DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 845 FL 024 603

AUTHOR Lauper, Julie Ann
TITLE Refusal Strategies of Native Spanish Speakers in Spanish and in English and of Native English Speakers in English.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers English to Speakers of Other Languages (31st, Orlando, FL, March 11-15, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Contrastive Linguistics; English; *English (Second Language); Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Usage; *Native Speakers; *Pragmatics; *Second Languages; *Spanish; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *Refusals

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed patterns in one speech act, that of refusal, in 60 native English speakers (responding in English only) and 120 native Spanish speakers (60 responding in English and 60 in Spanish). Native English speakers were college students in the United States and Spanish speakers were students in Spain. A questionnaire was used to elicit refusals for 20 situations. Data were also gathered concerning the subjects' age, gender, level of education attained, and country of origin. Analysis of the responses resulted in a taxonomy of 43 refusal strategies. Results indicate the three groups had different refusal patterns. In some cases, Spanish speakers refused similarly in Spanish (SS) and English (SE) but differently from English speakers (EE), suggesting pragmatic transfer in the SE group. However, it was also found that in some cases the refusal strategies of SEs approximated those of the EEs, and in other cases the SE strategies were different from both other groups. In addition, it was found that all three groups used different refusal strategies in refusals for moral, educational, social, financial, and physical reasons. (Author/MSE)

REFUSAL STRATEGIES OF NATIVE SPANISH SPEAKERS IN SPANISH AND IN ENGLISH AND OF NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS IN ENGLISH

by

Julie Ann Lauper

Brigham Young University

11 Rio Del Court

Danville, CA 94526

jlauper@pacbell.net

Abstract

In order to become competent in a second language it is important for second language learners to know how to recognize and perform speech acts. If second language learners do not become fluent in their use of speech acts, miscommunication and offenses will result. Refusals are a particularly difficult area for second language learners, and little study has been done in the area of refusals. In view of these problems, this present study was designed to analyze refusals made by native English speakers in English (EE) and native Spanish speakers in both English (SE) and Spanish (SS). It was found that SE, SS, and SE subjects refused differently. In some cases, SE refused like SS and differently from EE subjects, which may be evidence for pragmatic transfer in the refusal patterns of SE subjects. However, it was also found that in some cases the refusal strategies of SE approximated those of EE subjects and in other cases the strategies of SE were different from both the SS and EE subjects. It addition, it was found that all three groups used different refusal strategies in refusals for moral, educational, social, financial, and physical reasons.

REFUSAL STRATEGIES OF NATIVE SPANISH SPEAKERS IN SPANISH AND IN ENGLISH AND OF NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS IN ENGLISH

Up until the late 1960's, language proficiency meant grammatical competence (Chomsky, 1965). In 1966 Hymes redefined language proficiency and coined the phrase "communicative competence." Hymes (1972) showed that a language learner could not survive without learning what is "feasible," "appropriate," "possible," and "done" with the linguistic or grammatical forms (p. 286). Many linguists, (e.g., Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell, 1995; Wolfson, 1989; and, Gass and Selinker, 1983) feel that a social or cultural blunder can lead to a far more serious breakdown in communication than a grammatical error. Although native speakers attribute grammatical errors to a lack of knowledge of the target language, sociolinguistic errors are often attributed to the personality of the speaker.

According to Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell (1995), in order for second language learners to become fully competent they must achieve linguistic, discourse, actional, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence. Although all areas of communicative competence are important, this study looks only at actional competence, which involves the ability to recognize, react to, and perform speech acts with sociolinguistic competence.

Refusals are a major cross-cultural difficulty point for many nonnative speakers (according to Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz, 1990) and for this reason they are especially important for second language learners and educators. Because making a refusal implies that the refuser will decline the wish of the requester, the refuser runs a great risk of appearing impolite or offending the requester. The learner needs to be able to say "No" in a way that is appropriate and expected in the target language culture. This is especially difficult because, although every

language has linguistic forms for each speech act, the social norms that govern speech acts vary from one language to another, and, therefore, the way in which the speech acts are performed varies from culture to culture (Walters, 1983).

This study reports on the refusal strategy patterns of native English speakers, native Spanish speakers, and native Spanish speaking learners of English. Unfortunately, no studies have been done which have reported on the refusal strategies of Spanish speakers, or which have compared and contrasted the refusal strategies of native English and native Spanish speakers. In addition, no studies have been done which show how the subjects' language/cultural background affect their choice of refusal strategies in English. Notwithstanding, studies with other language speakers have shown that language/culture does have an effect on the respondents' choice of refusal strategies. (e.g., Stevens, 1993; Beebe, et al., 1990; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; Walters, 1983; Blum-Kulka, 1982)

For example, Beebe et al. (1990) found differences in the refusal strategies of native English speakers and native Japanese speakers. Native English and native Japanese speakers differed in the order, frequency, and pragmatics (the specificity and formality of the refusals) of the refusal strategies they used in response to the 12 situations on a questionnaire. Japanese excuses were found to be less specific than American excuses. Whereas Americans favored an "airtight" excuse, the Japanese speakers used excuses that were extremely vague. In addition, Japanese speakers favored responses that sounded more formal in tone than American responses in English.

Because cultures/language groups differ in the way they do speech acts, making a refusal involves a great deal of knowledge. If a language learner does not acquire this knowledge,

misunderstandings and possibly even offenses may occur. In addition, speech acts are complex because they vary according to the gender, age, status, and relationship of the interlocutors (e.g., Stevens, 1993; Madden & Kahn, 1992; Beebe, et al., 1990; Wolfson, 1981; Cohen & Olshtain, 1981).

Another variable which has not been studied, but which may also affect a subjects' choice of refusal strategies, is the reason for the refusing. No studies have looked at the reason for refusing, or have shown its importance in studies of refusals. However, studies which have been done with other speech acts suggest that the context of the speech act (the situation) has an effect on speech act behavior. For example, Yaacov looked at the apologies of Israeli elementary students (grades 2 and 4) who were participating in a drama class (In Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). This study focused on the degree of apology that a child would use in response to the severity of the offending action. Two children were asked to role play the two participants in each apology situation (same sex and cross sex). The participants were asked to act out certain situations three times, but each time a different degree of severity of the offending action was assumed. An example of one of the situations is the following:

> Two girls are participants in an apology situation in which the recipient owns a beautiful dress she received for her birthday, which the offender borrowed for a special occasion. The dress got damaged in the process. The girls act out the same situation three times, but each time a different degree of severity of damage is assumed: (1) the dress is dirty, (2) the dress is torn, (3) the dress is lost.

The apologies that the participants used were recorded and analyzed. Results of this study showed that the level of severity affected the type of apology used by the subjects.

The results of this study, when applied to refusals, suggest that the reason for refusing (e.g., financial, moral, educational, physical, or social reasons) may have an effect on the respondents' refusals. Because making refusals is a social interaction, saying no to someone will always have some kind of a social effect, but there are refusals which have additional implications. For example, if a friend asks if s/he could borrow $500.00, the refuser may be making the decision to refuse for financial reasons. If a friend asks you to go out for dinner, but you have a study group for a school class, the reason for refusing may be educational.

In conclusion, sociolinguistic rules and normative patterns of expected or acceptable speech act use have not yet been adequately analyzed and described. Without this needed insight into native and nonnative speaker behavior, teachers will not be able to help language learners to achieve the desired goal: communicative competence. Particular attention has been given to certain speech acts, such as compliments, expressing gratitude, and apologies, but little work has been done on refusals. In addition, no studies have been found which report the effect of the reason for refusing on subjects' refusal strategies. For these reasons, this study investigates whether or not the reason for refusing and the subjects' native language/cultural background affect native Spanish and native English speakers' choice of refusal strategies.

Method

Subjects

There were 180 subjects used for this study: 60 native English speakers and 120 native Spanish speakers. The native Spanish speakers were divided into two groups: 60 subjects who

answered the questionnaire in English and 60 subjects who answered the questionnaire in Spanish. All subject groups were balanced in gender.

The native English subjects were living in California, Ohio, and Utah. The native Spanish speakers were living in Spain, studying at the Universidad Autónoma in Madrid. All subjects were college students. The majority of the subjects ranged from 18-21 years old (84% of the subjects). The remaining subjects were between 22 and 32 with the majority in the 22-24 range. Although the subjects represent a sample of convenience and cannot be generalized to all age groups or all native Spanish and English speakers, they would seem to be representative of young, educated, urban Spaniards and American English speakers.

Instrument and Procedures

A questionnaire was prepared to elicit refusal strategies from the subjects. The questionnaire consisted of twenty situations, ranging from refusing to loan money to a friend to refusing a proposition from a prostitute. After the situation was explained a request was given and the subject had a chance to respond. Following is an example.

It's Friday night and your friend calls to invite you to go dancing.

You do not feel like dancing and do not want to go.

Friend: Hey, do you want to go dancing at the Edge tonight?

You:_____

Information regarding subjects' age, gender, highest level of education, and country of origin was gathered on the same questionnaire. Subjects were instructed to answer the questions in the best and most natural way that they would in a real situation and to use their own words.

After the instructions an example showing what was expected appeared but it elicited an apology rather than a refusal, so as to not provide a model refusal, as following:

> You have an appointment to work on a project with your professor. You almost forget about the appointment and are late in arriving. What would you say?
>
> **I am sorry, Prof. Brown; I have been very busy today and I did not realize that it was so late.**

The questionnaire was administered in both Spanish and English. One group of native Spanish speakers (SS) answered the questionnaire in Spanish, while the other group (SE) answered the questionnaire in English. The native English speakers answered the questionnaire in English. In order to keep the questionnaire culturally parallel for the different language groups, the situations were modified slightly in the Spanish version and the English version for the EFL subjects. For example, in the English version respondents were invited to go to New Orleans to celebrate Mardi Gras. In the Spanish and EFL versions, the respondents were invited to go on a trip to Sevilla.

The length of the questionnaire was limited to 20 situations for fear that the subjects would tire by the last questions. In addition, the order of the items was counter-balanced on two versions of the questionnaire.

At the end of each questionnaire, subjects were asked regarding their foreign language experience. Spanish speakers were asked about their experience with English and English speakers were asked about their experience with any foreign language. The questions were designed to sift out subjects that may have received training in making refusals in a foreign

language and/or lived in a foreign country, as these factors may have affected their production of refusals.

Subjects were then asked to rate the degree to which they felt they had been either tactful or honest in answering the survey. This information was gathered for an analysis that will not be reported in this paper. The following scale and instructions appeared on the questionnaire:

Where would you rate your answers to this survey on the following continuum?

White Lie Tactful Honest

-----------------*---------*---------*----------*----------*----------*----------*----------*--------*

(See Appendix A for a copy of the complete questionnaire)

The questionnaires were administered in Spanish and in English to native Spanish speakers studying at the Universidad Autónoma in Madrid, Spain. The questionnaires were also administered to native English speaking university students attending the University of California at Berkeley, Ohio University, and Brigham Young University.

Analysis of Data

In order to analyze the data, a taxonomy was developed to categorize the refusal strategies that were used by the native Spanish speakers in Spanish, the native English speakers in English, and the native Spanish speakers in English. The taxonomy used consisted of the taxonomy of Beebe et al. (1990) along with additional strategies discovered and labeled by the researcher. Table 1 shows the refusal strategy taxonomy that was used in this study along with examples.

Table 1

Taxonomy of Refusal Strategies Used by Native English and Native Spanish Speakers

Table 1

Taxonomy of Refusal Strategies Used by Native English and Native Spanish Speakers

Refusal strategy	Example
1. Saying you are leaving:	**"I better go" "Goodbye"**
2. Direct "no":	**"No"**
3. Negative willingness/ ability/ desire/need:	**"I can't" "I won't" "I don't want to" "I don't need..." "I don't think so"**
4. Statement of regret:	**"I'm sorry..." "I feel terrible..."**
5. Wish:	**"I wish I could help you..."**
6. Excuse, reason, explanation:	**"My children will be home that night" "I have a headache."**
7. Statement of alternative	***(I can do X instead of Y)*: "I'd rather..." "I'd prefer..."**
8. Statement of alternative	**(*Why don't you do X instead of Y*) "Why don't you ask somebody else"**
9. Statement of alternative	**(*Why don't we X instead of Y*) "Let's do...instead" "Why don't we ... instead?"**
10. Set condition for past, present, or future acceptance:	**"If you had asked me earlier, I would have" "If I finish early, I will go" "If I didn't have homework, I'd go with you"**
11. Promise of future acceptance:	**"I'll do it next time" "I promise I'll.." "Next time...I promise"**
12 Non-committal:	**"I'll try though"**
13. Statement of principle:	**"I never do business with friends"**
14. Statement of philosophy:	**"One can't be too careful"**
15. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester:	**"I won't be any fun tonight"**
16. Guilt trip:	**Waitress to customer who wants to sit a while "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee."**
17. Criticize the request/requester:	**Statement of negative feeling or opinion ("I think that's a bad idea") or insult ("Who do you think you are?" or "That's a terrible idea!")**
18. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request	**"I'm also low on money this month"**
19. Let interlocutor off the hook:	**"Don't worry about it" "That's okay" "You don't have to"**
20. Self-defense:	**"I'm trying my best." "I'm doing all I can do"**

Refusal strategy	Example
21. Acceptance that functions as a refusal:	**Unspecific or indefinite reply**
22. Acceptance that functions as a refusal:	**Lack of enthusiasm**
23. Accept	**"Sure" "I'd love to"**
24. Avoidance: nonverbal:	**Silence, hesitation, do nothing, physical departure**
25. Avoidance: verbal:	**Topic Switch**
26. Avoidance: verbal:	**Joke**
27. Avoidance: verbal:	**Repetition of part of request: "Monday?"**
28. Avoidance: verbal:	**Postponement: "I'll think about it." "Perhaps another day" "Maybe next time"**
29. Avoidance: verbal:	**Hedging: "Gee, I don't know." "I'm not sure."**
30. Avoidance: verbal:	**Ask a question**
31. Avoidance: verbal:	**Laugh**
32. Statement of positive opinion/ feeling or agreement:	**"That's a good idea" "I'd love to"**
33. Statement of empathy:	**"I realize you are in a difficult situation"**
34. Pause fillers:	**"uhh" "well" "oh" "uhm"**
35. Gratitude/appreciation:	**"Thanks" "Thank you" "I appreciate..."**
36. Strong and Direct Refusals:	**"I refuse" "No way" "Hell no" "Impossible" "Forget it"**
37. Softener or tag question:	**"If you like we can..." "Okay?" "You know?"**
38. Wishing the best after refusing:	**"I hope you enjoy yourselves" "Have a great time"**
39. Sarcasm	**"In your dreams" "When pigs fly"**
40. Passive negative ability:	**"It won't be possible"**
41. A saying that acts as a refusal:	**"A buen hambre, no hay pan duro" ["Hunger is the best sauce" is the English equivalent]**
42. Statements of sincerity:	**"Really" "Sincerely" "Truthfully"**
43. Attention getters:	**"Hey," "listen," "look," "wow," and "*venga tio*," [come on Uncle] "*que va*" [what's going on], "mira" [look], "oye" [listen]**

Next, the frequencies of refusal strategies were calculated. How many times each group used the different strategies in response to refusals for various reasons (educational, financial, social, moral, and physical) was calculated. Then a Chi-square analysis was done which analyzed the relationship between the frequency of refusals strategies and the language group and between the frequency of refusal strategies and reason for refusing. A significance level of 0.05 was set, so anything that was greater than this level was considered significant.

Results and Discussion

Frequency of Refusal Strategies and Reason for Refusing

The results of the Chi-square analyses showed that native Spanish speakers in Spanish (SS), native English speakers in English (EE), and native Spanish speakers in English (SE) differed their choice of refusal strategies in refusals for moral, social, physical, educational, and financial. In addition, there were differences in the refusal strategies of the three language groups. **The Frequency of Refusal Strategies and Reason for Refusing for Spanish Speakers in Spanish**

SS subjects used significantly different refusal strategies in refusing for moral, social, educational, physical, and financial reasons. The observed χ^2 was 1063.003 (df=164, p.001, $\chi^2 > \chi^2_{crit}$). Table 2 will report those strategies that were used significantly differently for the five reasons for refusing by SS subjects. Table 2 will report the actual frequency count, the row percentage, and the column percentage of each strategy for each reason for refusing. The table also highlights the strategies that are used most frequently for each reason for refusing.

Table 2

The Most Frequent and Significant Strategies Used by Spanish Speakers in Spanish

Refusal strategy	Moral (M)	Social (S)	Physical (P)	Educa-tional (E)	Financial (F)
2. Direct "no"	99 R=(21.8%) **C=(24.4%)**	114 (25.1%) **(23.0%)**	112 (24.7%) **(18.8%)**	53 (11.7%) **(10.6%)**	76 (16.7%) **(14.6%)**
4. Statement of Regret	38 R=(13.9%) C=(9.4%)	42 (15.3%) (8.5%)	30 (11.0%) (5.0%)	76 (27.7%) **(15.2%)**	88 (32.1%) **(17.0%)**
6. Excuse/Explanation	79 R=(8.2%) **C=(19.5%)**	207 (21.5%) **(41.7%)**	238 (24.7%) **(39.9%)**	242 (25.1%) **(48.5%)**	198 (20.5%) **(38.2%)**
7. Stating an Alternative	6 R=(7.4%) C=(1.5%)	17 (21.0%) (3.4%)	37 **(45.7%)** (6.2%)	7 (8.6%) (1.4%)	14 (17.3%) (2.7%)
10. Set conditions for acceptance	6 R=(12.5%) C=(1.5%)	2 (4.2%) (0.4%)	8 (16.7%) (1.3%)	15 **(31.3%)** (3.0%)	17 **(35.4%)** (3.3%)
17. Criticize the request(er)	90 **R=(69.8%)** **C=(22.2%)**	12 (9.3%) (2.4%)	7 (5.4%) (1.2%)	8 (6.2%) (1.6%)	12 (9.3%) (2.3%)
23. Accept	19 **R=(50%)** C=(4.7%)	0 (0%) (0%)	7 (18.4%) (1.2%)	8 (21.1%) (1.6%)	4 (10.5%) (0.8%)
28. Verbal Avoidance: Postponement	3 R=(3.7%) C=(0.7%)	32 **(39.5%)** (6.5%)	4 (4.9%) (0.7%)	22 **(27.2%)** (4.4%)	20 **(24.7%)** (3.9%)
32. Positive Feeling	7 R=(6.7%) C=(1.7%)	15 (14.3%) (3.0%)	23 (21.9%) (3.9%)	44 **(41.9%)** (8.8%)	16 (15.2%) (3.1%)
34. Pause Fillers	9 R=(20.5%) C=(2.2&)	6 (13.6%) (1.2%)	8 (18.2%) (1.3%)	4 (9.1%) (0.8%)	17 **(38.6%)** (3.3%)
35. Gratitude/ Appreciation	23 R=(11.7%) C=(5.7%)	24 (12.2%) (4.8%)	105 **(53.6%)** **(17.6%)**	8 (4.1%) (1.6%)	36 (18.4%) (6.9%)

Refusal strategy	Moral (M)	Social (S)	Physical (P)	Educa-tional (E)	Financial (F)
37. Softener/Tag Question	4 R=(9.3%) C=(1.0%)	16 **(37.2%)** (3.2%)	10 (23.3%) (1.7%)	5 (11.6%) (1.0%)	8 (18.6%) (1.5%)
44. Attention Getters	22 **R=(37.3%)** C=(5.4%)	9 (15.3%) (1.8%)	8 (13.6%) (1.3%)	7 (11.9%) (1.4%)	13 (22.0%) (2.5%)

Spanish speakers in Spanish and refusals for moral reasons

As can be seen from the column percentages highlighted in Table 2, in refusals for moral reasons, SS used the following strategies most frequently: direct "no" (24.4%), criticize the request/er (22.2%), and excuse/explanation (19.5%). When subjects felt morally opposed to a request they seemed to be direct in refusing the request and even criticized the request or the requester. They also occasionally gave excuses or reasons for refusing. For example, when approached by a prostitute some respondents explained that they weren't interested in the prostitute's services because they already had a boyfriend/girlfriend to spend the night with.

However, the row percentages highlighted in Table 2 indicate that SS used excuse/explanations less in refusals for moral reasons, as compared with refusals made for other reasons. It appears that subjects didn't see the need, or didn't want to explain their reasons as much when refusing for moral reasons. This may be because subjects didn't feel they needed to provide an explanation when the request was against their morals, or they may have felt like their reasons were personal, or that explaining their reasons would be imposing their moral standards on the requester.

The row percentages also indicate that the following strategies were used most frequently in refusals for moral reasons: criticize the request/requester (69.8%), accept (50%), and attention getters (37.3%). When subjects were morally opposed to a request they seemed to feel free to refuse it, but when they didn't actually feel morally opposed to the situation, they accepted.

In developing the questionnaire, it was hoped to find situations that were morally wrong for both native English and Spanish speakers. However, it was discovered that various situations were not morally wrong for many native Spanish speakers. In situations that were designed to elicit refusals for moral reasons, many native Spanish speaking respondents answered "sure" on the questionnaire then followed their answers with editorial comments such as: "I don't think this is wrong," "I would do anything for a friend," etc. Other subjects simply wrote, "I wouldn't refuse this."

Subjects also used more attention getters for moral reasons than for the other four reasons for refusing. Attention getters that were used in refusals for moral reasons included, "Venga tio" (come on) and "Que va" (what's up). These attention getters were used most frequently with friends, probably as a way to soften their refusal.

Refusals for social reasons

The column percentages in Table 2 indicate that, like in refusals for moral reasons, SS used excuse/explanation (41.7%) and direct "no" (23.0%) frequently in refusals for social reasons. It appears that these strategies are common elements in all types of refusals. However, the row percentages show that both of these strategies are used more in refusals for social reasons, than in refusals for moral reasons (direct "no" [M=21.8%, S=25.1%] and excuse/explanation [M=8.2%, S=21.5%]).

The row percentages also show that verbal avoidance: postponement (39.5%) and softeners/tag questions (37.2%) were used more in refusals for social reasons, than in refusals for other reasons. This may have been because subjects felt they could be more direct when they had a "legitimate" excuse or reason for refusing. When refusing for social reasons, the refuser's reason seemed to be that they didn't want to be with the person that invited them so the refuser had to be careful to ensure that the requester didn't take the refusal "personally."

Refusals for physical reasons

As indicated by the column percentages, SS used excuse/explanation (39.9%), direct "no" (18.8%), and gratitude/appreciation (17.6%) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. As in refusals for moral and social reasons, subjects used excuse/explanation and direct "no" frequently. However, in refusals for physical reasons, subjects also used gratitude frequently. The row percentages also indicate that gratitude/ appreciation (53.6%) was used more frequently in refusals for physical reasons than for other reasons. This is probably because the refusals for physical reasons involved declining food and other invitations that are not typically declined and that the respondents probably wanted to accept, if it hadn't been for their physical limitations.

The row percentages also showed that stating an alternative (45.7%) was used more in refusals for physical reasons than in refusals for other reasons. This was probably to show the requester that they (the respondents) wanted to preserve the social relationship, in spite of their physical limitation. For example, in one of the situations, the respondent is invited to eat dinner with a friend, but cannot because s/he is allergic to the main dish that is being served. The respondents used alternatives such as, "Well I'll just sit down and talk to you while you eat," or "I'll just wait in the living room until you are through," or "I'll just take a drink," which all show

the requester that the respondent is declining the invitation for strictly physical reasons, not social reasons.

Refusals for educational reasons

SS used excuse/explanation (48.5%) frequently in refusals for education reasons. This may be because educational reasons may not be reasons the requester might have predicted or expected, so refusers feel more need to explain their reasons. Another explanation may be that educational reasons may not be as valid or acceptable as other reasons for reasons, so the refuser provides even more explanations.

The row percentages show that positive feeling (41.9%) was used most in refusals for educational reasons and that set conditions for acceptance (31.3%), statements of regret (27.7%), and verbal avoidance: postponement (27.2%) were used frequently when refusing for educational reasons, as compared to refusals for other reasons. This would seem to be because the subjects were refusing, not because they didn't want to accept, but because they had the duty or obligation to their homework or attend their school classes (depending on the situation). They expressed intense positive feelings about the requests (to go to Sevilla for a week, for example) and were truly sorry they would not be able to go. Then they would often set conditions for acceptance. For example, "If you were going during spring break, I would be able to go" or "If you go after finals I can accompany you." They also used verbal avoidance: postponement frequently. This is probably because, in many cases, subjects would have liked to postpone the activity until they were done with their homework, or until spring break, etc. For example, "I'd like to go, but I can't afford to miss class this week. How about next week?"

Refusals for financial reasons

In refusals for financial reasons, SS used excuse/explanation (38.2%), statements of regret (17.0%), and direct "no" (14.6%) most frequently (as indicated by the column percentages). Excuse/explanation and direct "no" are used frequently in refusals for all five reasons. However, statements or regret are used more in refusals for financial reasons, than in refusals for other reasons. Subjects probably used a lot of regret to try to maintain the relationship with the requester and to show empathy. For example, in one of the situations, the respondent's friend asked to borrow a large sum of money. By using statements of regret, refusers were able to show that they felt bad for the financial difficulties of the requester, without having to fulfill their request. In addition, subjects probably would have liked to have been able to lend the money.

Row percentages indicate that pause fillers (38.6%), set conditions for past, present, or future acceptance (35.4%), and verbal avoidance: postponement (24.7%) were also used most often in refusals for financial reasons. Pause fillers were probably used most in these situations because it was more "difficult" for respondents to refuse for financial reasons, so they were stalling for time. This may be due to the particularly "sticky" nature of refusing for financial reasons, especially among friends. Set conditions for past, present, or future acceptance also showed the requester that, if it weren't for the refusers' financial limitations, they would have liked to have accepted or helped out, and verbal avoidance: postponement gave the refuser a way to soften the refusal by avoiding a definite "no".

The Frequency of Refusal Strategies and Reason for Refusing for English Speakers in English

EE also used significantly different refusal strategies in refusing for moral, social, educational, physical, and financial reasons. The observed χ^2 was 1358.970 (df=168, p=.001, $\chi^2 > \chi^2_{crit}$). Table 3 will report the raw frequencies, row percentages, and column percentages of those strategies that were used significantly differently for the five reasons for refusing by EE subjects. Table 3 also highlights the strategies that are used most frequently for each reason for refusing.

Table 12

The Most Frequent and Significant Strategies Used by Native English Speakers

Refusal strategy	Moral	Social	Physical	Educa-tional	Financial
2. Direct "no"	102 R=(23.7%) **C=(25.3%)**	91 (21.1%) **(21.6%)**	99 (23%) **(18.8%)**	60 (13.9%) **(12.1%)**	79 (18.3%) **(17.3%)**
4. Statement of Regret	39 R=(15.8%) C=(9.7%)	21 (8.5%) (5.0%)	32 (13%) (6.1%)	76 (30.8%) **(15.3%)**	79 **(32%)** **(17.3%)**
6. Excuse/Explanation	24 R=(3.3%) C=(6.0%)	158 (21.7%) **(37.4%)**	179 (24.6%) **(34.0%)**	217 (29.9%) **(43.8%)**	149 (20.5%) **(32.6%)**
7. Stating an Alternative	6 R=(7.5%) C=(1.5%)	9 (11.3%) (2.1%)	40 **(50%)** (7.6%)	6 (7.5%) (1.2%)	19 (23.8%) (4.2%)
8. Stating an Alternative	16 **R=(38.1%)** C=(4.0%)	9 **(21.4%)** (2.1%)	5 (11.9%) (1.0%)	6 (14.3%) (1.2%)	6 (14.3%) (1.3%)

Refusal strategy	Moral	Social	Physical	Educa-tional	Financial
10. Set Conditions for Acceptance	3 R=(6.0%) C=(0.7%)	6 (12%) (1.4%)	8 (16%) (1.5%)	17 **(34%)** (3.4%)	16 **(32%)** (3.5%)
17. Criticize the Request(er)	99 **R=(83.9%)** **C=(24.6%)**	9 (7.6%) (2.1%)	4 (3.4%) (0.8%)	2 (1.7%) (0.4%)	4 (3.4%) (0.9%)
23. Accept	3 R=(3.9%) C=(0.7%)	37 **(47.4%)** (8.8%)	23 **(29.5%)** (4.4%)	5 (6.4%) (1%)	10 (12.8%) (2.2%)
24. Nonverbal Avoidance	24 **R=(77.4%)** C=(6.0%)	0 (0%) (0%)	3 (9.7%) (0.6%)	3 (9.7%) (0.6%)	1 (3.2%) (0.2%)
28. Verbal Avoidance: Postponement	5 R=(5.4%) C=(1.2%)	26 **(28.3%)** (6.2%)	3 (3.3%) (0.6%)	31 **(33.7%)** (6.3%)	27 **(29.4%)** (5.9%)
32. Statement of positive feeling	3 R=(3%) C=(0.7%)	12 (12%) (2.8%)	21 (21%) (4.0%)	47 **(47%)** (9.5%)	17 (17%) (3.7%)
35. Gratitude/ Appreciation	44 R=(16.5%) C=(10.9%)	44 (16.5%) (10.4%)	108 **(40.5%)** **(20.5%)**	23 (8.6%) (4.6%)	48 (18%) (10.5%)
36. Strong and Direct Refusals	35 **R=(85.4%)** C=(8.7%)	0 (0%) (0%)	1 (2.4%) (0.2%)	3 (7.3%) (0.6%)	2 (4.9%) (0.4%)

Native English speakers and refusals for moral reasons

In refusals for moral reasons, EE (like SS) used direct "no" (25.3%) and criticized the requester (24.6%) most frequently. However, unlike SS, EE didn't use explanations frequently in refusals for moral reasons. It appears that EE subjects did not feel they needed to explain or

justify their refusals for moral reasons as much as SS, probably because (as mentioned on p. 15) Spanish speakers did not feel that many of these situations were morally wrong.

In addition, row percentages indicate that EE subjects used various strategies in refusing for moral reasons that SS subjects did not use frequently. EE subjects used strong and direct refusals (85.4%), nonverbal avoidance: silence, hesitation, do nothing, physical departure (77.4%), and statements of alternatives (38.1%) most frequently in refusals for moral reasons. Strong and direct refusals included such statements as, "you're crazy," "there's no way I'm going to help you steal that," and "not on your life." Especially in the situation involving the prostitute, many subjects said they would just keep walking without acknowledging the prostitute (nonverbal avoidance). And many times in the situation involving the friend who asked the respondent to cover for him/her while he/she stole something , EE subjects suggested alternatives such as, "Why don't you just let me buy that for you" or "Why don't you just wait until you have the money to buy that."

Because SS subjects did not use strong and direct refusals and accepted more than EE subjects (SS=50%, EE=3.9%) it seems that SS were not as intensely opposed to the requests as were the EE. In addition, nonverbal avoidance and statements of alternative were not used by SS so it is possible that these strategies are not used often by SS. EE subjects did not use attention getters, so it is possible that this strategy is not used often by native English speakers.

Refusals for social reasons

Like SS subjects, EE subjects used excuse/explanation (37.5%), direct "no" (21.6%), and verbal avoidance: postponement (28.3%) frequently in refusals for social reasons. But, unlike SS, EE did not use softeners or tag questions in refusals for social reasons. This may

demonstrate a cultural difference, or it may be because many EE subjects accepted many more of the social invitations, so they did not have a need to use softeners or tag questions. In addition, EE subjects seemed to use statements of alternatives as a way of softening their refusals.

Refusals for physical reasons

Like SS, EE used excuse/ explanation (34.0%), gratitude/appreciation (20.5%), and direct "no" (18.8%) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. The row percentages also show that, like SS subjects, EE subjects used gratitude/appreciation (40.5%) and statements of alternative (50%) more when refusing for physical reasons than for other reasons. This may be because many of the invitations involved food or drink and it is not common to refuse such invitations without gratitude and, at times, an alternative. For example, when respondents were invited to sit down and eat with their friend's family, they often replied, "Thank you, but I just ate. How about I sit here with you and just drink something."

In addition, it appears that is not acceptable to let physical limitations stand in the way of somehow fulfilling a request. Respondents could not simply refuse, without proposing an alternate way to comply with the request. For example, when English respondents were asked to help a coworker lift a box (but they weren't able to because they had hurt their back), the respondents often said that they would look for someone else to help the coworker lift the box.

Refusals for educational reasons

Like SS subjects, EE subjects used excuse/ explanation (43.8%), statements of regret (17.3%), and direct "no" (12.1%) most often in refusals for educational reasons. In addition, row percentages show that, like SS subjects, EE subjects used statements of positive feeling (47%), set conditions for acceptance (34%), and verbal avoidance: postponement (33.7%) frequently in

refusals for educational reasons, as compared with refusals for other reasons. Once again, this may be because respondents felt good about the requests and really wanted to accept them. EE expressed positive feelings about the request then proceeded to say that they would go if they didn't have school, or that they will go if they finished their homework, etc. Subjects also said that they would go later, or at spring break, or after finishing their homework. These strategies showed the subjects' desire to accept the requests and invitations and their conflicting commitment to school and homework.

Refusals for financial reasons

Like SS, EE used excuse/explanation (32.6%), direct "no" (17.3%), and statement of regret (17.3%) frequently in refusals for financial reasons. In addition, (as indicated by the row percentages) like SS subjects, EE subjects used set conditions for acceptance (32%) and verbal avoidance: postponement (29.4%) frequently in refusals for financial reasons, as compared with refusals for other reasons. Unlike SS, EE didn't use pause fillers.

The Frequency of Refusal Strategies and Reason for Refusing for Spanish Speakers in English

EE subjects also used significantly different refusal strategies in refusing for moral, social, educational, physical, and financial reasons. The observed χ^2 was 791.417 (df=164, p=.001, $\chi^2 > \chi^2_{crit}$). Table 4 will report the raw frequencies, row percentages, and column percentages of those strategies that were used significantly differently for the five reasons for refusing by SE subjects. Table 4 also highlights the strategies that are used most frequently for each reason for refusing.

Table 4

The Most Frequent and Significant Strategies Used by Spanish Speakers in English

Refusal strategy	Moral	Social	Physical	Educa-tional	Financial
2. Direct "no"	100 **R=(27.4%)** **C=(21.7%)**	92 **(25.2%)** **(16.3%)**	59 (16.2%) (9.9%)	54 (14.8%) (9.2%)	60 (16.4%) (10.8%)
4. Statement of Regret	68 R=(13%) **C=(14.8%)**	97 (18.5%) **(17.1%)**	79 (15.1%) **(13.3%)**	137 **(26.2%)** **(23.5%)**	143 **(27.3%)** **(25.8%)**
6. Excuse/Explanation	97 R=(9.6%) **C=(21.1%)**	198 (19.6%) **(35%)**	241 (23.8%) **(40.6%)**	249 (24.6%) **(42.6%)**	228 (22.5%) **(41.1%)**
7. Stating an Alternative	7 R=(7.5%) C=(1.5%)	31 **(33.3%)** (5.5%)	28 **(30.1%)** (4.7%)	6 (6.5%) (1.0%)	21 (22.6%) (3.8%)
8. Stating an Alternative	12 **R=(37.5%)** C=(2.6%)	5 (15.6%) (0.9%)	4 (12.5%) (0.7%)	5 (15.6%) (0.9%)	6 (18.8%) (1.1%)
13. Statement of Principle	20 **R=(62.5%)** C=(4.3%)	7 (21.9%) (1.2%)	1 (3.1%) (0.2%)	2 (6.3%) (0.3%)	2 (6.3%) (0.4%)
17. Criticize the Request(er)	82 **R=(60.3%)** **C=(17.8)**	15 (11.0%) (2.7%)	23 (16.9%) (3.9%)	6 (4.4%) (1.0%)	10 (7.4%) (1.8%)
28. Verbal Avoidance: Postponement	2 R=(2.5%) C=(0.4%)	24 **(29.6%)** (4.2%)	11 (13.6%) (1.9%)	31 **(38.3%)** (5.3%)	13 (16.1%) (2.3%)
32. Statement of positive feeling or opinion	7 R=(6.1%) C=(1.5%)	18 (15.7%) (3.2%)	25 (21.7%) (4.2%)	49 **(42.6%)** (8.4%)	16 (13.9%) (2.9%)
34. Pause Fillers	17 R=(17.4%) C=(3.7%)	16 (16.3%) (2.8%)	29 **(29.6%)** (4.9%)	20 (20.4%) (3.4%)	16 (16.3%) (2.9%)
35. Gratitude/ Appreciation	48 R=(17.8%) C=(10.4%)	63 (23.3%) (11.1%)	94 **(34.8%)** **(15.8%)**	25 (9.3%) (4.3%)	40 (14.8%) (7.2%)

Native Spanish speakers in English and refusals for moral reasons

SE subjects used very similar strategies as the SS in slightly different proportions. They used direct "no" (21.7%), excuse/explanation (21.1%), and criticize the request or requester (17.8%) frequently in refusals for moral reasons. Both SS and SE subjects used more excuse/explanation than the EE subjects in refusals for moral reasons.

SE subjects used more statements of regret than SS and EE subjects in refusals for moral reasons (14.8%) and in refusals for moral, social, physical, and financial reasons. This may be because respondents answering in their second language are less sure of the cultural norms of the target language, and may overuse this strategy in hopes of avoiding offense to the requester. As the row percentages show, SE subjects used more statements of principle in refusals for moral reasons than in refusals for other reasons. However, SS and EE subjects didn't use this strategy in their refusals. When requesters asked the respondents to do something that the respondents felt was morally wrong, it was natural for the respondents to have refused stating their principles. SE probably used this strategy more than the other groups because they are more doubtful than SS and EE speakers that their requesters are aware of their principles (as SE subjects are responding to requesters of another culture).

Finally, SE subjects used statements of alternative (37.5%) more than SS and EE subjects, and more in refusals for moral reasons. This may be because SE subjects wish to soften their refusals to requesters who possibly have different cultural values.

Refusals for social reasons

Like SS and EE subjects, SE subjects used excuse/explanation (35%) and direct "no" (16.3%) in refusals for social reasons. SE subjects also used statements of regret (17.1%) frequently in refusals for social reasons. Row percentages show that, like SS and EE subjects, SE subjects used verbal avoidance: postponement (29.6%), and like SS subjects, SE subjects used stating an alternative (33.3%) frequently in refusals for social reasons. These strategies may be used by SE subjects because they feel insecure about refusing in a second language for fear of offending the requester. This may be the way they soften their refusals.

Refusals for physical reasons

Like EE and SS, SE used excuse/explanation (40.6%) and gratitude/appreciation (15.8%) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. However, unlike SS and EE subjects, SE subjects did not use direct "no" (9.9%) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. Instead, they used statements of regret (13.3%). This may be another attempt of SE subjects to soften their refusals to requesters of another language/cultural background. SE subjects don't seem to be as confident in using direct refusals, possibly because they do not know how the requesters will receive such refusals.

Row percentages show that, like SS and EE, SE subjects used statement of alternative (30.1%) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. However, SE also used strategy 34 (pause fillers) frequently in refusals for physical reasons. This may be because they didn't know how to form the refusal for linguistic or pragmatic reasons. Either they weren't sure how to reject the invitations and requests because the language structures were difficult or they were unsure how the situations were rejected "politely" in the target language.

Refusals for educational reasons

Like SS and EE subjects, SE subjects used excuse/explanation (41.1%), statement of regret (23.5%), and direct "no" (9.2%) frequently in refusals for educational reasons. In addition, row percentages show that SE subjects (like SS and EE subjects) used verbal avoidance: postponement (38.3%) and statements of positive opinion (42.6%) more when refusing for educational reasons than for other reasons. However, SS and EE subjects also used set conditions for acceptance frequently in refusals for educational reasons, but SE subjects did not. This might be because conditionals are a difficult English structure for learners of English to form.

Refusals for financial reasons

Like SS and EE, SE used excuse/explanation (41.1%) and statements of regret (25.8%) frequently in refusals for financial reasons. However, SE subjects used direct "no" (10.8%) less than SS and EE subjects. Row percentages show that, once again, SE subjects used set conditions for acceptance less than SS and EE subjects (probably because of the linguistic complexity of the strategy). And SE subjects used verbal avoidance: postponement less than SS and SE subjects, and pause fillers less than SS subjects.

Conclusion

Summary of Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the subjects' native language/ cultural background and their reason for refusing would have an effect on native Spanish and native English speakers' refusal strategies. It was found that EE, SS, and SE subjects refused

for negative pragmatic transfer in the refusal patterns of SE subjects. However, it was also found that in some cases the refusal strategies of SE approximated those of EE subjects and in other instances, the refusal strategies of SE subjects were different from those of both EE and SS. This may have been because the SE subjects were responding to requesters of a different culture, or because they avoided making refusals which were linguistically challenging, etc.

It was also found that the three groups varied their refusal strategies according to the reason for refusing. All language groups criticized the request or the requester more for moral reasons, used verbal avoidance: postponement in refusals for social reasons, used gratitude/ appreciation and statements of alternative more in refusals for physical reasons, used statements of positive feeling frequently in refusals for educational reasons, and statements of regret in refusals for financial reasons.

Implications

The first implication of this study follows from the results that showed that the reason for refusing has an effect on the refusal strategies of respondents. This means that classroom practices need to be in context and have a purpose. Students need to be taught more than a fixed, "I'm sorry, I can't go tonight" when learning how to refuse in English. They need to know that this phrase will vary if they are refusing for moral, physical, educational, social, or financial reasons. In addition, they need to know that, if they don't perform this speech act acceptably, they may offend or confuse the requester.

Another implication of this study deals with the results of this study that showed that subjects' culture has an affect on their speech acts across the globe. English is spoken by more nonnative English speakers than by native English speakers. In addition, it is possible that

English speakers (native or nonnative) of each group use speech acts differently when they speak English. Because of this, language teachers need to take into consideration the needs and interests of their students before they begin teaching American English speech acts to all the people of the world. For example, if learning English in Europe, a language learner may benefit more from learning British English speech acts than American English speech acts (which may not be the same) because they may have more opportunities to interact with people from Britain than from the United States. On the other hand, if a teacher is in Japan teaching EFL to business men and women who will interact with business men and women from the United States, the teacher would probably teach them American English cultural norms for speech acts so that they could interact successfully with people from the United States. Therefore, language teachers need to take into consideration the learners' purposes for learning English in order to assess what would be most beneficial to teach.

However, it is possible that in some cases students will not see the need to learn speech acts, even when the teacher does see a definite need. For example, an EFL teacher preparing students to participate in a home-stay program in the United States, should encourage students to achieve competence in performing American English speech acts. If not, the students' stay in the United States may be difficult and problematic. One particular area that may lead to serious problems is dealing with proposals from a member of the opposite sex. If interlocutors do not refuse or interpret refusals in the same way, miscommunication may result and the situation could lead to charges of sexual harassment. For example, American English speaking women may refuse a man's advance in a way that is misinterpreted as an acceptance by men from outside of the United States. In order to avoid this situation and other similar situations, it is

important for teachers to encourage students to learn how to interpret and perform these critical speech acts competently, even when the students may not have interest in learning speech acts.

In order for students to be motivated to learn to perform speech acts they must see the need. Students need to be aware that people from different countries perform speech acts differently. In addition, they need to be aware of the consequences of performing speech acts in a foreign country, the way they would in their native country. They need to see that miscommunications can sometimes lead to serious problems. Seelye (1993) suggests come activities designed to raise students' awareness of intercultural communication. Some examples are culture assimilators, culture capsules, culture clusters, and culturgrams[1] (or other sources that may be available in the students' country or that may be provided by the teacher).

Videos are another good way to teach speech acts. Students can watch video clips in the target language which show native speakers involved in making refusals. The teacher could pre-view the clips and be prepared to introduce the video clips and to indicate to the students the critical cultural points and the possibilities for cross-cultural miscommunication. Pre-viewing and post-viewing activities could be used which help students observe and analyze the differences between the way the people in the video performed the speech acts, and the way the students would perform the speech acts in their native language and culture.

Another good way for students to learn and practice speech acts is through drama. Plays could be created by the teacher which include different speech acts. Students would then have the opportunity to act out different roles and situations, practicing performing speech acts in a

[1] Culturgrams, a series of four-page briefings, providing information into the cultures of about 100 countries are available from Publications Services, David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies, 280 HRCB, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602.

manner that would be appropriate in the target language community. This technique would be most successful at a more advanced level, when students already see the need for cross-cultural speech act competence, and are already aware of many of the differences in the way speech acts are performed in their native culture and the target language culture.

In summary, teachers of foreign languages need to use effective techniques in teaching language and/or develop new techniques that let students learn language in context, with a purpose, and with the understanding that they will need to learn more than grammar to survive in the target language culture. Students first need to be aware that there are differences in the way people of different cultures perform speech acts, then they need to see the need to learn what these differences are, and finally, students need to be taught how to perform speech acts in the target language culture. They need to become competent in performing speech acts in cross-cultural communication.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Some caution is needed in interpreting the results due to the limitations of this study. First, for practicality sake, the data were gathered in written form. Unfortunately, written and spoken language are slightly different from each other. It is more common for subjects to edit written responses and for them to be more formal, than it is in spontaneous spoken language. These differences may have affected the subjects' refusal behavior. However, subjects' responses did include pause fillers such as "Uhh," "Uhm," "Well," and "Oh" and attention getters such as "Hey," "Listen," "Look,"etc. Such strategies show that subjects were following the instructions which indicated that they should imagine themselves in the situations or in similar situations and then to answer in the most natural way as they would in a real situation.

They were also encouraged to use their own words. In spite of the instructions and the subjects' use of natural language, there remains the possibility that the subjects' responses differed slightly from what they would have said if they had responded orally.

Another difficulty in preparing the instrument was finding situations which would be morally wrong for both the native English speaking culture in the United States and the native Spanish speaking culture in Madrid, Spain. As mentioned previously, it is difficult to find situations that are parallel for all cultures.

All of these limitations show the need for additional research. There is a great deal more that needs to be discovered about refusal patterns of different language groups and second language learners acquisition of refusals. Studies need to look more at the relationship and status of requesters and refusers. The length of time the second language learner has lived in the target language culture and its effect on the acquisition of speech acts could also be studied (as it has been in other speech act studies). And, more needs to be done looking at the type of elicitation strategy (offer, suggestion, request, or invitation) and the reason for refusing (with refusals and with other speech acts). In addition, studies should be done which aim at constructing and testing methods and classroom techniques that will help teachers prepare their students to function successfully in the target language culture. Comparisons between ESL and EFL students' performance of speech acts should also be looked at.

References

Beebe, L.M., Takahaski, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E.S. Anderson & S.D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York, NY: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 3*(1), 36-55.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, A., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 5-35.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning, 31*(1), 113-134.

Eisenstein & Bodman (1986). "I very appreciate," Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics 7*(2), 167-185.

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1983). *Language transfer in language learning.* Rowley, M.A.: Newbury House.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Madden, M. & Kahn, A.S. (1992, April). *Strategies for resisting influence: The effects of gender, status, and relationship closeness.* A paper presented at the Eastern

Psychological Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 434).

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A.D. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.) Sociolinguistics and language acquisition (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Seelye, H. N. (1993). *Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Stevens, P.B. (1993). The pragmatics of "No!": Some strategies in English and Arabic. *IDEAL, 6*, 87-112.

Walters, J. (1983). Strategies for requesting in Spanish and English. *Language Learning, 29*(2), 277-293.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Invitations, compliments, and the competence of the native speaker. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics, 24* (4), 7-22.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL.* New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Appendix

Questionnaire

Male/Female Age____ Highest Level of Education_____ Country of Origin_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Try to imagine yourself in the following situations, or in a similar experience that you have had, then answer the following questions in the most natural way, as you would in a real situation. Use your own words.

Example: You have an appointment to work on a project with your professor. You almost forget about the appointment and are late in arriving. What would you say?

I am sorry Professor Brown, I have been very busy today and I did not realize that it was so late.

1. A salesperson comes to your door selling magazines. You don't want to buy anything because you think they are too expensive and you are short of money these days.

Salesperson: So, would you like to buy a magazine subscription?
You: _____
_____
_____

2. While at a dance club a person whom you've never met asks you to dance. After a few dances s/he asks you to go out. However, you have no interest in going out with this person.

Stranger: Would you like to go out with me on Saturday?
You: _____
_____
_____

3. Your friend asks you to lend her/him 50.000 pts, but s/he does not know when s/he will be able to pay you back. 50.000 pts is nearly all of your savings, and you don't want to lend her/him the money.

Friend: I am really low on money right now. I know this is a very sensitive issue but is there any way you could loan me 50.000 pts?
You: _____
_____
_____

4. You are at the supermarket and employees are giving out free samples of the food items. One employee invites you to try a sample of their new chorizo. You don't want any, however, because chorizo makes you sick to your stomach.

Employee: Try our new chorizo. It is made with new spices. It's really good.
You: _____
_____
_____

5. You are at the Corte Ingles with your friend and all of a sudden your friend asks you to cover for him/her so that he/she can steal something. However, you don't feel it is right to help your friend steal so you don't want to cover him/her.

Friend: Hey, can you come over here to my right and cover me so no one can see me?

You: _____
_____
_____

6. You work at a store. One night a fellow worker you've never met comes by work and asks you to substitute for him/her the following morning. You usually work nights and had planned to study for your test in the morning, so you don't want to substitute.

Worker: Hi, I work mornings and am looking for a substitute for tomorrow morning. Is there any way you could work for me?
You: _____
_____
_____

7. You and a friend work together at the supermarket. One night, while unpacking boxes, s/he asks you to help her move a box. Although you'd like to help, you hurt your back last month and the doctor instructed you not to lift anything heavy. Therefore, you do not want to move the box.

Friend: Can you give me a hand with this box? We have to move it over there.
You: _____
_____
_____

8. It's Friday night and your friend invites you to go dancing, but you do not feel like dancing and don't want to go.

Your Friend: Hey, would you like to go dancing at el Orense tonight?
You: _____
_____
_____

9. You are walking down the street late at night when suddenly you are stopped by a prostitute. You do not feel that what he/she is doing is right so you don't want to receive his/her "services."

Prostitute: Hello. How would you like to spend the best hours of your life with me in that little hotel over there. I promise you won't regret it.
You: _____
_____
_____

10. A person approaches you on the street selling goods you believe are stolen. Although the price is good, you don't want to buy anything stolen because you don't feel that it's right.

Salesperson: Come take a look. We have lots of choices...Would you like to buy that?
You: _____
_____
_____

11. A friend invites you to go out to dinner. However, you don't want to go because you are preparing for a big test and have plans to be at a study group most of the night.

Friend: A bunch of us are going to eat tonight. Would you like to go?
You: _____
_____

_____

12. You are at a dance club. While you are sitting down, cooling off, someone sits down next to you and invites you to a cold drink. However, you have a toothache and a cold drink would irritate it even more.

Dancer: Would you like to have a cold drink with me to help you cool down a bit?
You: _____
_____
_____

13. You are at a dance and someone you don't know invites you to dance. However, he/she isn't someone you feel like dancing with.

Stranger: Would you like to dance?
You: _____
_____
_____

14. You are at work and a coworker calls you up and asks you to punch in for him/her because he/she is going to arrive late and doesn't want the supervisor to know. But you feel it's dishonest so you don't want to do it.

Coworker: Hi! Could you please punch in for me? I'm going to be late to work today and I don't want the supervisor to find out.
You: _____
_____
_____

15. You are at school, waiting to buy a drink in a machine. The person ahead of you realizes that they do not have enough money to buy anything. You brought exact change, and don't have any extra money.
Stranger: These prices must have gone up since last time I've bought food here. I only have 40 pts. Do you by chance have an extra 10 pts that I could have?
You: _____
_____
_____

16. You stop by to see your friend and family. When you arrive they are just beginning to eat and your friend invites you to eat with them. Unfortunately, you realize that you are allergic to the main dish and don't want to eat.

Your Friend: Oh, it's great to see you. We were just sitting down to eat. Would you like to join us?
You: _____
_____
_____

17. You are a university student. Your friend invites you to take a trip to Sevilla with him/her for a week, but you don't want to miss school.

Friend: I'm going to Sevilla for a week. Would you like to go with me?
You: _____
_____
_____

18. You and your friend have a class together. Your friend invites you to study at his/her home, but the truth is, you don't want to study at your friend's home because you don't like his/her spouse and know that he/she will be there while you study.

Your Friend: Do you want to study together at my house tonight?
You: _____
_____
_____

19. Your friend is the manager of a restaurant and offers you a job working for her/him. You don't want to accept the job because the pay is lower than you feel you can afford.

Friend: So what do you think? Do you want to come to work for us? We could really use you!
You: _____
_____
_____

20. On your way to class you are stopped by someone soliciting people to fill out a questionnaire that would take about a half an hour. However you don't want to miss your class, so you don't want to stop and fill it out.

Solicitor: Could you please take thirty minutes and fill out this questionnaire for me?
You: _____
_____
_____

Where would you rate your answers to this survey on the following continuum?

White Lie Tactful Honest
------------------*---------*---------*---------**---------*---------*---------*---------*---------*

How many years have you lived in an English speaking country?
How many years have you formally studied English?

Rate your English proficiency.
Beginner Low Intermediate Intermediate Advanced Native-like
Have you ever been taught how to make refusals in English by a teacher, friend, or other native speaker?

TESOL 97

FL024603

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Refusal Patterns of Native English Speakers in Spanish and English and of Native English Speakers in English.

Author(s): Julie Lauper

TESOL 97 presentation? X yes ___ no If no, was this presented at another conference? ___ yes ___ no Specify: _____

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents	
☒ Check here **For Level 1 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	☐ Check here **For Level 2 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.
	Level 1	**Level 2**	

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Julie Lauper	Printed Name/Position/Title: Julie Lauper, ESL Instructor	
Organization/Address: 11 Rio Del Ct Danville, CA 94526 City College of San Francisco	Telephone: 510 820-6147	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: jlauper@pacbell.net	Date: 5/28/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037