meyer, 2009). Meanwhile, distance deals with how close or distant relationship that individual has with other people (Meyer, 2009). The closer the relationship, the less formal and more intimate the communication (Meyer, 2009). Finally, ranking of imposition deals with the degree to what extent an utterance might threaten other people's faces (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It means the higher the risk of the utterance, the more polite the language used. Politeness might be portrayed through the speaker's utterance. Thus, in order to broaden the comprehension, Leech's tenet (1983) on politeness maxims is pointed out below.

### Politeness Maxims

Leech (1983) classified the maxims of politeness into 6 types: 1) tact maxim deals with minimizing cost to other and maximizing benefit to others. To illustrate, when someone offers a help to an old man "*would you mind if I help you to bring your luggage?*", this seems to portray the use of tact maxim since the speaker attempts to maximize benefit to others. The next politeness maxim is 2) generosity maxim. It focuses on minimizing benefit to self and maximizing cost to self (Leech, 1983). The different point is that tact maxim is "other-centered", whereas generosity maxim is "self-centered" (Leech, 1983). For instance, the utterance "*you must lend me your car*" is impolite because the speaker attempts to maximize benefit to himself/herself (Wijana, 1996). Thus, the utterance representing generosity maxim is "*I lend you my car*". This is because the speaker strives to maximize cost to himself/herself.

The third type is 3) approbation maxim. It deals with minimizing dispraise to other and maximizing praise to other (Leech, 1983). This seems to be illustrated in the utterance "*Wow! Your painting is so beautiful*". Meanwhile, 4) modesty maxim deals with minimizing praise to self and maximizing dispraise to self. The point distinguishing approbation and modesty maxim is that approbation is "other-centered", whilst modesty maxim is "self-centered" (Leech, 1983). By way of description, when someone says "*you are so smart*", then the hearer replies "*no, it is just a coincidence*", thus the hearer's utterance appears to depict modesty maxim since he/she attempts to maximize dispraise to himself/herself.

The fifth type is 5) agreement maxim. It is associated with maximizing agreement between self and other, minimizing disagreement between self and other (Leech, 1983). For instance, when someone says "*Japanese language is difficult, isn't it?*", then the addressee replies "*yes, that's right*", it exhibits agreement maxim since both the speaker and the hearer maximize agreement. Finally, 6) sympathy maxim concerns with maximizing sympathy to other and minimizing antipathy to other (Leech, 1983). To illustrate, when there is a friend who obtains a scholarship and we congratulate him/her, it means we implement sympathy maxim.

Based on those theoretical frameworks, the researcher hypothesized that the characters on the TV series "*Tetangga Masa Gitu?*" would use different types of speech act under a certain aspect to refuse food in the communication.

## METHOD

This study wrestled under the scope of descriptive qualitative approach since the results of the study were explicated and analysed through the descriptions (Creswell, 2014). The data of this study were the utterances containing of speech acts and their underlying aspects. Meanwhile, in terms of the data source, the data were gained from NET TV's *youtube* channel on the television series entitled "*Tetangga Masa Gitu?*" ("What An Annoying Neighbor!") or abbreviated as TMG. It is a situational comedy (sitcom) TV program from NET TV. This study focused on investigating the speech acts of refusing food. In the data collection, the researcher looked for the relevant episodes with regard to that theme by typing the keywords "*Bintang memasak*" (Bintang cooks). Next, the researcher watched the videos and decided to opt the three most relevant videos. Afterward, the researcher transcribed the relevant utterances as the data to be analysed and translated the data from Indonesian language into English.

After gathering the data, the researcher undertook the data analysis process. First of all, the researcher read the transcribed data and identified the speech acts of refusing food by highlighting and bolding them on *microsoft word*. Then, the researcher classified the utterances based on the types of speech acts as proposed by Austin (1962), Searle (1976), Wijana (1996) and Parker & Riley (2014). Next, the researcher examined the aspects underlying the use of speech acts under Leech's notion (1983) on speech situation aspects and politeness maxims as well as Brown's and Levinson's tenet (1987) on the politeness parameters. In classifying the data, the researcher also scrutinized and re-watched the videos to analyse and assure the non-verbal facets supporting the speech acts such as the intonation, facial expressions or the gestures of the characters. Ultimately, the researcher drew a conclusion.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis results, the researcher uncovers that there are different types of speech acts used by the characters on the TV series to refuse the food as presented below.

Table 1. The findings of the study

The Types of Speech Act	Utterances	Functions/ Illocutionary Forces	Syntactic Forms	The Plausible Meanings of Non-Literal Speech Acts
Direct non-literal speech act	Datum 1: <i>It is better for us to have a lunch there.</i>	Directive (recommending)	Imperative	Preventing the addressee not to cook.
	Datum 2: <i>Dear, I swear I am already full, really.</i>	Representative (stating)	Declarative	Refusing the meal. The speaker did not want to eat it anymore.

Indirect non-literal speech act	Datum 3: <i>Uhm. Is not there anything else? For instance a bread or an instant noodle, like that (smiling)</i>	Directive (ordering)	Interrogative	Refusing the offered food. The speaker attempted to order the other food to the addressee.
---------------------------------	---	----------------------	---------------	--

### Direct non-literal speech act

#### Data 1

In the series of season 3, episode 280 entitled “*Si jago masak*” (The master of cooking), Bastian arrived at home after jogging, then his wife was planning to cook. At that moment, Bastian opted a direct non-literal speech act strategy to prevent Bintang not to cook. It is reflected in the subsequent conversation:

Bintang: *Sekarang kamu mandi dulu, istirahat, aku mau masakin kamu soalnya. Aku ada resep baru dari mami. Hihhi (tersenyum)*

Bastian: *Resep baru? Uhm...uhmm. Bi, Bi, kalo makan, ini aku punya ide bagus.*

Bintang: *Apa?*

Bastian: *Aku baru aja mau ngajakin kamu di restoran baru depan komplek. Uuh, very recommended. Mending kita makan disitu.*

Bintang: *Now, you take a bath first, then take a rest, because I am going to cook for you. I have a new recipe from mommy. Hihhi (smiling)*

Bastian: *A new recipe? Uhm...uhmm. Bi, Bi, I have a good idea about having a food.*

Bintang: *What is it?*

Bastian: **I have just wanted to ask you to go to the new restaurant in front of this housing complex. Uuh, it's very recommended. It is better for us to have a lunch there.**

The bold utterances demonstrate the use of direct speech act since those belong to directive speech act in terms of recommending and suggesting (Searle, 1976). The recommending speech act could be indicated through the use of performative verb in the sentence “I have just wanted to ask you to go to....” (Wijana, 1996; Parker & Riley, 2014). Moreover, Bastian also implemented modality “it is better” to deliver a suggestion, thus it belongs to imperative sentence. In addition, he also gave a thumb up as a sign of a recommendation. Therefore, those utterances are considered as direct speech act since the syntactic form is imperative and the function is suggesting or recommending (Searle, 1976).

For further extent, those bold utterances also reflect non-literal speech acts since what Bastian said does not represent what he meant (Wijana, 1996; Rohmadi, 2017; Parker & Riley, 2014). He did not merely recommend Bintang to have a lunch at the new restaurant, instead what he actually meant is that he attempted to prevent his wife from cooking since he assumed that Bintang's cooking would always be unpleasant. In addition, Bastian's

utterances reflected the violation of agreement maxim since he implicitly showed a disagreement for not eating Bintang's dish (Leech, 1983). In further exploration, Wijana (1996) explicated that the agreement maxim belongs to unipolar scale maxim since it deals with the judgment on good or bad the speaker towards himself/herself or other people.

The flouting of politeness maxim is considered as a non-contextual discourse and non-bonafide communication (Rohmadi, 2017). Bonafide communication tenet was proposed by Grice (Wijana, 2017). It refers to the adherence of the interlocutors on Grice's maxims, besides it could also be extended to the obedience of Leech's politeness maxims (Wijana, 2017). In this case, Bastian did not obey the agreement maxim, thus he undertook the process of non-bonafide communication. However, this kind of violation is intentionally done instead as a polite technique to save Bintang's face, so that she would not get offended if her dish was not good (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Yule, 1996; Wijana, 2008; Yule, 2010). Hence, it is in accordance with Wijana's statement (1996, 2017) explicating that the interlocutors could break those maxims as long as there is a reason underlying the violation.

In the deeper exploration, the researcher also found out that on the video, Bastian's facial expression was quite shock when Bintang said that she wanted to cook. Crystal (2008) asserted that the speaker's facial expression and gesture are regarded as kinesics. Crystal also elucidated that kinesics is a form of the extra-linguistic feature. Basically, this scholar elucidated that the extra-linguistic feature refers to any communicative facet which is outside of a language. Furthermore, Bastian also used hesitation filler "**uhm...uhmm**" and put his fingers on his forehead in a short time to signal that he was doubt of the dish that Bintang would cook and was thinking to refuse it in a polite way. Hence, he decided to recommend a new restaurant. Those analyses strongly illustrate that the speaker intentionally implemented non-literal speech act to represent politeness, so that his wife is not offended and does not lose her face (Wijana, 2008).

## Data 2

By extent, the researcher also discloses the use of the direct non-literal speech act in the series of season 2, episode 41 entitled "Monster chef". In a morning, Bintang had already cooked porridge for her husband, Bastian. Then, he seemed to use a non-literal speech act, so that Bintang would not feel offended that her dish was not good. Below is the conversation demonstrating it:

Bintang : *Aku nyiapin bubur buat kamu.*

Bastian : *Asik, aku cobain ya. (memakan) (minum)*

Bintang : *Kok gak dihabisin?*

Bastian : ***Udah kenyang sayang, beneran, sumpah.***

Bintang : I have prepared a bowl of porridge for you.

Bastian : Yippie, let me try it. (eating) (drinking)

Bintang : Why do not you finish the meal?

Bastian : **Dear, I swear I am already full, really.**

Based on the aforementioned conversation, it could be grasped that the sentence "Dear, I swear I am already full, really" appears to indicate the use of the direct non-literal speech act (Wijana, 1996). It is regarded as the direct speech act because the syntactic form is declarative and the function is representative speech act (Austin, 1962). The verb "swear" in that utterance does not refer to a commissive speech act since it does not deal with committing a future action. Rather, the word "swear" and "really" function as the emphasis to convince the addressee towards what the speaker said. Furthermore, Bastian used the addressing system "dear" to show an intimacy for exhibiting the positive-face, so that Bintang's face would not be threatened (Foley, 2001; Wijana, 2008). Moreover, it also portrays Brown's and Levinson's politeness parameter (1987) in terms of the distance rating. These scholars further elaborated that the more intimate the relation between the speaker and the addressee, the less distance they have in a communication.

Moreover, in terms of the non-literal speech act, Bastian's utterance actually does not reflect his real intention (Wijana, 1996; Rohmadi, 2017; Parker & Riley, 2014). It does not make sense if he had already been full only by eating one spoon of the porridge. After tasting it, he decided not to eat it any longer since it did not taste good. Therefore, he lied to his wife by saying that he had been full as a way to refuse the dish. This kind of strategy portrays that he violated Grice's quality maxim, thus it is categorized as a non-bonafide communication (Rohmadi, 2017). Hence, the researcher concluded that the speaker did not want to offend Bintang's feeling, therefore he used non-literal speech act and the violation of quality maxim to implicitly decline the meal and save Bintang's face. Therefore, it supports Wijana's argument (1996, 2017) asserting that there is a contingency for the speakers to flout the maxims as long as there is a reason underlying the violation. Besides, this kind of violation also illustrates a face saving act functioning to lessen the contingency of threat towards the addressee's face (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Yule, 1996; Wijana, 2008; Yule, 2010).

In the deeper investigation, the speaker's gesture and facial expression also posit a big role to form a meaning in the communication (Crystal, 2008; Wijana, 2008; Yule, 2010; Rohmadi, 2017). Therefore, the researcher also analyzed those points. From the analyses, the researcher uncovered that Bastian's eyes bulged while eating the food. It indicates that he was pretty shock on the food's taste. Furthermore, when asserting "Dear, I swear I am already full, really", Bastian also smiled and pretended to belch to signal that he had been full. Additionally, he also exhibited a V hand gesture to represent his swear and he really meant with his utterance. Overall, those kinesics features were done as a polite way to refuse to eat the porridge.

### Indirect non-literal speech act

#### Data 3

Besides the direct non-literal speech act, the researcher also found out the use of indirect non-literal speech act in the series of season 2, episode 86 entitled “*Guru masakku*” (My cooking teacher). Adi is Bintang’s and Bastian’s neighbour. He has a close relationship like a family for Bintang and Bastian. Thus, he often borrows something or even asks for food, except Bintang hand-made dish. He frequently asks for instant noodle and coffee to them. In this scene, Adi intentionally used this type of speech act in order not to eat Bintang’s cuisine. It could be seen in the following conversation:

Bintang: *Mas Adi kesini perlu apa?*

Adi : *Nggak ada perlu apa-apa sih, yah seperti biasalah Bintang, pulang kerja, sepi nggak ada orang di rumah, gak ada makanan, kelaperan, jadi ya kalo kamu mau ngasih makanan sih saya nggak nolak.*

Bintang : *Nah, kebetulan kalo gitu, Mas Adi jadi orang pertama yang nyobain sayur asem saya. Yah? Hm? Please?*

Adi : *Eee. Gak ada yang lain apa? Kayak roti apa mi instan gitu (sambil tersenyum)*

Bintang : *Nggak ada, udah-udah. Ini aja ya.*

Bintang: Adi, what is the matter that you come here?

Adi : Nothing, yeah, just as usual, Bintang. Coming from working, no one is at home, no food, I get hungry, so if you want to give me food, I absolutely do not refuse it.

Bintang : Accidentally, you become the first person to taste my *sayur asem* (tamarind vegetable soup) . Yeah? Hm? Please?

Adi : **Uhm. Is not there anything else? For instance a bread or an instant noodle, like that (smiling)**

Bintang : Nothing. Just try this, okay.

The utterance “**is not there anything else?**” strongly demonstrates the use of indirect speech act since there is unconformity between the syntactical form and illocutionary force (Yule, 2010; Parker & Riley, 2014). The syntactical form is interrogative or question. However, the illocutionary force is actually directive speech act (Searle, 1976) which possibly means “**give me another food!**” Thus, it is not solely a question. It could be grasped that Adi intentionally employed indirect speech act by using an interrogative form to portray politeness. It resonates with Yule’s (1996), Parker’s and Riley’s statement (2014) asserting that for the sake of politeness, people often use the indirect speech act to mitigate or soften the speech act. Moreover, Brown & Levinson (1987) and Foley (2001) also asserted that the use of indirect speech act and a question is the form of negative face strategy. It aims to make the addressee comfortable and not to make his/her face threatened (Wijana, 2008). All in all, this analysis appears to exhibit that the use of indirect speech act is underlain by politeness parameter in terms of ranking of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Furthermore, that utterance does not only exhibit the indirect speech act, but also the non-literal speech act. It is because what Adi said does not represent what he meant (Wijana, 1996; Rohmadi, 2017; Parker & Riley, 2014). His question and his examples of food such as a bread or an instant noodle are the signals that he actually does not want to eat Bintang's dish, *sayur asem* because he has already known that it is not delicious. Therefore, he selected the indirect non-literal speech act as a polite way to refuse to eat Bintang's dish. Unfortunately, since previously he has already said "I get hungry, so if you want to give me food, I absolutely do not refuse it", thus he has no other choices, but to eat the *sayur asem* in order not to make Bintang offended.

For further extent, another plausible aspect propelling Adi to use indirect non-literal speech act is that the cultural facet. Adi is a Javanese person and was born in Yogyakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. Hence, this cultural background might also contribute to the way Adi communicates. This seems to be in tune with Leech's speech situation aspects (1983) in terms of the speaker's social background and cultural context. Moreover, Wierzbicka (1991) and Geertz (1976) elucidated that Javanese society is well-known for their culture upholding "dissimulation" and "indirection". This prominent culture aims to maintain a harmonious interpersonal rapport (Geertz, 1976; Nadar, 2007). Novinger (2001) and Rahardi (2019) pointed out that this type of indirect communication style is categorized as a high-context communication since it carries an implicit message to be interpreted by the addressee.

Tannen (1984, 1985) elucidated that when the speaker employs indirectness, it functions to lessen the contingency of threat towards the addressee's independence or impose the addressee. Thus, it means they strive to attain what they want without saying what they mean (Tannen, 1984, 1985). In this case, this finding appears to amplify Nadar's study (2007), revealing that boldness or straightforwardness is perceived as impolite in Javanese culture. Hence, Adi's indirect refusal might contribute to maintaining a peaceful relationship as neighbor.

By the extent, in interpreting the speaker's intention, the researcher takes into account both the intra-linguistic and the extra-linguistic context within the communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Besides the use of speech act, Adi also directly showed a hesitation through the use of filler "uhm" (Crystal, 2008) when Bintang asked him to try her *sayur asem*. Extra-linguistic features also support it. While uttering a filler pause, Adi also took his eyes off Bintang and scratched his forehead. In a nutshell, this facial expression and gesture demonstrate that he was doubtful and was thinking of a way to refuse the food. These appear to be in line with Crystal's argument (2008), asserting that kinesics features also contribute to conveying meaning in the communication. Besides, he also delivered his utterance "for instance a bread....." with a smile full of feeling bad. This implies that he realized that he actually had violated the agreement maxim (Leech, 1983). It is because he attempted to refuse the food offered by Bintang. Thus, it shows that the speaker displayed a disagreement towards the addressee (Leech, 1983). That is why he was a little bit felt bad and smiled. His feeling to feel bad seems to be in line with Wijana's notion

(1996) on unipolar scale maxim since it deals with the judgment on good or bad the speaker towards himself/herself or other people.

Meanwhile, the flouting of politeness maxim is considered as a non-contextual discourse and non-bonafide communication (Rohmadi, 2017). In this case, Adi did not obey the agreement maxim, thus he undertook the process of non-bonafide communication. However, this kind of violation is intentionally done instead as a polite technique to save Bintang's face, so that she would not get offended if her dish was not good (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Yule, 1996; Wijana, 2008; Yule, 2010). Hence, it is in accordance with Wijana's statement (1996, 2017) explicating that the interlocutors could break those maxims as long as there is a reason underlying the violation.

Comparing to the previous inquiries, the result of this study disclosing that Adi used an interrogative sentence as a directive speech act appear to resonate with Dewi's (2013), Muntiningsih's (2013) as well as Oktasdio et al's research (2018). Those scholars also found out that there is a function shifting of an interrogative sentence from asking an information into commanding someone to do something (Dewi, 2013; Muntiningsih, 2013; Oktasdio et al, 2018). Furthermore, they also uncovered that this type of indirect speech act functions to make more polite requests/orders and prevent the addressee's bad feelings (Dewi, 2013; Muntiningsih, 2013). To an extent, Adi used the interrogative sentence as a directive speech act to create a polite order might also portray that Adi could use linguistic form appropriately in a particular situation (Altikriti, 2011). Despite sharing similarities, the present study also offers a difference compared to the existing inquiries. This study provides a more nuanced analysis by discussing Leech's external contexts (1983) underpinning the use of speech acts, such as kinesics. Moreover, the researcher also analyzed the flouting of maxims done by the characters for saving Bintang's face. Hence, these points might become the novelties of this research.

Meanwhile, the findings with regard to the aspects underlying the use of speech acts seem to expand Made et al.'s study (2014). These scholars discovered that the social distance, politeness, and setting become the factors propelling the use of a particular speech act on "Habibie Ainun" movie. Notwithstanding, the present study appears to enrich the former analysis by finding out other aspects underlying the use of speech acts such as culture (Leech, 1983) and ranking of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). As a result, this inquiry has successfully answered the two key research questions pertaining to the types of speech acts used for refusing food and the facets underlying the use of speech acts.

## CONCLUSION

As the concluding remarks, this study discloses that the characters (Bastian and Adi) on the TV series "*Tetangga Masa Gitu?*" used direct non-literal and indirect non-literal speech act as the means to refuse Bintang's cuisine. From the analyses, the researcher drew an illation that the direct speech acts were used by Bastian, who is Bintang's husband. On the contrary, Adi, Bintang's neighbour tended to use the indirect speech act to refuse the

meal. Thus, it could be grasped that their choices of speech act were possibly underlain by the politeness parameter in terms of distance rating (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Furthermore, Adi seemed to also select indirect speech acts due to the ranking of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). He possibly thought that using an imperative sentence for commanding Bintang to give him other food might be impolite and threaten Bintang's face. Besides, the culture might also become another plausible reason why Adi used indirect speech acts. He is a Javanese. Geertz (1976) explicated that the Javanese culture feature in communication is indirectness. It is done for maintaining a good rapport with Bintang as a neighbour. Therefore, Adi opted to use indirect speech act by using a question implying directive function (Yule, 2010; Parker & Riley, 2014).

Regardless of those differences, both also implemented the same type of speech act, the non-literal speech act. In delivering the non-literal speech acts, the characters employed various strategies such as using the positive and negative face as well as flouting the agreement and quality maxim. This demonstrates that there is a disobedience of the cooperative and politeness principle. Besides, although having an intimate relationship, the speakers also violated the pragmatic parameter by using non-literal speech acts. To wrap those all up, the whole violations were done for a particular motive (Wijana, 2017), which was for the sake of politeness to save Bintang's face so that she would not get offended that her dish was not delicious.

Despite providing more nuanced analysis, this study still has a limitation. There is an absence of literal speech. Moreover, the indirect speech act found is only in the form of interrogative sentence functioning as a directive speech act. Thus, future scholars could complete this lacuna by investigating more types of speech acts in refusing food, such as direct literal and indirect literal speech acts. Besides, the subsequent studies could also explore another form of indirect speech act, for instance, a declarative sentence functioning as a directive speech act.

Furthermore, this inquiry's results on the facets underlying speech act only deal with politeness, distance, ranking of imposition and culture. Hence, these lacunas could be further covered by the next researchers by exploring other aspects such as power, age, economic background, gender, and so forth. Ultimately, this study is worth to be expanded by analyzing speech acts of refusing food done by people from other cultural backgrounds or countries. Besides, it also seems intriguing that future scholars examine the refusal speech acts used within diaspora communities, for instance, Javanese diaspora living in other countries. It aims to reveal whether they still maintain Javanese's indirectness culture or have already been assimilated to the host country's culture to speak straightforwardly.

## REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Altikriti, S. F. (2011). Speech act analysis to short stories. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6), 1374-1384.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J., W. (2014). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed-method approaches*. London: Sage Publication.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dewi, N. C. (2013). Analisis tindak tutur tidak langsung literal dalam film Deathnote Movie: The First Name karya Shusuke Kaneko [An analysis of indirect literal speech acts on Deathnote Movie: The First Name by Shusuke Kaneko]. *Japanology*, 1(2), 131-141.
- Foley, W. A. (2001). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge MA & Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Geertz, C. (1976). *The religion of Java*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Genetti, C. (2014). *How languages work: An introduction to language and linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Made, D. J. I., Nyoman, P. A. J. I., & Putu, A. L. (2014). An analysis of speech acts in the conversation between Habibie and Ainun in the film entitled Habibie and Ainun 2012. *E-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, 2, 1-10.
- Meyer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muntiningsih, R. (2013). Indirect speech act in Judy Christenberry's novel the cowboy secret son: A pragmatic analysis. *PERSPECTIVE: Journal of English Language and Learning*, 1(1), 26-36.
- Nadar, F. X. (2007). The prominent characteristics of Javanese culture and their reflections in language use. *Humaniora*, 19(2), 168-174.
- Novinger, T. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A practical guide*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Oktadistio, F., Aziz., M., & Zahrida. (2018). An analysis of direct and indirect speech acts performed by main characters in the movie revenant script. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 2(1), 59-85.
- Parker, F., & Riley, K. (2014). *Linguistics for non-linguists: a primer with exercises* (5th ed.). Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2019). *Pragmatik: Konteks intralinguistik dan konteks ekstralinguistik* [Pragmatics: Intra-linguistic context and extra-linguistic context]. Yogyakarta: Amara Books.
- Rohmadi, M. (2017). *Pragmatik: Teori dan analisis* [Pragmatics: Theory and analysis]. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). The classifications of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-24.

- Tannen, D. (1984). The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 189-195.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Cross-cultural communication. In Teun A. van Dijk, (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis Vol 4: Discourse analysis in society* (pp. 203-215). London: Academic Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Dasar dasar pragmatik* [The basics of pragmatics]. Yogyakarta: ANDI.
- Wijana, I. D. P (2008). Tindak tutur dan perwatakan dalam cerpen "Harga seorang perempuan" karya Oka Rusmini [Speech act and characterization in a short story "Harga seorang perempuan" by Oka Rusmini]. *Sintesis*, 6(1), 51-65.
- Wijana, I. D. P (2017). Exploitation of pragmatic aspects in Indonesian humorous discourses. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(2), 108-115.

#### SOURCES OF DATA

- Netmediatama. (2014, November 10). *Guru masakku* [My cooking teacher] (Season 2, Episode 86) [TV Series Episode]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/A2S3XnDIYe8>
- Netmediatama. (2014, August 9). *Monster chef* (Season 2, Episode 41) [TV Series Episode]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/tbQUR1XkRIk>
- Tetangga Masa Gitu. (2015, August 15). *Si jago masak* [The master of cooking] (Season 3, Episode 280) [TV Series Episode]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/oVF8eJsDQjI>

