CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The researcher discusses about the related theories, previous studies, and the theoretical framework of this study in this chapter.

2.1 Related Theories

2.1.1 Pragmatics

In linguistics, pragmatics is a specialized branch of study focusing on the relationship between natural language with users of the language. Pragmatics focuses on conversational implicatures or that which a speaker implies and which a listener infers. There exist several concepts in pragmatics, such as deixis, entailment, implicature, presupposition, reference and inference, and speech act (illocutionary, locutionary, and perlocutionary act). As specified by George Yule (1996), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Frequently, more to do with analyzing what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning that also studies how people understand and produce a communicative act in specific situations through conversation analysis.

To put it in a simple explanation, pragmatics is elucidated as contextual meaning. Generally, pragmatics is the aspect of meaning which is used in communication among speaker, utterance, and addresser which cannot be predicted. This necessarily entails interpreting what people mean in a particular

context and how that context affects what is communicated. It studies how more gets communicated than is said. The closeness of distance, whether it is conceptual, physical, or social, implies shared experience. The speaker (or writer) decides how much they need to say given how close or how distant the listener (or reader) is.

In summary, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and users of these forms. Only pragmatics get people involved in the analysis. Although the study of grammar focuses on language systems, pragmatics provides a complementary perspective on language and provides insight into the language choices users make in social situations.

2.1.2 Context

"Pragmatics studies the meaning of words in context, analyzing the parts of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors impacting communication, as well as the knowledge of the place and time in which the words are uttered or written" (Stilwell Peccei, 1999; Yule, 1996). Its approaches focus on the meaning of words in interaction and how interactors communicate more information than the words they use. The speaker constructs the linguistic message and intends or implies a meaning, and the listener interprets the message and concludes the meaning (Brown and Yule, 1983; Thomas, 1995).

Context is what determines the actual meaning of a word, phrase, or utterance. Context may include additional information about the type of the text, the period in which the text was written, the writer's age and/or nationality, and fiction or non-fiction. Typically, there are three sorts of context to observe in

interaction: the background knowledge context or what they know about each other and the world, the co-textual context or what they know about what they have been saying, and the situational context or what speakers know about what they can see around them.

Context is an essential factor in the interpretation of utterances and expressions. There are four important aspects of context as stated by Cruse (2006): (1) knowledge presumed shared between speaker and hearer (2) preceding and following utterances and/or expressions (co-text), (3) the immediate physical situation, and (4) the wider situation, including social and power relations. McManis *et al* (1987) also asseverate four divided subparts of context:

1. Epistemic context, is the background knowledge that is shared between the speaker and the hearer.
2. Linguistic context, is the utterances previous to the utterance under consideration.
3. Physical context, is where the conversation and actions take place, and what objects are present.
4. Social context, the social relationship and setting of the speaker and hearer.

2.1.3 Speech Act

As a branch of pragmatics, this area of study focuses on how words are used to carry out actions, not just to represent information. It is used in linguistics, legal theory, literary theory, philosophy, psychology, and even the development of artificial intelligence. Speech Act Theory was introduced in 1975 by Oxford

philosopher J.L. Austin in "*How to Do Things with Words*" and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle.

A speech act is an action performed by means of language, including complaining about something, refusing something, or requesting for something. Austin (1962) stated that a speech act is a functional unit in communication. It is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance. Phonetically, an utterance is a unit of speech bounded by silence. The smallest unit of verbal communication is not the verbal expression, but the performance of a particular kind of action. When a person utters a sentence, it is actively doing things, not just saying things. There are things that can be done with words, including requesting, asking questions, giving orders, and making promises. As shared by Searle (1969), "Speech acts are the basic unit of linguistic communication.".

2.1.3.1 Levels of Speech Act

Speech act considers three levels or components of utterances:

1. Locutionary acts (the making of a meaningful statement, saying something that a hearer understands)

2. Illocutionary acts (saying something with a purpose, such as to inform)

3. Perlocutionary acts (saying something that causes someone to act)

Yule (1996) stated that out of the three levels, the most discussed is illocutionary. Illocutionary speech acts can also be classified into different families grouped according to their intended use.

2.1.3.2 Classification of Speech Act

On other hand, J.R. Searle (1969) presented a taxonomy of different five basic kinds of activities that can be performed in speaking:

1. Representative

   A speech act that states what the speaker believes to be the case or not such as asserting, suggesting, and concluding as a way for the speaker to spread out the truth of the expressed proposition. It could include facts, descriptions, assertions, and conclusions. For example, "The couch is comfy". The speaker is representing the comfy couch to the hearer, saying that the couch is comfortable.

2. Directive

   Directive is a speech act that speakers use to get someone else or hearers to do something such as ordering, requesting, commanding, or questioning something as a way for the speaker to ask the hearer to carry out an action. It could be positive or negative. For example, "Stop doing that!". The speaker is directing the hearer to stop doing something that they're doing at the moment. It can be said that the speaker is ordering or commanding the hearer. Another example is, "Could you stop doing that, please?". Usually a question phrase with the key words "please" is counted as requesting or questioning something in a directive speech act. The first example could be considered rude and the latter example is oftentimes considered polite or at least less rude.

3. Commissive

A speech act that speakers use to act out some future actions such as making promises, threatening, pledging, and refusing. Commissive speech acts can be performed alone or by group. For example, "We're not going there." is a refusal, "I will protect the cat." is promising, and "If you lift a finger, we will destroy every last one of you." is threatening.

4. Expressive

    Expressive is a speech act where the speaker states what they feel such as congratulating, thanking, and welcoming as a way for the speaker to express a psychological state or attitude. Those feelings felt by the speaker could be negative such as sorrow, dislikes, and pain. Positive feelings such as likes, joy, and pleasure are more common in expressive speech acts. For example, "I'm happy for you!" and "I'm sorry about that…".

5. Declaration

    Declaration is a speech act that can make a difference or change the world such as firing and marrying as a way for the speaker to bring a state of affairs. For example, "You're fired!" and "I now pronounce you husband and wife.".

    2.1.4 Speech Act of Refusal

    A refusal refers to the situation when a speaker directly or indirectly says "no" to an invitation or request. As Gass & Houck (1999) state, refusals are speech acts that occur as a negative response to other acts such as offers, requests, and suggestions. Refusals oftentimes include explanations or reasons why such refusals are necessary. But refusal isn't just a "no", it is also a generative stance, situated in

a critical understanding of settler colonialism and its regimes of representation. Based on a pragmatic vantage point, the negotiation of a refusal may entail frequent attempts at directness or indirectness and politeness and impoliteness that are suitable to the situation and may differ according to the social values of a particular culture (Perriman, 2007, p.1). The speech act of refusals represents the type of unfavorable response. Searle (1977) asserts that refusals belong to the category of commissive because they commit the rejecter to perform an action. Added by Félix-Brasdefer (2008), refusals can be used in response to invitations, requests, offers, and suggestions.

When responding to invitations, offers, requests, or suggestions, acceptance or approval generally takes precedence, but refusal or rejection does not. Rejection or refusal can mean disapproval of the interlocutor's ideas and can therefore pose as a threat to the interlocutor. Acceptance or consent, on the other hand, tends to be used in direct speech without much delay, moderation, or explanation, while refusal is mostly more to indirect, involving moderation and/or slow down. A curve or across a curve. Delay likely indicates that the rejector has a valid reason for refusal, and may imply that if possible or feasible, the rejector would accept or agree instead.

2.1.4.1 Refusal Strategy

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) proposed a classification of refusals comprised of three categories: adjunct refusals, direct refusals, and indirect refusals. In Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, the speech act of refusal is one of the face-threatening acts in communication. It is very complicated

in that the speaker and the listener take turns to realize face negotiation. Refusals often include explanations or reasons for why such refusals are necessary. Refusal strategies are used to reaffirm that the recipient of the rejection has agreed, but has compelling reasons for rejection and regrets the need to reject it. If a refusal response is expressed indirectly, the degree of inference increases as the speaker must choose the appropriate form to soften the negative effects of a direct refusal (Félix-Brasdefer, 2008). The two main types are direct negation and indirect negation, which can be divided into semantic formulas: utterances for performing refusals. Adjuncts to refusals: the utterances themselves do not represent refusals, but are linked to semantic expressions to give particular refusals particular effects. A direct refusal is when the speaker uses negative language to express a disagreement. An indirect refusal then indicates that the offer, invitation, or proposal was indirectly rejected (Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz, 1990).

a.   Direct Refusal

A strategy that is often followed by a compelling statement that indicates performative verbs and non-performative statements. Direct refusal includes the occurrence of both a Direct "*no*" which is where the rejecter briefly rejects the request, invitation, etc. The negative of a proposition a verb can be used with expressions such as "*I do not think so*", or "*I cannot*". Direct strategies are divided into two statements: Performative statement and Non-performative statement.

Performative statement or a mitigated refusal is a refusal strategy that is frequently used to soften and diminishes the negative effect of direct

refusal. Performative verbs such as refuse and reject. For example, "*I refuse.*", "*It appears I can't come there.*".

Non-performative verbs directly saying "*no*" or only showing negative willingness like "*I cannot/I will not*". The speaker sometimes makes an utterance which a non-performative verb mixed with showing a negative willingness in it. (Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz, 1990). For example, "*No, I will not do it.*".

b.   Indirect Refusal

There are several semantic formulas in indirect refusal, that strategies may happen when the rejecter gives reasons, regrets acceptance, wishes if they were able to fulfill their request, and gives a promise of future acceptance. In indirect refusals, the degree of a conclusion increases because the speaker must take the appropriate pattern to make the interlocutor not offended by the negative effects of a direct refusal (Felix-Brasdefer, 2008). Indirect refusal head acts include many linguistic strategies by which an invitation, an offer, a request, or a suggestion are indirectly refused. The indirect refusal strategies occur as the head refusal acts including reasons and explanations, statements of alternatives, letting the interlocutor off the hook, and conditional acceptances.

Indirect refusal may include these strategies:

1. Acceptance that functions as a refusal, such as an Unspecific or indefinite reply and Lack of enthusiasm: "*Ok. /Right.*"

2. Attempt to dissuade the interlocutor such as statement or threat of negative consequences to the requester: "*I will not be any fun at your party.*", Guilt trip: "*I can't reach my target if you're not buying anything.*", Criticize: "*Who do you think you are?*", Request for help, assistance, and empathy by dropping or holding the request, Let the interlocutor off the hook: "*It's okay/Don't worry about it/You don't have to.*", Self-defense: "*I tried my best/That's all I can do.*"

3. Avoidance, such as Nonverbal: Silence, Do nothing, Hesitation, or Physical departure, and Verbal: Joke, Topic switch, Repetition of the part request, Postponement, Hedging.

4. "*My mom would not let me go because I have to do chores.*"

5. Set conditions for Future or Past Acceptance, such as "*If you had asked me before, I would have…*"

6. Statement of Alternative, such as "*I would rather…/I prefer to…/I can do X instead of Y.*", "*Why don't you ask someone else?*"

7. Statement of Philosophy, such as "*Excuse is worse than sin.*"

8. Statement of Principle, such as "*I never like lazy people who like easy note taking.*"

9. Statement of Regret, such as "*I am sorry…*", "*I feel bad…*"

10. The Promise of future acceptance, such as "*Next time I will…/I Promise I will…*", "*I can help you tomorrow.*"

11. Wish, such as "*I wish I could…*"

c.   **Adjuncts Refusal**

A refusal response is constantly guided by adjuncts to refusals which might precede or come after the main refusal response. Adjuncts cannot be used by themselves, but along with refusal strategies. Adjuncts to refusals are classified into five kinds:

1. Alerters (address terms)

2. Gratitude/Appreciation, such as "*Thank you for reaching out…*"

3. Pause fillers, such as "*Uh…/Um…/Oh…/Well…*"

4. Statement of empathy, such as "*I know you're in a tight position…*"

5. Feeling or agreement or statement of positive opinion, such as "*I would love to…*", "*That's a good idea…*"

Refusal response is constantly accompanied by adjuncts that could follow the main refusal response. Gass & Houck (1999) stated that refusals are complex speech acts that require not only long sequences of negotiation and cooperative achievements, but also "face-saving maneuvers to accommodate the non-compliant nature of the act".

2.1.4.2 Refusal Sequences

The linguistic expression used in a refusal sequence might add direct and indirect strategies (Felix-Brasdefer, 2008). According to Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990), refusals can be seen as a series of the following sequences:

1. Pre-refusal strategies, these strategies prepare the addressee for an upcoming refusal. For example, willingness in refusing such as "I'd really like to but…"

2. Main refusal or Head Act, this strategy expresses the main refusal. For example, direct refusal such as "I can't come."

3. Post-refusal strategies, these strategies follow the head act and tend to emphasize, justify, mitigate, or conclude the refusal response. For example, giving an apology, reason, explanation, or expressing regret, and then direct refusal such as "I'm sorry, I have plans to do. I really can't."

An example to see the refusal sequence in a complete sentence in a situation where a student is asked to stay longer in the library by his teacher:

Teacher: *I need you to learn the material by this afternoon, can you stay in the library longer?*

Student: *Well… I would like to* (Pre-refusal; willingness), *but I can't* (Head Act; Direct refusal; non-performative statement). *I'm sorry, sir* (Post-refusal; apology/regret). *I have a doctor's appointment this afternoon* (Post-refusal; reason/explanation). *I really can't stay* (Post-refusal; Direct refusal; non-performative statement).

2.1.4.3 Factors Influencing Refusal Strategies

"From a pragmatic perspective, the negotiation of a refusal may entail frequent attempts at directness or indirectness and politeness or impoliteness that are appropriate to the situation and may vary according to the social values of a particular culture. The choice of a direct or indirect refusal and the appropriate degree of politeness employed will depend on the relationship between the participants (close or distant), age, gender, power, and the situation" (Félix-Brasdefer, 2008). It can be inferred that the use of refusal strategies is mostly influenced by power and social distance between the speaker and the hearer.

According to Yang (2008), refusal is initiated by four types of acts: invitation, offer, request, and suggestion. Each type can be divided into subcategories based on its different communication features.

1. Invitation, is a written or verbal request of inviting someone to go somewhere or to do something. Invitation as an initiating act is classified into two types: ritual invitation and real invitation. Ritual invitation often occurs at the end of the interactions. It functions as a leave-taking act between the speaker and the hearer. Through unspecific expressions of invitation, the speaker shows the willingness of maintaining relationship with the listener in the future. Real invitation shows the speaker's intention to treat the listener, such as "Do you want to come with me to that concert?".

2. Offer, is an expression of readiness to do or give something. Offer as an initiating act is classified into four types: Gift offer, favor offer, consumable offer, and opportunity offer.

3. Request, is an act of asking politely or formally for something. As an initiating act, request is divided into four types: request for action (money transferred or payment), request for a favor (help or borrowing something), request for information or advice (caption or description of a photo or video), and request for permission or agreement (job application).

4. Suggestion, is an idea or plan put forward for consideration. As an initiating act, suggestion is classified into two: Solicited suggestion, suggestions asked by the interlocutors, and Unsolicited suggestion, suggestions given by the interlocutors.

2.1.5 Direct and Indirect Speech Act

There are two types of speech acts; direct and indirect speech acts. According to Yule (1996), direct speech act is an utterance that is performed by the speaker which means exactly and literally. It implies that in uttering something, the speaker says what they mean and they mean what they say. For example, a speaker says "Please close the door." to a hearer. That is a direct request for the hearer to close the door. Thus, both the speaker and the hearer can understand what the utterance means literally this way.

Searle (1975) introduced the concept of 'indirect speech act'. In indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than they actually say by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer. An utterance is categorized as an indirect speech act if the literal meaning of the locution differs from its intended meaning.

2.1.6 Social Media

An interactive media technologies that facilitate the creation and sharing of ideas, information, interests, and other forms of expression towards networks and virtual communities (Kietzmann, Jan H.; Hermkens, Kristopher, 2011., Obar, Jonathan A.; Wildman, Steve, 2015). The idea that social media are defined simply by their capability to bring people together has been deemed excessively broad, as implying that fundamentally different technologies such as the telegraph and telephone are also social media (Schejter, A.M., Tirosh, N., 2015). In 2019, Merriam-Webster defined social media as "forms of electronic communication (such as websites for social networking and microblogging) through which users create online communities to share information, ideas, personal messages, and other content (such as videos).". Social media promotes users to share content with others and display content in order to enhance a particular brand or product.

According to Kaplan (2012), mobile social media applications can be classified into four types:

1. Quick-timers (only time sensitive): Transfer of traditional social media mobile apps to increase immediacies such as posting on Twitter or status updates on Facebook.

2. Slow-timers (neither location nor time-sensitive): Transfer of traditional social media applications to mobile devices such as watching a YouTube video or reading a Wikipedia article.

3. Space-locators (only location sensitive): Exchange of messages with relevance for one specific location, which is tagged to a certain place and read later by others such as Tumblr, Yelp, and Fishbrain.

4. Space-timers (location and time-sensitive): Exchange of messages with relevance mostly for one specific location at one specific point in time such as Line, WhatsApp, Telegram, and Kakao Talk.

2.1.7 Online Shopping

The activity or act of purchasing goods or services over the internet with websites or mobile apps. It means consumers can directly go online to the merchant's website from a picture, link, or an advertisement of their vendible they posted, or find a product of interest by searching among alternative vendors using a shopping search engine, which displays the same product's availability and pricing at different e-retailers. Then consumers could continue to selecting the goods, and arranging the delivery. Buyers pay for goods or services online using credit or debit cards. As the revenues from online sales continued to grow significantly, researchers identified different types of online shoppers, Rohm & Swaminathan (2004) identified four categories and named them "convenience shoppers, variety seekers, balanced buyers, and store-oriented shoppers". They focused on shopping motivations and found that the variety of products available and the perceived convenience of the buying online experience were significant motivating factors. This was different for online shoppers, who were more motivated by time saving and recreational motives.

Online shopping has been around for about more than twenty years. It has grown in popularity significantly. Online shopping is a subset of E-Commerce, which stands for Electronic Commerce. Nowadays, consumers can shop online using a range of different computers and devices, including desktop computers, laptops, smartphones, and tablet computers. Online stores typically allow shoppers to find a particular model, brand, or item using a "search" feature. Online customers must have internet access and a valid payment method to complete the transaction. A credit card, an Interac-enabled debit card, or a service like PayPal. For physical items (clothing, paperbacks, etc.), the e-tailor ships the item to the customer. For digital products, such as digital audio files for songs or software, e-tailers typically send the files to their customers over the Internet. The largest of these online retailers are Alibaba, Amazon.com, and eBay (The Economics, 2013).

Online shopping has embarked their branch to social media platforms like Instagram Shop, TikTok Shop, or manual posts where vendors posted an information about their vendible in words, pictures, and/or videos. On the social media Twitter, people who want to sell products tweet with the hashtag #WTS (meaning they want to sell), and customers can reply to the tweet or directly contact the seller by sending a direct message. People looking for a specific item can also tweet with the hashtag #WTB, which stands for Want to Buy, and sellers can reach potential buyers' tweets in the same way.

2.2 Previous Study

The researcher considers that this research cannot stand without any references so, the researcher gathered papers of studies that are related to this study in order to make this research accurate and reliable. The first related study is an article of qualitative research titled "Refusal Strategies Used by Male and Female Sellers at Pasar Raya Padang" by Rusdi Noor Rosa from Universitas Negeri Padang in 2010. The research is aimed at finding different strategies used by male and female sellers while refusing the buyer's offer. The data of his research are refusals in the bargaining process between sellers and buyers that took place in Pasar Raya Padang. The data were analyzed by using the classification of refusal strategy proposed by Beebe, Takashi, & Uliss-Weltz (1985). The finding of the research shows that male sellers used non-performative statement strategy most frequently which implicitly indicated that they tended to refuse the buyers' offer in a direct way. Female sellers used excuse, reason, and explanation strategies most frequently which indicated that they preferred to refuse the buyers' offer in an indirect way.

The second related study is a research titled "Refusal Strategies in English by Malay University Students" by Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar, Salasiah Che Lah, and Raja Rozina Raja Suleiman from Universiti Sains Malaysia in 2011. This study aims to discover the preferred semantic formulas or strategies used by Malay university students in Malaysia to refuse a request in an academic context. 40 undergraduate and postgraduate students were asked to respond to different situations in which they were required to carry out the speech act of refusing a request. The data, collected by means of a Discourse Completion Test, were analyzed in terms of semantic formulas and were categorized according to the

refusal taxonomy of Beebe et al. (1990). The findings show that participants differ in the ways they perform refusals. Regret or saying 'sorry', and giving excuses for these semantic formulas suggest the influence of Malay culture in respondents' realizations of refusals in English.

The third related study is a qualitative research titled "Refusal Strategies Used by Javanese in Communicating: A Pragmatics Study" by Widya, S.S., M.Hum. and Erika Agustiana, SS., M.Hum. from University of Indraprasta PGRI in 2021. The research is aimed at examining the refusal strategies and refusal sequences used by Javanese in the novel *Pinatri Ing Teleng Ati* karya Tiwiek AS. The results showed that all three refusal strategies, direct, indirect, and adjunct, were used by characters in the novel. Direct strategies consisted of performative statement while indirect strategies consisted of acceptance functions as refusal, attempt to dissuade interlocutor, avoidance, reason/explanation, statement of alternative, statement of philosophy, and statement of principle. Adjunct strategies consisted of pause filler and gratitude. The results also revealed that not only social factors influencing the refusal strategies used but also the state of the relationship between interlocutors. The deteriorating relationships will increase the tendency of choosing higher-level face-threatening strategies.

The fourth related study is a qualitative research titled "Bentuk-Bentuk Penolakan Verbal Dalam Bahasa Indonesia Mahasiswa ASEAN Studies" (Kinds of Verbal Rejections in Bahasa Indonesia used by ASEAN Studies' Students) by Septa Widya Etika Nur Imaya Nabilah from Universitas Negeri Malang in 2018. It is aimed to identify forms of Indonesian verbal rejection of ASEAN Studies students

in formal and informal communication. The data in this research are forms of verbal rejection of Indonesian according to the context that accompanies it in formal and informal communication. First, the data source is a recording of a conversation in accordance with the provision of qualitative research data sources. Second, the data source is a questionnaire that has been distributed and filled out by eighteen ASEAN Studies students. The results obtained from this research are (a) the use of the word 'tidak' or its equivalent, (b) giving reasons for rejection, (c) the use of the terms or conditions as a rejection, (d) the use of suggestion or other alternatives, and (e) the use of comments as a rejection which are each found in both of formal and informal communication.

They made similar research, discussing refusals and their linguistics of it. The differences found from those studies are the data used for the research and the context it is based on. Some of the previous research is not in English but in other languages, which helps the researcher to broaden how refusals work in other languages as well. The researcher will gather data from online sellers on how they will refuse as a response to the researcher's offer using the help of internet social media platform chats. They did face-to-face area research with the subjects while the researcher will do online area research with the online sellers as the subjects with customer-to-seller context to identify the online seller's refusal strategies. Following the first related study by Rusdi Noor Rosa which have similar attention to refusals by sellers, the researcher differentiates the research by not genderizing the sellers and not only focusing on sellers' refusals when bargaining but also when

the sellers refuse other offers such as trading or exchanging product options, delivery options, etc.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

In the philosophy of language and linguistics, speech act is something expressed by an individual that not only presents information but performs an action as well. (J.L. Austin, 1975). The speech act of refusals represents the type of unfavorable response. According to Searle (1977), refusals belong to the category of commissives because they commit the refuser to perform an action. Added by Félix-Brasdefer (2008), refusals can be used in response to requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions. The researcher will discuss refusals' speech act based on Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz's (1990) proposed classification of refusals, which is comprised of three categories: adjunct refusals, direct refusals, and indirect refusals.

The researcher aims this study to discuss and analyze how people as sellers in social media are communicating in selling their products to prospective buyers. The researcher specifies this study by using social media because actual online marketplaces are using computer bots in answering prospective buyers' chats and/or questions. Thus, the researcher cannot consider answers from there are valid as this study's data. The researcher furthermore specifies this study by setting some filters for the subjects which are only sellers who sell hobby and collectibles products, three social media that are considered suitable for this study are picked by the researcher as the medium of collecting the data: Instagram, Twitter, and

WhatsApp. The researcher will communicate as a customer, try to bargain and/or make offers with the sellers through the chats in the selected social media platforms, and see if the sellers would perform any refusals by text in the form of *bubble chats*. The researcher will gather the data and identify different strategies used by the sellers while refusing customer's offer based on Beebe, Takashi, and Uliss-Weltz's (1990) classification of refusal acts, and analyze the most dominant refusal strategy used by the sellers who sell hobby and collectibles products in the realm of online shopping with social media.