



Minnesota State University, Mankato
Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly
and Creative Works for Minnesota
State University, Mankato

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other
Capstone Projects

2011

A Study of Turkish and English Refusal Speech Acts with a Secondary Examination for Bi-Directional Language Transferrals

Morgan Jerome Moody
Minnesota State University - Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moody, M. J. (2011). A Study of Turkish and English Refusal Speech Acts with a Secondary Examination for Bi-Directional Language Transferrals [Master's thesis, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/281/>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

A study of Turkish and English refusal speech acts with a secondary examination
for bi-directional language transferrals.

By

Morgan J. Moody

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts: English

In

Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

July 2011

A study of Turkish and English refusal speech acts with a secondary examination
for bi-directional language transferrals.

Morgan Moody

This thesis has been examined and approved by the following members of the
thesis committee.

Dr. Nancy Drescher, chair

Jessica Schomberg, second reader

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1
Conclusion.....	9
Chapter II: Review of the Literature	11
High versus low context language	12
Transferrals	13
Pragmatic failures	15
Speech Act Theory	18
Refusals	19
How status affects refusals.	26
Face and politeness.....	28
The pragmatics of refusal speech acts.....	30
Comparative Studies	31
Chapter III: Methodology.....	39
Participants	39
Materials and Methods.....	41
DCT Administration	44
Data Analysis	45
Classification of Refusals (Table 3.1)	47
Conclusion	49
Chapter IV: Results.....	50
Macro-view of content.....	51
Requests.....	51
Invitations.	51
Offers.	52
Suggestions.	52
Effects of Status	53
Invitations.	56
Offers.	58

	iv
Suggestions	62
Comparative Analysis/Examination for Transferrals	65
Content of Refusals.....	71
Discussion	74
Chapter V: Conclusion.....	77
Limitations of the study	78
Possible future research	81
References	82

Tables

Table 1.0: Table of terminology	7
Table 2.0: Five Fundamental Speech Acts	18
Table 2.1: Components of Refusals	21
Table 2.2: Adjuncts to Refusals	22
Table 2.3: Strategies for Speech Act Acquisition	24
Table 2.4: Strategies for Sustaining Knowledge of Speech Acts	25
Table 3.0: Table of stimulus type in relation to status	42
Table 4.0: Requests when Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor	53
Table 4.1: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor	54
Table 4.2: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor	55
Table 4.3: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor	56
Table 4.4: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor	57
Table 4.5: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor	57
Table 4.6: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor	59
Table 4.7: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor: Part One	59
Table 4.8: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor: Part Two	60
Table 4.9: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor	61
Table 4.10: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor	62
Table 4.11: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor	63
Table 4.12: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor	64

Figures

Figure 1: Classification of Refusals.....	47
Figure 2: Adjuncts to Refusals.....	47

Chapter I: Introduction

Turkey is a country of rising importance in the international arena. Political and business communications between Turkey and the rest of the world will most likely be increasing in the coming years. Turkey is not only a geographical bridge between East and West, but also an important power for regional stability and integration, according to Kandemir (1997). Because Turkey is the only country that is a concurrent member of NATO, Economic Cooperation Organization, and the Black Sea Economic Cooperation, Turkey is an integral part of multilateral peace efforts. Turkey is allied with Israel as well as numerous Arab countries. The West must begin to improve relations and communications with Turkey.

The current research will explore sociolinguistic differences between Turkish and North American English refusal acts. A basic knowledge of the modern Turkish language will contextualize the present study, as well as provide a greater ability to understand Turkey as a nation. One point in modern Turkish history that is of particular importance to the current study is the nation-wide language reformation. The language reform is important as it was the birth of modern Turkish and the removal of the language of the Ottoman Empire. The reform began during an overarching cultural reform in the fledgling nation, which was born after the fall of the Ottoman Empire (1299 AD to 1923 AD). The goal of the language reform was to modernize and return Turkish to its

linguistic roots. To understand the modernization process, one must understand the history of the Turkish people and the linguistic legacy left by the forbearers of the modern Republic of Turkey. After the conversion of the Turkic peoples to Islam and the defeat of the Byzantine Empire (306 AD to 1453 AD), the Ottoman Turks took control of Asia Minor. During the transitory period of the conversion and conquest of the Byzantines, the Turks acquired a multitude of loan words from Arabic and from the neighboring Persians. Parallel to the Ottoman's rise to power over Byzantium and the Seljuk Empire was the rise of the Ottoman's version of Turkish, which is called Osmanlıca.

With the expansion of the Ottoman Empire came the absorption of other cultures and languages, allowing for the increased influence of the Arabic and Persian languages on Ottoman Turkish. Osmanlıca became the official language of the Empire, slowly eroding the use of the pre-Ottoman Turkish. Başkan (1986) compared the process of language change in this area to that of English during the Norman Conquest over England, allowing for the linguistic domination of the English language by French, demoting the standing of English in society.

Numerous issues within the Ottoman Empire led to its decline and eventual fall at the hands of western powers. The War of Independence (1919 AD to 1923 AD) was won by the Turks, who quickly realized that the repercussions of the First World War had to be addressed by the Republic of Turkey. With the establishment of the Republic in 1923 AD, the new government realized that, in order to survive, they must modernize their country and society. The modernization came to be through four major undertakings:

1) the secularization of the formerly Islamic nation, 2) Westernization, 3) removal of Ottoman influences, 4) the return and dominance of pre- Osmanlıca Turkish. The creation of a secular Turkey was seen as necessary as the subject of religion had, in the past, impeded the progress of modernization within the Empire. The Caliphate, and all laws and regulations that were religious in nature, were abolished. Religious garb became outlawed as was the use of Arabic in the education system of Turkey. The use of the Indo-Arabic numeric system was replaced by the Roman system of the West. The most significant event in the language reform occurred in 1928, when the Arabic script of the Empire was replaced with the Roman alphabet. The reason that the shift to a Roman alphabet is such an important event is that, according to Başkan (1986), the Arabic script was “a sacrosanct symbol of Islam among Muslim nations” (p. 100). The introduction of the Roman alphabet brought forth Western influences in language and possibly other social-cultural elements.

Another form of modernization was the downplay of Islam in the culture and imagery of Turkey in order to further model the West. As the extrication of Islam from the culture occurred, the Turks unconsciously realized it must be replaced by something. The “something” became the strong Turkish nationalism that still exists today. Thusly, the Turks purged all Arabic and Persian loanwords and linguistic influence, replacing the gaps with their own “lexical items of Turkic origin with neologisms based on Turkish roots and suffixes” (Başkan, 1986, p. 102). Along with the Romanization of the Turkish script, the language was reformed to become a phonetic language, meaning that there is a one-to-one relationship between a grapheme (letter) and a phoneme (sound).

The removal of the Arabic script was not only a political issue but also one of practicality. The script itself is incompatible with the Turkish language.

The understanding of incompatibility and the shift to a Roman style of writing was led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the fledgling nation's leader and a major proponent of the change. He saw the inherent incompatibility between the Arabic text and the modern Turkish, expurgated of the outside linguistic influences. Arabic is based upon consonants, only containing three vowels that are not written when they are short. The number of vowels in the Arabic writing system is in contrast to modern Turkish, which has eight. Turkish also has five more consonants than Arabic that could not be represented with a grapheme. The missing consonants are: 1) "v", 2) "g", 3) "p" 4) "ç" and, 5) "j". The Arabic consonants "h", "y", and "v" can be pronounced as vowels. The differences caused a great deal of confusion and also led to an increase in illiteracy among Turkish people. Atatürk's motivation for change was based on necessity and had popular support.

The historical information presented in the current research is important because it has a direct correlation with the linguistic shifts in Turkish society. Historically, Persian, Arabic, and Turkish fused and became Osmanlıca, both culturally and linguistically. As that occurred and despite the efforts made to eradicate any linguistic artifacts of the Ottoman era, it is clear that that era had an important influence on Turkish society. Turkish history exemplifies a universal truth; language and culture are intertwined and as a person or group of people learn certain aspects of language, these aspects may show themselves unconsciously despite efforts to suppress them. One could

examine the phenomenon in terms of how bi-or-multi-lingual individuals use language.

A combined knowledge of the past with the present will help foster cultural and linguistic understanding of a bridge nation such as Turkey.

This linguistic context provides a particularly rich environment for the study of pragmatics. Pragmatics is a form of linguistics that examines how context aids in understanding the meaning of utterances, according to Cutting (2002). For example, pragmatics can examine how culture affects language and language use. A theory within pragmatics is known as Speech Act Theory. As Cutting (2002) notes, Speech Act Theory examines what we say and what is intended. To further understand Speech Act Theory, an example will be presented. One individual may state “It sure is cold in here!” and simply be declaring a fact. In Speech Act Theory one could examine the utterance more deeply and see that the individual is indirectly making a request for the interlocutor to close a window or turn on the furnace.

Pragmatic failures provide an opportunity to study pragmatic competence. Pragmatic research is important, especially cross-cultural pragmatic research, as researchers begin to learn and catalogue the strategies of languages. Pragmatics allows for a better diagnosis of a failure (whether or not it is due to pragmatic transfer).

The current study specifically looks at the speech act of refusals in the US and Turkey. A “refusal” is the name of a category of speech acts that are used to decline something be it a request, an invitation, an offer, or a suggestion. An example of how such a speech act may manifest itself can be found in the following conversation: “Would you like to go have a cup of coffee?” With the response of: “I’d love to, but I

have a class starting in five minutes, maybe tomorrow.” The response clearly operates as a refusal to have coffee at that time.

Turkey and the United States of America will be discussed using contrastive cross-cultural pragmatics in the present study. Cross-cultural pragmatics is a concept that examines the use of a specific speech act functions in two cultures. The current study looks at the phenomenon of transferrals, or the occurrence of an individual integrating approaches to language use from one language to another (Ewert 2008). A different way of explaining transferrals may be to give yet another example. Let us state that in one language the way that an individual greets a friend could be “What’s up?” while in another language, individuals ask the question of “How’s your health?” With a scenario created, let us pretend an individual who was born and educated using the first language begins to learn the second. If the individual in question does not know the pragmatically correct greeting of “How’s your health?” They may make a literal translation of the phrase “What’s up?” into the second language; the use of a direct translation across languages is a transferal.

Table 1.0 is a collection of technical terms used within the current study. The information contained within the table includes: the term, its definition, the original source for the word and where it is defined within this text. The table should act as a reference guide for those readers who are unfamiliar with the specific terminology of the linguistic subsets discussed within the literature review.

Table 1.0: Table of terminology

Term	Definition	Origin
Declaratives (Performatives)	Declarative acts are those that make a notable or important change after having been performed	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007) p. 25
Representatives	Acts that allows the speaker to convey viewpoints, feelings, assertions and others.	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007) p. 25
Expressives	These are acts that allow the speaker to express the speaker or listener's psychological state of being. It is considered to be one of the most important types of speech acts for a language learner.	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007) p. 25
Directives	Directives are face-threatening acts as they allow the speaker to articulate a want while compelling the listener or listeners to fulfill the want.	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007) p. 25
Commissive	Commissive speech acts are also face-threatening. With a commissive, the speaker obligates (or refuses to obligate) himself or herself to take a future action. The use of such verbs as "promise" or "refuse" strengthens the commissive.	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007) p. 25
Direct/Indirect Dimension	"[The] extent [to which] speakers reveal their intentions through explicit communication."	Nelson, 2002 A, p. 40
L2 User	"An L2 user is defined as any person who uses a second language for a real-life purpose, for example receiving education through the medium of the L2."	Ewert, 2008, p. 32
L2 Learner	"Persons learning English in the classroom for future use."	Ewert, 2008, p. 39

Pragmatic competence	An individual's capacity to understand language used in a specific context and to employ a language successfully to accomplish a certain purpose.	Nelson, 2002 B, p. 163
Pragmalinguistic competence	The ability to use language correctly to achieve a speech act.	Nelson, 2002 B, p. 163
Sociopragmatic competence	Whether or not the chosen speech act is correct in a given context.	Nelson, 2002 B, p. 163
Multicompetence	"The knowledge of more than one language in the same mind."	Ewert, 2008, pp. 32-33
The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism	"All the languages of a multilingual are separate but interacting subsystems in a dynamic system."	Ewert, 2008, p. 33
Face	The concept of manufacturing and preserving an individual's concept of self as seen or experienced by others.	Turnbull and Saxton, 1996, p. 145
Social psychological pragmatics	How linguistic assets are utilized in interpersonal communication.	Turnbull and Saxton, 1996, p. 145
Linguistic transfer	"Incorporation of elements from one language into another."	Ewert, 2008, pp. 33-34
Negative pragmatic transfer	"When a pragmatic feature [e.g., direct or indirect strategies, mitigation devices] in the interlanguage is (structurally, functionally, distributionally) the same as in LI [first language] but different from L2."	Félix-Brasdefer, 2009, p. 590
Semantic formula	"Consists of a word, phrase or sentence which meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy, and [...] can be used to perform the act in question. Semantic formulas are, for example, direct refusal (e.g. "No", "I refuse", "no way") or statement of regret (e.g. "I'm sorry," "unfortunately")."	Ewert, 2008, p. 39

Pragmatic failure	When a L2 speaker communicates with a native speaker and the native speaker understands the purpose of the utterance differently than what the L2 user intended.	Nelson, 2002 B, p. 164
Reconceptualized Second Language Acquisition	"All language knowledge is inherently dynamic, variable, provisional and sensitive to renegotiation and renewal."	Félix-Brasdefer, 2009, p. 3
Cultural scripts	Formulaic social situations that necessitate highly routine communication and are biased toward a specific culture.	Ewert, 2008, p. 38
Speech act	The smallest component of communication.	Nelson, 2002 B, p. 163
High context culture	"One in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message."	Nelson, 2002 A, p. 40
Low context culture	The opposite of a high context culture, they are explicit and the information is coded in the words themselves.	Nelson, 2002 A, p. 40

Conclusion

Two research questions are addressed in the current study: "How do native Turkish-language speakers use refusals in comparison to native English-language speakers?" and "How many, if any, language transferrals occur in the English discourse of Turkish English Language Learners?" Chapter I presented the growing importance of Turkey as a country as well as the parallel of the importance of Turkish as a language. A brief history of the massive language reform created contextualization and understanding

for the rest of the study. The information collected was then connected to the two research questions examined in the study.

The rest of the study will be structured as follows: Chapter II will review relevant literature in order to build a clearer framing for the study. The third chapter will present the methodology for the study and materials used in the data-collection process. Results of the collection as well as interpretation will be found within Chapter IV. The fifth and final chapter will conclude the present study giving a retrospective overview of what occurred and what conclusions were made.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature

The literature review then, examines past comparative studies about refusal speech acts in different cultural contexts, as well as general information related to pragmatics and Speech Act Theory. A rather large component of linguistics, called pragmatics, is defined by Cutting (2002) as the study of the improvement in accuracy of understanding statements when the meaning is interpreted in view of the situation in which the statements were made. Within pragmatics, there is a concept known as Speech Act Theory. Cutting (2002) further explains that Speech Act Theory encompasses the intended meaning of an utterance.

Another important concept within Speech Act Theory is that of the direct/indirect dimension. Nelson et al. (2002a) defines the direct/indirect dimension as how explicitly an individual expresses his or her meaning through communication. What is known as the direct type of communication is the explicit proclamation of an individual's general desires, needs and stance. Direct communication is stating what is thought without equivocation or hidden meaning. The indirect type of communication is the exact opposite; the speaker hides their true desires, needs and stance.

Chang (2008) notes that Americans prefer a more explicit and direct style of discourse that is also assertive. The Chinese, on the other hand, avoid the word "no" with

great persistence and prefer a more unassertive, indirect and implicit style of communication. The discussed difference is not just the case with English and Chinese, but also Arabic of Jordanian and Egyptian varieties (Nelson, 2002 a).

Another part of pragmatic study is the exploration of refusal speech acts. Chang (2008) described refusals as actions of speech that are a rejection of another individual's speech acts for the initiation of social interaction by a different individual.

Language is the focus of the current study, specifically the use of language in differing cultures to refuse an offer, suggestion and other scenarios. There are elements of language that must be discussed and defined including multicompetence, transferrals, pragmatics, Speech Act Theory and refusals, in order to better understand the current study.

High versus low context language

As explained above, the study of pragmatics is based upon contextualizing utterances. Within languages, context is also important, in relation to the intended meaning of a statement. Nelson et al. (2002 a) uses Hall's (1976) definition of high versus low context cultures. A high context culture is "one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message" while low context cultures are the opposite; they are explicit and the information is coded in the words themselves (as cited by Nelson 2002 a, p. 40). The Arab cultural communication style is very much considered to be high context while American communication is considered low context, thus more direct in nature (Nelson, 2002 a).

Transferrals

To begin to discuss language in the context of second language acquisition and the context of this study, linguistic transfers must be examined. Ewert (2008) researched transferrals as other researchers have, with the interesting difference that the direction of the transferrals occurred from L2 to L1, rather than vice versa. A part of the Ewert (2008) article discussed how exposure to an L2 can cause pragmalinguistic transfers in terms of linguistic behaviors of an individual's L1. It also defines and discusses awareness of multi-language knowledge as well as the transfer in multicompetence.

Ewert (2008) defines multicompetence as “the knowledge of more than one language in the same mind” (pp. 32-33). Ewert then notes that since the knowledge is stored in one mind, the multiple languages are then unified. The unification creates a multicompetence of both the languages rather than having them stored separately.

Differences between monolinguals and bilinguals/multilinguals are actually fairly far-reaching. In communication, bilingual individuals tend to give more information to, and are more attentive of the needs of, interlocutors. Ewert (2008) points out that, in the case of children, bilinguals have a better sense of metalinguistic consciousness. It can be inferred from this that the bilingual individuals are more aware of the formal rules and constructions of language.

Ewert (2008) mentions that the concept of language transfer has its roots in the realm of psychology, specifically in studies relating to behavior. Furthermore, the specialized understanding of the concept of transfer is broken down and defined as

“[w]hat occurs when the learning of one activity influences the learning of a second ability” (Ewert, 2008, pp. 33-34). Ewert (2008) defines the process of linguistic transfer in research on second language acquisition as “incorporation of elements from one language into another” (pp. 33-34).

Similarly, the concept of transfer has been absorbed into pragmatics in regard to the way an individual's pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures that are not related to his or her L2 affect the way the individual comprehends, creates, and acquires pragmatic subject matter in his or her L2 (Ewert, 2008). According to Félix-Brasdefer (2009), negative pragmatic transfer occurs when a pragmatic element is approximated by an individual in the L2 and is used the same as in their L1 but different from the L2.

In an attempt to further clarify the concept of transfer, Ewert (2008) states that “The verb transfer implies that someone moves something from one place to another [...] language acquisition or use is not transferring something from one part of the mind to another, but two systems accommodating to each other” (p. 34). Ewert’s (2008) views may be very different from the original, psychological view of transfer, but they are backed by data collected through research. Language transfer occurs in both directions and is "intermodular in the sense that bilingualism affects certain aspects of cognitive processing" (p. 34). Numerous studies have found that pragmatic transfers from L2 to L1 occur. It is important to note that elements of the second language do not transfer over to all the areas of the first language in the same level and the consequences of the transfer cannot be predicted every time. Also, Ewert (2008) points out that “some areas of pragmatic knowledge are either unaffected or less affected by L2 influence” (p. 34).

Ewert (2008) found that the amount of exposure to an L2 does, in fact, influence how often certain semantic formulas are used in refusal acts with interlocutors of equal or higher status. Ewert (2008) states that a "semantic formula consists of a word, phrase or sentence which meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy, and...can be used to perform the act in question. Semantic formulas are, for example, direct refusal (e.g. "No", "I refuse", "no way") or statement of regret (e.g. "I'm sorry", "unfortunately")" (p. 39). Ewert (2008) found the exposure did not affect the way the individuals speak to interlocutors of a lower status. It was found that native Polish speakers who are L2 users of English transferred semantic formulas from their English usage to Polish for those who are of equal or higher status.

Pragmatic failures

Pragmatic failure occurs when an L2 speaker communicates with a native speaker and the native speaker understands the purpose of the utterance differently than what the L2 user intended (Nelson, 2002 b). A failure in pragmatic competence can be due to negative pragmatic transfer; the L2 user transfers a pragmatic strategy from their L1 that is inappropriate in the L2 context. As pragmatic failure is a real issue among language learners, ways must be found to resolve it. The reduction of pragmatic failures is very important as native speakers are not as forgiving of pragmatic failures as they are of "phonological, syntactic, and lexical errors" (Nelson, 2002 b, p. 164). Pragmatic failures are generally seen negatively, as being rude, arrogant and so on. Failure that is seen as negative may render the actual intentions of a remark unclear to the interlocutor.

A concept known as the Reconceptualized Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is a different way of viewing multicompetence in that it holds a social-interactionist and emergence perspective of language in which, according to Félix-Brasdefer (2009), "all language knowledge is inherently dynamic, variable, provisional and sensitive to renegotiation and renewal" (p. 3). In this way, language is not a precondition for performance; language knowledge is a property of performance. The knowledge is developed through language use in communicative activities that are culturally bound and in specific situations, according to Félix-Brasdefer (2009). The idea that knowledge is developed through cultural usage plays a role in the discussion of the differences between monolinguals and those who speak two or more languages. In the reconceptualized SLA view, the differences occur due to the fact that multilinguals have far more expansive experience with varied social and cultural linguistic contexts.

The nature of bidirectional linguistic effects cannot be confined to transfers. Ewert (2008) noted that "In a study of bilingual sentence processing, Cook et al. (2003) found that Japanese-English bilinguals demonstrate higher preference for animate subjects in their L1 than monolingual native speakers of Japanese, which cannot be an effect of transfer from the L2 English" (p. 35). These Japanese individuals are perceived to be more 'Japanese' in the way they communicate than their monolingual counterparts. The appearance of being more 'Japanese' is thought to be due to their multicompetence and not solely due to the fact they are competent in a second language. The benefits found in bilingual individuals is far reaching, it even positively effects third language acquisition as well. Ewert (2008) further explains the benefits by noting that

"bilingualism affects cognitive aspects of attention and perception, language awareness and linguistic sensitivity and these, in turn, affect L1" (p. 35).

Ewert (2008) explains that numerous studies have been performed that examine the L1 pragmalinguistic behaviors using an approach from interlanguage pragmatics. The findings of the studies suggest that bilinguals create a style of intercultural communication that is similar to and simultaneously dissimilar from the communication styles that are established in both of their languages and will utilize this style when communicating in either of the languages. Furthermore, it has also been found that those who move to other locations will adapt their metapragmatic judgments to those more similar to the native language of the location in which they reside.

Ewert (2008) defines cultural scripts as formulaic social situations that necessitate highly routine communication and are biased toward a specific culture. Ewert (2008) goes on to discuss the phenomenon of cultural scripts with the example of Polish individuals.

The studies discussed provided results that showed L2 users communicated in a different way than their native speaking peers, this may be due to transferrals from the L2. The importance of these findings is that they may show a combination of cultural scripts in the mind, or a modification of the awareness of an interlocutor's communicative expectations. A change in awareness of such expectations suggests that the L2 users have more knowledge of the types of pragmalinguistic behavior that the interlocutor would see as creating less of a threat to the interlocutor as well as to the L2 user's face by peers.

Speech Act Theory

Nelson et al. (2002a) states that a speech act can be defined as a small component of discourse as well as a purposeful, fundamental element of communication. Speech acts can be classified into five fundamental types. The acts are categorized by how social communication between the individual or individuals speaking and those that listen is affected, according to Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007). These five categories are presented in Table 2.0.

Table 2.0: Five Fundamental Speech Acts

Act	Definition	Example	Source
Declaratives (Performatives)	Declarative acts are those that make a notable or important change after having been performed.	“Henceforth, you are all graduates of Minnesota State University, Mankato.”	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007), p. 25
Representatives	Acts that allows the speaker to convey viewpoints, feelings, assertions and others.	“I believe that this is the most opportune time to grow roses.”	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007), p. 25
Expressives	These are acts that allow the speaker to express the speaker or listener’s psychological state of being. It is considered to be one of the most important types of speech acts for a language learner.	“I really like your new shirt!”	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007), p. 25
Directives	Directives are face-threatening acts as they allow the speaker to articulate a want while compelling the listener or listeners to fulfill the want.	“Go help your cousin in the garage.”	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007), p. 25

Commissive	Commissive speech acts are also face-threatening. With a commissive, the speaker obligates (or refuses to obligate) himself or herself to take a future action. The use of such verbs as “promise” or “refuse” strengthens the commissive.	“I promise to help you tomorrow.”	Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2007), p. 25
------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

Refusals

Félix-Brasdefer (2009) exclusively examined refusals with native speakers of a higher status. The participants were placed in situations wherein they had to refuse invitations, requests and suggestions. The participants were able to use the discourse during the interaction to ensure that the act and scenario ended well. The three pragmatic levels examined by the study were "situational variation, individual variability, and the sequential organization of refusals in learner-NS interactions" (p. 1). Félix-Brasdefer (2009) discusses the impact of the length of time participants stay within the target language's environment. Language interference/transfers are a familiar topic covered in this study. Also similar to other studies, the authors viewed the elicitations in sequences. The authors looked at variation not only at the individual level but also at the situational level. A multitude of strategies were used within the refusals within the categories of direct and indirect responses.

According to Félix-Brasdefer (2009), refusal acts are a type of commissive; this is due to the nature of the act of refusing. The act itself commits the refuser to not comply with what is requested, suggested or so on. This type of act is a type of response to an interlocutor's initiating utterance. Also noted by Félix-Brasdefer (2009), is the idea that

“Refusals are second pair parts in conversation and belong to the speech act of dissent which represents one type of assertive act or negative expression” (p. 3). Refusal acts require a great deal of pragmatic knowledge as well as an acute understanding of the different variables of a social context. This is why refusals are important from a sociolinguistic perspective.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) examined refusal acts and used this information in a study of the cognitive processes behind the use of the speech acts. The study investigated the processes and perceptions of non-native Spanish speakers when refusing invitations from others of the same or higher statuses. The technique used by the study is known as Retrospective Verbal Reports (RVRs). RVRs consist of collecting reports verbally from participants directly following the completion of a task while the pertinent information is still contained within the participant's short-term memory and will be more directly acquired or used as 'retrieval cues'. The study had twenty-two participants; twenty male native English speakers who also were advanced learners of Spanish and had spent time in Latin America as well as two native speakers of Spanish to initiate the scenarios. Immediately after the interactions took place the native English speakers were interviewed regarding the cognitive processes that took place during the interaction.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) found that refusals can be direct or indirect with varying levels of complexity dependent upon where on the continuum of indirect and direct the act itself falls. Indirect refusals have an increased level of complexity due to the added necessity of choosing correct forms of communication in order to reduce any negative effects that would occur due to a direct, negative refusal. Other extraneous societal

variables must be taken into consideration when examining the way one refuses. These variables can include age, gender, power distance, education level, and social distance. Adverbs as well as mental state predicates, justification for the refusal, presenting an alternative, having a condition for future acceptance, presenting an indefinite reply or a postponement can be used simultaneously or separately in order to alleviate the negative effects associated with direct refusals.

Félix-Brasdefer (2009) further breaks down direct and indirect refusals by stating that a refusal that is direct in nature is precise and clear in relation to its intended meaning, such as “No; I am unable to help you”. The complexity of a refusal is increased when it is articulated indirectly. In the case of an indirect refusal, the speaker must create a suitable structure in order to alleviate the inherent face-threatening effects of a direct refusal. In order to create an indirect refusal, ten components may be included in the refusal. These ten components are listed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Components of Refusals

Component of an Indirect Refusal	Example
Mitigated Refusal	“Sorry, I don’t think I can cover your shift tomorrow.”
Reason/Explanation	“I have to study for a test tonight.”
Indefinite Reply	“I’m not positive if I can really help you.”
Alternative	“Can we plan to meet up for dinner tomorrow instead?”
Postponement	“I know I need the course, but I would rather I take it next year.”
Request for Clarification/ Request for More Information	“This coming weekend?”/ “What day were you planning to go fishing?”
Promise to Comply	“I can’t promise you for sure, but I’ll do my best to make it.”
Repeat of Previous Utterance	“...July?”
Express Regret or Apologize	“I’m really sorry, I just can’t make it”

Félix-Brasdefer (2009) explains that adjuncts may be used with indirect refusals as seen in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Adjuncts to Refusals

Adjunct	Refusal
Positive remark	“That sounds like a great opportunity, but...”
Expression of willingness	“I’d like to help you but...”
Expression of gratitude	“Thank you so much for offering me this promotion but...”
Partial agreements used to preface a refusal	“Yeah, that sounds like a good idea, but...”
Minimal vocalizations or discourse markers	“Oh, shoot, I already made plans.”

Félix-Brasdefer (2009) mentions that in a second language refusal situation with an asymmetric status between the initiator and a refuser of lower status, the refuser must be well prepared pragmalinguistically and also have a grasp of how interactions must occur in order to refuse correctly in the social context and to be able to effectively continue the refusal across numerous speech turns.

Ewert (2008) makes the claim that unlike requests and apologies, refusals are under-examined in linguistics. The first study to examine refusal strategies was performed by Beebe and Cummings in 1985. The next leap came when the Beebe, Takahashi and Ullis-Weltz study in 1990 found transference in strategies by Japanese individuals with a second language of English. The Beebe et al. study was also a landmark in that it created a methodology for examining cross-cultural and inter-language refusal acts. Since that time, many other cross-cultural studies have been performed.

Kwon (2004) makes the point that "refusals are known as a 'sticking point' in cross-cultural communication" and "refusals can be a tricky speech act to perform linguistically and psychologically since the possibility of offending the interlocutor is inherent in the act itself" (p. 340). If one refuses in a manner incongruent with the normal manner of the spoken language, the individual refusing risks offending the interlocutor. Kwon (2004) notes that the "choice of these strategies may vary across languages and cultures. For example, when Mandarin Chinese speakers wanted to refuse requests, they expressed positive opinion (e. g., 'I would like to ...') much less frequently than American English speakers since Chinese informants were concerned that if they ever expressed positive opinions, then they would be forced to comply" (p. 340). The Kwon (2004) study is discussed at length on page 40.

Chang (2008) describes refusals as actions of speech that are a rejection of another individual's initiation of social interaction. Refusals require a great deal of pragmatic proficiency as the act in and of itself threatens the other individual's positive or negative face. Chang (2008) is careful to note that while refusals exist in all languages and cultures, the degrees of politeness and the way the act is executed can be exceptionally different across languages and cultures. As stated by Chang (2008), previous research has shown that the excuse/reason semantic formula was the most frequent formula in a refusal speech act. As Chang (2008) pointed out, Maeshiba et al. (1996) found that learners at a high proficiency level had less probability of having occurrences of first language interference in their strategies for apologies than those of lower proficiencies in English as a second language. Maeshiba's findings reinforced the findings of Robinson (1992).

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) elucidates that refusals can also be performed via the use of other speech acts. These speech acts could include requests for clarification such as “What day is the birthday party on?”, requests for further information, a pledge to comply or an apology/expression of regret. For example, “I’m really sorry I couldn’t make it to your birthday party.” More often than not, a refusal act has a supplementary, encouraging comment, gratitude, limited agreement or a proclamation of willingness. One might say, as a refusal, “Thanks a lot for inviting me to go to your cabin for the weekend but I already made plans, sorry.” This refusal includes both an expression of gratitude and an expression of regret to supplement the refusal and lessen the face-damaging effects. Face-saving is an important part of an act in order to soften the blow of the response. The act itself may be similar to a negotiation with a desire for mutual understanding.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) presents Cohen’s (2005) categorization of the methodologies for gaining knowledge of and the exercise of speech acts. These methodologies are recommended by Cohen to support the language learners in order to increase their comprehension of the specifics of the second language's pragmatic speech acts in four ways. These are presented in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Strategies for Speech Act Acquisition

Strategy	Explanation
Cognitive Strategies	<p>Help learners identify, distinguish, practice and commit material to memory.</p> <p>For example, in the speech act of refusals, learners may group direct and indirect strategies and identify the linguistic forms necessary to mitigate and perform a refusal politely.</p>

Metacognitive Strategies	Comprise of the planning, execution (e.g. checking how it is going) and the evaluation of a speech act.
Effective Strategies	Regulate attitudes, motivation for learning an L2 and reduce anxiety.
Social Strategies	Which include seeking opportunities to interact with NSs and to engage in various speech act interactions.

Note: Information taken from Félix-Brasdefer (2008, p. 196) and placed into tables by the author of the current study.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) also points out Cohen's (1996, 1998) list of methodologies for the use of language within the boundaries of what the language learner have already learned. These methodologies are listed in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Strategies for Sustaining Knowledge of Speech Acts

Strategy	Examples
Retrieval Strategies	Utilized to retrieve the pragmalinguistic information necessary to perform a speech act, such as the use of the conditional in Spanish to express politeness or the use of the imperfect to express mitigation or a distancing effect.
Rehearsal Strategies	Include practicing (form-focused practice) target language structures.
Cover Strategies	Using a memorized or formulaic form that has not been fully understood in an utterance, or the use of simplification as a result of incomplete knowledge of the target language.
Communication Strategies	Aim at conveying meaningful information or expressing an appropriate speech act response in a target language.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) found that individuals who were native English speakers and spoke Spanish as a second language thought in both languages when placed in a situation requiring a refusal. These individuals would return to English in order to create the refusal act as they had a lack of Spanish pragmalinguistic information.

How status affects refusals.

Nelson et al. (2002 a) found that refusals create a problem for the one performing the speech act because the goal of clear communication comes into disagreement with preserving face; the refusal act creates a danger of offending the other party. The use of refusals must be tempered with more indirect forms because the more direct a refusal act is, the greater the chance of the initiator taking offense. Nelson et al. (2002 a) states that the results of Beebe et al. (1990) reinforces the magnitude of the factor of status in how individuals strategize their refusal acts. For example, Beebe et al. (1990) found that Japanese and Americans differ in their refusal acts based upon the status of the initiator. Americans tend to use similar indirect strategies when performing a refusal act, regardless of the status of the other party (higher, equal or lower status individuals). One interesting note with American refusal acts is that they tend to end a refusal with ‘thank you’ if the initiator is of equal status. The use of ‘thank you’ is radically different from the Japanese, who change the level of directness depending upon status. Japanese individuals tend to use more direct refusals when communicating with those of a lower status. The direct strategy used with lower status individuals was present in refusals for invitations as well as requests. The usage of a direct communication is different from situations wherein a Japanese individual refuses an invitation from someone of a higher status. In the case of higher status, one uses more of an indirect strategy with the added use of politeness.

The Ewert (2008) study used discourse completion tasks (DCT) to elicit responses to atypical requests. The participants included 190 native speakers of Polish who were enrolled at an English medium college and 13 Native speakers of English between the

ages of 30-40. The Polish individuals were placed in two groups: L2 users and L2 learners, both utilizing English as the L2. The L2 user group had a total of 106 members, 12 males and 94 females with a mean age of 21.07. The L2 learner group consisted of 84 individuals, 29 males and 55 females with a mean age of 21.13. Ewert (2008) notes that it would have been important to have monolingual Poles but a comparative group essentially does not exist as the only Poles with an insignificant knowledge of English were those with less education and differing social backgrounds. The fact that these individuals were of differing social backgrounds with less education would create numerous control group issues.

The results of the Ewert (2008) study did not indicate any noteworthy differences between the L2 users and learners in the scenarios including individuals of lower status. The study, however, showed that the L2 users used statements of regret and self-defense more often than the L2 learners in the scenarios in which interlocutors held equal status. Regret was conveyed in 85% of the L2 users' responses, in contrast to the 51% of the L2 learner's responses. When this data was examined in relation to the English data, the difference between the L2 users and L2 learners in regard to the use of regret and self-defense was not corroborated (Ewert 2008). The lack of substantiation is possibly due to the disparity in size between the group of native English speakers and the native Polish users. Moreover, L2 users utilized the semantic formulas of regret and self-defense in Polish more than the native English speaker group did. Ewert (2008) notes that because the L2 users made use of these formulas more often in their L1 than native English speakers, the possibility of the L2 users having pragmatic transfers from English to Polish is low.

In the case of scenarios with individuals of higher status, the L2 users differed from the L2 learners. As with the equal status scenarios, the L2 users were found to have used regret and self-defense more than the L2 learners. Beyond these reoccurring formulas, the L2 users also used direct refusals and excuses more than the L2 learners.

Explanations occurred in the responses of L2 users at a percentage that was close to that of the percentage found in the responses of native English speakers. Ewert (2008) notes that transfer is doubtful as the native English speakers had a drastically different response patterns. The native English speakers used self-explanations frequently but negative opinion and willingness were used by 9 out of the 13 native English participants.

Another difference was found between L2 users and L2 learners. The L2 learners had more responses that were categorized by Ewert (2008) as “other/ unspecific/ indefinite” (p. 45) which were often statements that could be considered offensive or rude.

Face and politeness.

Turnbull and Saxton (1996) conducted a study regarding the desire of speakers to save face while performing a refusal act. Face is the concept of manufacturing and preserving an individual's concept of self as seen or experienced by others. Threatening of face is a serious issue and most people will attempt to lessen this threat through the use of modal verbs.

The authors initially examined 70 examples of refusal acts in the context of a request in order to discover if individuals use modal expressions in the refusal acts as a way of attempting to save face. These expressions occurred frequently and their frequencies were approximately equal in their appearance across groups in their refusals

to requests. The authors found that only three types of these modal structures actually occurred within their study.

These three structures were: "modal expressions of epistemic probability/possibility exclusively (e.g., I might), root necessity/probability exclusively (e.g., I have to work), plus the combination (e.g., I don't think I can)" (p. 145). The authors posited that the structures mentioned were used to lessen the damage to face by expressing disinclination, bringing up a previous commitment, or using both of these strategies in tandem. The authors then inspected an additional 101 refusal acts in the context of requests to expand the study to see if these same results would occur again.

Of the additional 101 refusal acts examined, 72% had at least one modal expression present and 40% of the refusals contained two or more within the refusal of compliance. The findings of Turnbull and Saxton (1996) also show that the incidence of use of modal expressions was roughly equal for all of the refusals (as was found in the first study) with one exception. In the case of the use of identifying an imminent state of being, the use of modals was expressed in about 32% (12 of 37). No usage of modals that would cause face-aggravation or damage was found within the 101 refusals.

As an overall examination of the total of 171 refusals, 74% contained at least one modal and 33% had two or more modals in the refusal. Turnbull and Saxton (1996) found that within the 37 acceptances, 19 contained modals and 18 did not; compared to 127 refusals that contained modals and 44 that did not. Statistically, modal expressions occurred significantly less often in acceptances than in refusals and interestingly enough, those modal expressions used in the acceptances would be considered as face-aggravating

structures in the context of an acceptance. The finding that modals occur less in acceptances than in refusals makes sense. Modal expressions are used in order to perform facework. As an acceptance is not a face-damaging action, the use of modals would not be necessary.

The authors note the fact that the study highlights the significance of analyzing how linguistic assets are utilized in interpersonal communication; a concept called social psychological pragmatics.

The pragmatics of refusal speech acts

The present study examines the speech act of refusal in English and in Turkish. Also examined is how the status of the individuals involved in those speech acts impacts the method of refusing. Examination of the differences that occur between the English and Turkish languages during the act of refusing will also be conducted. The use of semantic formulas for cross-cultural pragmatic comparisons is incredibly important as they allow for the betterment of our understandings of other languages and how individuals react to different situations as a result of cultural differences (Nelson, 2002 a).

There is reason to believe that there are significant differences in the ways that Turks and English speakers use refusal acts in various situations. These differences are important for English as a Second Language (ESL) or as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers to recognize. These teachers must be able to effectively teach the English refusal strategies to Turkish speakers so that the Turks may use the language more similarly to native speakers.

Comparative Studies

The first major cross-cultural pragmatic examination of refusal acts was performed by Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990). The study is considered a landmark as the DCT, classification method of refusals, and general methodology for the following studies, as well as the current study, were created and tested. The aim of the study was to show that pragmatic transfer occurs in the content, regularity and organization of semantic formulas. Sociolinguistic variables such as status were also examined in the study.

The participants included 20 Japanese speakers of Japanese (JJs), 20 bilingual Japanese speakers of Japanese and English (JEs), and 20 American speakers of English (AEs). The mean age of the 20 JJs was 29.6, 28.5 for JEs and 28.9 for the AEs. The proportion of female to male was 9:11 for JJs, 12:8 for JEs, and 12:8 for AEs. With the exception of 5 of the JEs (who were students), all the participants had a college to graduate level education.

The Beebe et al. (1990) study contained a DCT that presented the participants twelve scenarios to answer. The responses were coded into semantic formulas using the classifications. The frequency of semantic formulas was calculated. The study's findings suggested that there were, indeed, pragmatic transfers present in the order of the semantic formulas from the native language of Japanese to the target language of English. These individuals used the same assortment of formulas as the American speakers of English but they were found to be more reminiscent of the order of semantic formulas used by native speakers of Japanese. Transferrals not only occurred in the order of the semantic formulas but also the frequency and content.

Another important pattern is that previous literature may not always be completely consistent in all cases all the time. To better explain this comment, in the study by Beebe et al. (1990), it was found that Japanese participants used direct strategies for refusals more than the participants from the United States, contradicting the expectations regularly found in the intercultural literature.

Nelson et al. (2002 a) performed an investigation of Egyptian and US English refusals. Like the current study, Nelson et al. (2002 a) used a form of the Beebe et al. (1990) DCT. This study does not look at refusals in an L2 context but at both languages separately and simultaneously without any discussion of inter-language interference. The DCT in this study consisted of three requests, three invitations, three offers and three suggestions. Each of these scenarios included a refusal with one of each directed toward a person with a higher status, an equal status and a lower status.

An issue found in the studies presented in the current study, as well as the current study itself, is the lack of spoken discourse. The studies had their participants write what they think that they would verbally state to the interlocutor. The use of written communication can cause some issues as they may not write in the same way they normally speak. Jordanian (and Arabic in general) written discourse is different from the spoken form (Nelson 2002 a). In Nelson (2002 b), this was further explained. Arabic has different written and spoken styles thus a written response would be in a formal language, very different from the day-to-day spoken form, which is more casual in nature. In an attempt to circumvent the issue of language, Nelson et al. (2002 a) used a recording

device to gain the Arabic answers in a way that is more similar in terms of register fluctuation. The Americans were recorded speaking English and the Egyptians were recorded speaking in Arabic.

Nelson et al. (2002 a) references previous studies that point out that Americans tend to use more strategies for refusals than do native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. The general chain of events for the Mandarin Chinese speakers is an apology followed by a circuitous strategy with a reason. The research tends to indicate that the way Mandarin Chinese speakers refuse occurs because the Chinese find the refusal process to be an uncomfortable action and desire to end the situation as soon as possible. An important side note is that both Americans and Mandarin speaking Chinese individuals modify their strategies to fit the initiator's status.

A total of 55 individuals participated in the Nelson et al. (2002 a) study: 25 Egyptians and 30 United States citizens. They all completed the DCT within their home countries and in their native languages (Arabic and English, respectively). The Egyptians ranged from 19 and 39 years old including 15 males and 10 females, all living in Cairo. Three participants were students in a private university and 11 studied in public universities. The rest of the participants had bachelors' degrees gained at public universities and had various professions (5 accountants, 2 auditors, a teacher and a secretary). The participants from the US ranged in age from 24 to 40 years old; half of the participants were male and half were female. All of these participants had bachelors' degrees and, while many originated from elsewhere, they all lived in Atlanta, Georgia and were Caucasian. Eight participants were graduate students, 16 worked in some form of business and 6 were teachers.

The US group of participants yielded 358 refusals and the Egyptians yielded 300. These responses were coded with a US inter-coder reliability of 89% and 85% for the Arabic data. The coders utilized the classification of refusals created by Beebe et al. (1990).

According to Nelson et al. (2002 a), Egyptian males, in contrast to Egyptian females, when refusing those of either higher or lower status, used more direct strategies than Americans interacting with those of higher or lower status. These findings concur with those of Beebe et al. (1990). The findings suggest that Americans tend to use indirect strategies when refusing requests from individuals of higher or lower status. Nelson's (2002 a) comparative study of Egyptian Arabic and American English goes against the grain of the commonly held beliefs regarding the use of indirect/direct communication styles. Nelson found that, overall, the frequency of direct and indirect refusal act strategies in the United States and Egypt are actually roughly equal. Nelson makes sure to note that the incongruity between these findings and the general knowledge of Arabic exemplifies the necessity of analyzing the more minute speech acts and the inherent risk in creating, as well as using generalizations about language and/or culture; especially if one is assuming that only a single style is used universally despite other factors (age, status, gender, etc.).

During Nelson's (2002 a) comparative language study, many patterns were found within the studies that were examined to aid in the construction of the project. While most studies acknowledge cultural differences and contend that there will be differences in direct versus indirect styles of refusals, most do not include other features that could

cause differences even within the same language and culture. These complicating factors include status as well as gender. As discussed in the above section on status, the status of individuals changes the strategies of refusal acts greatly. Gender roles in a culture have the possibility to alter strategies just as greatly, especially in countries that are not very egalitarian.

Nelson et al. (2002 b) states that indirectness is one of the hallmark features of Arabic as a language. Nelson's study is based upon Beebe et al.'s 1990 study. The authors used the discourse completion task included within the Beebe et al. study. Nelson et al. (2002 b) interviewed 30 Americans and 25 Egyptians during the course of the study eliciting 298 American refusals and 250 Egyptian refusals. Like Beebe et al, the authors broke each refusal down into its base parts. Data was then reviewed for frequency of the direct versus indirect refusal strategies, the average frequency of the indirect strategies (specific types of strategies) and the effect of status on the strategy used by the participants.

The results of the study seem to suggest that there are more similarities in how Egyptians and Americans refuse than differences. The results also indicated that both Egyptians and Americans used comparable strategies with similar frequency; thus the chance of pragmatic failure in communication between the two groups is low. Both the speakers of English and the speakers of Arabic usually gave reasons along with numerous indirect strategies when making a refusal. These are important findings as it contradicts previous studies which found that Jordanians used more indirect strategies than Americans. The findings also do not support the idea that speakers of Arabic use indirect

refusals with individuals that are of an unequal status but close to them or acquaintances of equal status. However, it is noted by Nelson et al. (2002 b) that these differences in findings reflect a difference in the behavior of the participants or if it is due to a difference in methodology. The methodology used in the studies that presented such findings utilized a written DCT, thus the participants replied with Modern Standard Arabic. Modern Standard Arabic is a formal variety of Arabic and is not used in everyday communication and, as previously discussed; the written form of Arabic differs from the spoken variety.

One interesting finding within the Nelson et al. (2002 b) study suggests that the use of the DCT is suitable for the gathering of pragmalinguistic data but it does not show the sociopragmatic density of acts such as refusal as they are so threatening to one's face. Those that use the DCT to collect information can see the participants' ability to correctly use the target language in order to complete a speech act, such as a refusal, but not if the speech act in and of itself is contextually appropriate. The speech act is completed but since the scenarios are contrived with pre-constructed reactions from the initiator, the appropriateness of the speech act cannot be represented through the reaction of the initiator.

Chang (2008) specifically examined refusal acts and their usage in conversations by native Mandarin Chinese speakers learning English. The study looked at possible L1 transfers in the refusal acts. The study was conducted through the use of a discourse completion questionnaire. The discourse completion questionnaire contained twelve scenarios that were broken down into requests, invitations, offers and suggestions.

Detailed information described the social statuses of those involved in the scenario and detailed contextual information was presented.

The questionnaire was provided in English and in Mandarin in order to gain data from the L1 as well as the L2. The participants of the study included 35 American college students as well as 41 English major seniors, 40 English-major freshmen, and 40 Chinese-major sophomores all of which were native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. The results indicate that the Chinese students used indirect refusals with specific excuses while the Americans were very direct and used vague excuses.

The native Chinese speaking bilingual English majors, like the native Chinese speakers studying Chinese, used considerably fewer direct refusals than the native speakers of English. The differences in the usage of adjuncts between the two ELLs and the native speakers of English group were not statistically noteworthy. Chang (2008) notes that since pragmatic transfer did occur in the fact that the ELLs used fewer direct refusals but not in the use of fewer adjuncts, the acquisition of certain linguistic elements, such as sociolinguistic conventions, may exist within a type of hierarchy denoting levels of difficulty in learning rules.

Chang (2008) showed that Americans prefer a more explicit and direct style of discourse that is also assertive. The Chinese, on the other hand, avoid the word “no” with great persistence and prefer a more unassertive, indirect and implicit style of communication.

Kwon (2004) performed a comparative study of English and Korean refusals. The study included 40 Koreans living in Korea and 37 speakers of American English

residing in the USA. Beebe et al.'s (1990) Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used in the study to elicit responses. The data was analyzed with the taxonomy study developed in the Beebe et al. (1990) study. The same general strategies were found in both languages but they differed in how often they were used and what was said in the strategy (including consideration of status and types of elicitation). The Koreans tended to shy away from direct refusals and would be more hesitant during the speech act. The use of apologies was prevalent among the Koreans while their American counter-parts usually were positive and would communicate appreciation for the proposition. Another notable difference was the use of reasons why the individual must refuse. The Koreans tended to give a reason while the Americans did not. Across situations, the Americans tended not to account for status while the Korean participants took special care when refusing those of a higher status. These differences can cause problems for Korean English Language Learners (ELL) as they tend to experience a great deal of L1 interference.

Chapter III: Methodology

Chapter II presented a general literature review in the area of pragmatics and specifically, the cross-cultural pragmatics of refusal acts. The chapter contained a table gathering all key terminology related to the present study and the original contexts from which they were taken. A broad examination of language was discussed, exploring such concepts as face and politeness, transferrals, pragmatic failures, Speech Act Theory and refusals. The chapter concluded with an overview of past cross-cultural pragmatic refusal comparative studies.

Chapter III will present the methodology used in the present study and discuss its evolution from the previous studies. Moreover, topics such as participant information, materials, methods, task administration and data analysis will be discussed in depth. The sub-heading of data analysis contains a coding classification for refusal acts and adjuncts. This information is the foundation of the study, giving the author, and those researchers before, the ability to compare refusals across languages with accuracy.

Participants

Forty-seven participants were involved in this study, including a convenience sample of twenty Americans. Thirteen Turks, primarily within the city of Ankara, and fourteen Turks attending a Turkish English-medium school including the Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi translated as the Middle Eastern Technical University (ODTÜ or METU) were recruited. The specific criteria for the subjects included 1) Turkish only

speakers (no English), 2) native speakers of English who do not speak Turkish, and 3) bilingual speakers of Turkish and English (only – no other language background).

The monolingual Turkish individuals ranged from twenty to thirty-two years of age and have various backgrounds such as doctors, physicists, and teachers. Not all were as well educated as some were students rather than professionals. The bilingual Turks were predominantly involved in language studies and teaching but also included food engineering among other professions. The monolingual native English speakers had a large range in terms of their professions, such as psychology, creative writing, cognitive science, history and mass communications, among many others. Some of these individuals were students, with different areas of study including English, mathematics and biology. The ages of the monolingual Turks ranged from twenty to thirty-two with the highest concentration in the twenty-six to twenty-eight year old range. Bilingual Turks ranged from nineteen to forty-two with a steady distribution. The monolingual English speakers ranged from nineteen to sixty with the vast majority of individuals in their early twenties.

The native English speakers were a convenience sample of friends and acquaintances of the investigator on the campus of Minnesota State University, Mankato. Turkish professors were given the task of recruiting individuals based on the set criteria. They then recruited the participants, including friends, family members, and students. The bilingual individuals agreed to complete the task in both English and Turkish before becoming participants.

The reason for the inclusion of native, monolingual English speakers from the United States of America and native, monolingual speakers of Turkish in Turkey was to create two native language comparison groups. These groups should create responses that are indicative of socio-cultural norms that are a generalized standard of the language and region. The responses were then compared and contrasted with the responses elicited by the bilingual group in order to see if the language use is similar to the norms presented by the control groups or if any inter-language transferrals (either L2 to L1 or L1 to L2) occurred.

Materials and Methods

The instrument of elicitation used in this study was a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) disseminated using an online survey program. This DCT was a reproduction of the one created for the study by Beebe et al. (1990). The DCT was chosen in this study as it allows for rapid collection of a great deal of data. The DCT is also easily modified in order to focus on specific variables such as the types of scenarios present. As the current study is a reproduction of the Beebe et al. (1990) study, the DCT addressed the same areas of interest. The DCT presents the participants with several scenarios with answer sections wherein only a refusal would make sense. To ensure that participants refuse without being explicitly told to do so, the authors made sure to have a final statement after the blank to make sure that only a refusal would be an appropriate answer. The DCT contains twelve scenarios in which participants communicate with individuals of three variable status levels: higher, equal and lower. There are four

overarching stimulus types covered in the DCT: requests, invitations, offers and suggestions. There are three scenarios for each of the four stimulus types that correspond with the three aforementioned status levels. Each of the twelve scenarios contains specific information regarding the overall scenario and the status of the interlocutors.

Table 3.0: Table of stimulus type in relation to status

Stimulus type	Refuser status (relative to interlocutor)	DCT item	Situation
Request	Lower	#12	Stay late at night
	Equal	#2	Borrow class notes
	Higher	#1	Request raise
Invitation	Lower	#4	Boss's party
	Equal	#10	Dinner at friend's house
	Higher	#3	Fancy restaurant (bribe)
Offer	Lower	#11	Promotion with move to small town
	Equal	#9	Piece of cake
	Higher	#7	Pay for broken vase
Suggestion	Lower	#6	Write little reminders
	Equal	#5	Try a new diet
	Higher	#8	More conversation in foreign language class

The DCT was used by the current study in order to elicit refusals in twelve scenarios from monolingual speakers of English, monolingual speakers of Turkish and bilingual speakers of Turkish and English. The scenarios were further differentiated by the status of the other individual in the conversation. The other person could be of lower, equal or higher status as this difference might change the way the participant refuses.

There was a very slight modification in the language used between the original DCT and the versions used in this study. A cultural issue existed in question eleven of the DCT. The scenario in question has the participant having to decline a promotion

including a transfer to Nowhereville. “Nowhereville” could be translated but it was decided that it would be better to add the description (*üçra bir şehir*) after mentioning the city. The phrase “*üçra bir şehir*” translates to “a remote, out-of-the-way, or solitary city”. This gives the Turkish respondents the equivalent amount of information as the native speakers would gain from “Nowhereville.”. Beebe et al. (1990) used the name “Hicktown” but as that may be offensive, the name was changed.

In order to perform this study, a translation was created for both the DCT and the online consent form. These documents were translated and checked independently by two native Turkish speaking TEFL professionals in order to ensure the accuracy of the documents.

The current study diverges from the progenitor study by Beebe et al. (1990) by using Turkish instead of Japanese. Beebe et al. (1990) provided the DCT to native Japanese speakers, native English speakers and Japanese native speakers that use English as a second language. Beebe discovered the norms of English and Japanese refusals by examining the linguistic data from the DCTs filled out by the two sets of monolinguals. Then, the researchers compared the answers of the bilinguals in English to ascertain whether or not these bilinguals used the culturally bound Japanese refusal styles in English, rather than the norms associated with the English language. Essentially, Beebe et al. (1990) investigated the extent of L1 transfer to refusals in the L2. Chang (2008) examined the amount of transfer that occurred in the L2 as well as how much influence the proficiency level of English (L2) seemed to have on transfer.

The current study not only collected linguistic data in the bilinguals' L2, but also collected L1 data from both native English speakers and native Turkish speakers as well as responses in the L2 (English) of the Turkish bilinguals. As previously mentioned, the DCT is in both Turkish and English. The Turkish translation stays as true to the original English version as possible. Certain politeness and cultural differences had to be accommodated for in order to increase the authenticity of the scenarios.

DCT Administration

The DCT used for the present study was created digitally. Minnesota State University, Mankato's technology services were given both the Turkish and English DCTs and used their resources to place both DCTs on their Survey Monkey account. By working with the technology services, concerns related to security and anonymity were minimized. The monolingual participants were provided with the DCT in their native language while the bilinguals completed both forms of the DCT. In order to reduce influence of the first task on the performance of the second task, the bilinguals were asked to complete each DCT one month apart. Previous knowledge of the question may cause the individual to answer the scenario in an abnormal way, in other words not conforming to their language's socially prescribed refusal. The period of one month was chosen as that was the longest practical time-period for this particular study. Stoyhoff (2011, personal communication) stated that there is no research-based standard for a test-retest time period in this field at this time. He further commented that a one month period should prove adequate for this study.

The DCT was placed as an online survey through the use of Minnesota State University, Mankato's school resources. Professors in Turkey forwarded the links to individuals who met the criteria for the different surveys. These professors assigned each bilingual individual a code number that they presented at the beginning of each answer. This number was kept consistent throughout the process to ensure maximum security and anonymity. The use of a code to link one individual to both the English and Turkish DCTs was important in order to accurately compare the relevant linguistic data. The Turkish professors recorded the numbers but they were never given the results nor was the author provided the list of names to uphold the anonymity of the participants.

Data Analysis

The process of data analysis closely reflected that of Beebe et al. (1990). The raw respondent data were analyzed as a string of semantic formulas and were coded as such. As noted in the literature review of the current study, a semantic formula could be a sentence or phrase, even just a word that fits a semantic strategy or criterion that is used to fulfill a specific speech act (Ewert, 2008). A table of semantic formulas used in the current study can be found in Table 3.1. To give an example of the process, one could examine the following authentic statement used by an individual to refuse to attend a friend's cocktail party: "mm, no, sorry, I just can't tonight. I was hoping to use tonight to recover, just stay in; don't really want to push the fatigue any further. But we should hang out soon." The example given would be coded as: "mm" [pause filler adjunct] "no" [direct refusal (nonperformative statement)] "sorry" [statement of regret] "I just can't tonight [Nonperformative statement (ii)]. I was hoping to use tonight to recover,

just stay in; don't really want to push the fatigue any further" [reason] "but we should hang out soon" [offer of alternative]. For a full list of semantic formulas used in this study (as listed by Beebe et al. (1990)) please see the list below. Also included is a collection of initial statements that are unable to exist in the absence of a solid sequence of semantic formulas and cannot be used as a refusal on their own are known as "adjuncts," as described by Beebe et al. (1990).

Added to the list of classifications is an adjunct labeled as "Term of Endearment." The author of the current study added this to the list of classifications created by Beebe et al. (1990). The reason for the additional adjunct came from necessity. All three groups of participants used terms of endearment during the course of the task. While these items were not nearly as common as others within the list, they still occurred enough that the author found it necessary to include it in the study.

- I. Direct
 - a. Performative (e.g., "I refuse")
 - b. Nonperformative statement
 - i. "No"
 - ii. Negative willingness/ability ("I can't." "I won't." "I don't think so.")

- II. Indirect
 - a. Statement of regret (e.g., "I'm sorry..."; "I feel terrible...")
 - b. Wish (e.g., "I wish I could help you...")
 - c. Excuse, reason, explanation (e.g., "My children will be home that night."; "I have a headache.")
 - d. Statement of alternative
 - i. I can do X instead of Y (e.g., "I'd rather..." "I'd prefer...")
 - ii. Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., "Why don't you ask someone else?")
 - e. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., "If you had asked me earlier, I would have...")
 - f. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., "I'll do it next time"; "I promise I'll..." or "Next time I'll..."-using "will" of promise or "promise")

- g. Statement of principle (e.g., “I never do business with friends.”)
- h. Statement of philosophy (e.g., “One can’t be too careful”)
- i. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor
 - i. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester (e.g., “I won’t be any fun tonight” to refuse an invitation)
 - ii. Guilt trip (e.g., waitress to customers who want to sit a while: “I can’t make a living off of people who just order coffee.”)
 - iii. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack (e.g., “Who do you think you are?”; “That’s a terrible idea!”)
 - iv. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
 - v. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., “Don’t worry about it.” “That’s okay.” “You don’t have to.”)
 - vi. Self-defense (e.g., “I’m trying my best.” “I’m doing all I can do.” “I no do nutting wrong.”)
- j. Acceptance that functions as a refusal
 - i. Unspecific or indefinite reply
 - ii. Lack of enthusiasm
- k. Avoidance
 - i. Nonverbal
 - 1. Silence
 - 2. Hesitation
 - 3. Do nothing
 - 4. Physical departure
 - ii. Verbal
 - 1. Topic switch
 - 2. Joke
 - 3. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g., “Monday?”)
 - 4. Postponement (e.g., “I’ll think about it.”)
 - 5. Hedging (e.g., “Gee, I don’t know.” “I’m not sure.”)

Figure 1: Classification of Refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (“That’s a good idea...”; “I’d love to...”)
2. Statement of empathy (e.g., “I realize you are in a difficult situation.”)
3. Pause fillers (e.g., “uhhh”; “well”; “oh”; “uhm”)
4. Gratitude/appreciation
5. Term of Endearment (“sweetie”; ”bro”; “honey”)

Figure 2: Adjuncts to Refusals

In the examination of elicited responses, the arrangement of the formulas was coded for each of the refusals. In each situation, the semantic formulas were totaled for each of the three groups of participants. The rate of occurrence for each of the semantic formulas in each scenario was calculated. Certain semantic formulas can be further examined based upon the specific content. As Beebe et al. (1990) pointed out with excuses, the type of excuse used (content) can vary in terms of how specific or unspecific it is.

The author utilized TESL graduate students at Minnesota State University, Mankato in the English 689: Studies of English Linguistics (Pragmatics) course to read and classify the DCT responses into the various components of refusal formulas. The author of the current study taught a lesson to the class explaining cross-cultural pragmatics and how DCTs are used in order to compare and contrast semantic formulas across languages. The students were given copies of the chart containing the classification of refusals used in the current study. After being taught the proper way of interpretation and coding under the guidance of the professor, the students were placed into groups with at least one native English speaker to begin to code the monolingual English replies to the DCT. The author of the present study coded the monolingual English DCT answers separately and did not examine the students' coding of the same questions beforehand in order to avoid an influence on the way the author coded the replies. The resulting coded responses were compared to one another to rate the inter-rater reliability. The use of TESL graduate students was a way to increase the inter-rater reliability of this study due to their increased familiarity of the subject matter.

Conclusion

Chapter III discussed the important elements of the methodology of the current study. The examination of similarities and differences between the studies of the past and the present study allowed for an understanding of the ever-progressing nature of the field of cross-cultural pragmatics. One of the most important items discussed in Chapter III, other than the Discourse Completion Task, is the classification for refusal acts used in coding participant responses into their base functions to allow for optimal compatibility for comparison. Participant information, materials, methods, and task administration were examined in Chapter III.

Chapter IV will present and analyze the findings of the current study. The data and their interpretation will be examined and discussed in depth. The findings of the present study will be discussed in relationship to the earlier studies and their broad findings in regard to transferrals and other related subject matter. It will be a topic of interest to examine how the findings of the current study compare and contrast to those discussed in Chapter II.

Chapter IV: Results

The current study is an examination and comparison of Turkish and English refusals to requests, offers, suggestions, and invitations. One of each of these refusals includes interlocutors of lower, equal and higher status in comparison to the respondents. The present study is based upon the Beebe et al. (1990) study. Numerous other, similar studies have been discussed in chapter two. The reason for conducting the study with English and Turkish as the languages of choice is that this has not been performed as far as the author is aware. Also of note, the author hopes that such a study will increase awareness of Turkey and the Turkish language in the west.

Chapter III was an examination of the methodology used in the present study. Participants were categorized and described for a better understanding of what would occur in the study. The instrument used for elicitation, the discourse completion task, was examined as were the classifications of refusals used to code participant responses. The method of administration was an online survey through Minnesota State University, Mankato. The method of examination was explored; this set the groundwork for Chapter IV.

Chapter IV contains a discussion of the results from the examination of the responses to the discourse completion task used as an elicitation method. Specifically examined in Chapter IV are: frequency of semantic formulas, refusals, status, content of semantic formulas and possible signs of transferrals.

Macro-view of content

The discourse completion task is broken down into four types of scenarios: three requests, invitations, offers and suggestions. This section will break down each participant group into the four types of scenarios and describe the most common semantic formulas for refusing them.

Requests.

The monolingual Turkish respondents used: reasons (27%), statements of regret (18%), and nonperformative statements (ii) (17%) most commonly when refusing requests. The bilingual Turkish participants predominantly used reasons (34%), statements of regret (24%), and nonperformative statements (ii) (11%) most commonly when refusing requests in Turkish. Monolingual, native English users preferred reasons (28%), nonperformative statements (ii) (14%) tied with statements of positive opinion (14%) and with statements of regret (13%) as the third most popular semantic formula. Bilingual Turkish participants largely used two formulas; reasons (36%) and statements of regret (21%) when refusing in English.

Invitations.

Reason (41%) was the most popular formula used by monolingual Turkish participants and the only one used with any regularity. Bilingual Turks responding in Turkish predominantly utilized reasons (41%) and statements of regret (23%) when refusing invitations. Monolingual English speakers preferred to use reasons (38%),

statements of regret (19%), and gratitude (10%). Reason (39%), statements of regret (23%), and statements of positive opinion (14%) were the most common semantic formula classifications used by bilingual Turkish participants responding in English.

Offers.

Monolingual Turks were found to make use of gratitude (24%), reasons (23%), and letting the interlocutor off the hook (13%) when refusing offers. Bilingual participants replying in Turkish employed reasons (25%), gratitude (18%), letting the interlocutor off the hook (14%), statements of philosophy (8%), and nonperformative statements (i) (8%). The monolingual, native English users were found to respond with reasons (38%), statements of regret (19%), and gratitude (10%). The most prominent ways bilingual Turks using English replied were: reasons (24%), gratitude (18%), and letting the interlocutor off the hook (16%).

Suggestions.

The predominant way that monolingual Turkish participants refused was with reasons (37%). The same result was found with bilingual Turks using Turkish to respond to suggestions; reason (44%) being the only significant formula. Monolingual English-using participants used reason (44%) the most and it was also the only widely used formula. Like all of the other groups, bilingual Turks using English also were found to have only one preferred formula, reason (44%).

Effects of Status

An examination of how the groups of participants refuse to individuals of varying status within the four elicitation types will occur within the “Effects of Status” section.

The prominent semantic formulas are presented in tables below for each status level by the four groups of participants per scenario type.

Table 4.0: Requests when Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Nonperformative (ii)	25%	24%	15%	25%
Reason	20%	24%	33%	16%
Regret	18%	20%	N/A	18%
Statement of Positive Opinion	N/A	N/A	11%	24%
Postpone	N/A	N/A	19%	N/A

The data suggests a way that individuals refuse requests at differing status levels. Monolingual Turkish-speakers tend to use reasons as indirect ways to refuse requests. The data shows that when the Turkish speaking individuals are of a higher status than the interlocutors, they will tend to be more direct and use nonperformatives (ii) such as “I can’t” or “I won’t” in conjunction with reason, “I have other plans”, and an expression of regret such as “I’m sorry”. Postponement (10%), such as “I’ll run our numbers again and I’ll see what we can do, let’s meet next week to discuss this”, occurred only when the respondents were of a higher status. An expression of positive opinion, such as “That could be a great trip”, occurred when the participants were of higher status (12%) and as a lower status (10%).

In regard to the bilingual Turkish participants responding in Turkish, the data presented shows an almost equal use of nonperformatives (ii) “I can’t”, reasons and regret while at a higher status.

When responding in English, the bilinguals show more of a tendency to present reasons rather than nonperformatives (ii). Bilinguals using English is also the only group to use the strategy of postponement (19%) in an evident way.

Monolingual English users did use postpone (6%) in the higher status situation but the usage is not nearly as frequent as seen in the bilingual group discussed above. Postpone was not used by the monolingual English users in either of the other status types for requests. The use of a term of endearment, “Buddy” (2%) was also only used in situations of a higher status.

Table 4.1: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	26%	46%	35%	32%
Regret	26%	29%	27%	N/A
Criticize Request(er)	N/A	N/A	N/A	12%
Nonperformative (ii)	N/A	N/A	N/A	9%

When communicating with equals, the data suggests that monolingual Turks use reasons and regret most often (26% for each). This may be an attempt at saving face and preservation of status as equals.

Bilinguals responding in Turkish show that the use of reason (46%) was the most often used method of refusing requests from equals with regrets (29%) being used to a

lesser extent. Bilinguals replying in English made use of reason (35%) and regret (27%). These were used more than any other formulas when communicating with status equals.

Unique to monolingual English speakers was the use of criticizing the request or requester, such as “Why would you say that? That’s a terrible idea!”, and the use of nonperformatives (ii) when refusing equals.

Table 4.2: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	45%	33%	39%	48%
Regret	N/A	22%	30%	14%
Alternate (i)	15%	22%	26%	10%
Guilt Trip	15%	N/A	N/A	N/A

When the interlocutors are of a higher status, placing the monolingual Turkish respondents into a position of lower status, the individuals overwhelmingly presented reasons (45%) as their form of refusal with some presenting an alternative (i) such as “I can do this but not that” or a guilt trip (see Table 3.1), such as “if I stay, my daughter won’t go to sleep on time”.

Bilingual respondents using Turkish replying to situations wherein they are of lower status used reason, regret and statements of alternative (i) (22%) to refuse. The use of regret when at a lower status may be an attempt to mitigate the face-damaging nature of refusing an interlocutor of a higher status. The data suggests that the bilinguals will be more likely to be direct with their refusals when in a high-status scenario, although they seem to mitigate the directness with reasons and regret. For the responses of the

bilinguals using English, reason (39%) and regret (30%) were used most often as well with interlocutors of a higher status.

The data shows that the monolingual English responses contained a great deal of nonperformatives (ii) (25%) and statements of positive opinion (24%) when in the scenario of a higher status. This is not reflected in the other two status levels, with 32% of equal status responses and 48% of lower status responses containing reasons, the most used formula for both. The monolingual English data suggests that they are much more direct, yet positive, when at a higher status.

Invitations.

Table 4.3: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	40%	42%	46%	35%
Gratitude	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonperformative (ii)	16%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regret	N/A	19%	15%	18%
Statement of Positive Opinion	N/A	N/A	15%	N/A

When examining the data from the Monolingual Turks and how they refuse requests, a trend appears. Reason is always the most often used formula for all three status levels. Along with the reason as a refusal, gratitude (20%), “I really appreciate the offer”, and nonperformative statements (ii) (16%) are used in high status scenarios.

The data from the bilinguals responding in Turkish showed the preference for reasons but also regret when in a higher status.

With the exception of gratitude (12%) when refusing equals, the ways that monolingual English participants refused invitations when at a higher or equal status were approximately the same.

Table 4.4: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	44%	48%	36%	41%
Statement of positive opinion	24%	14%	15%	N/A
Regret	N/A	31%	24%	15%
Gratitude	N/A	N/A	N/A	12%

With monolingual Turks, no use of nonperformative statements (ii) were found when communicating with those of equal status. Instead, statements of positive opinion (24%) are used. The data suggests that the Monolingual Turk group is more willing to exert their status and use direct refusals when in a position of higher status while being less direct and more regretful or positive when refusing an equal.

When refusing those of an equal status the bilinguals responded similarly to the high status scenario with one significant difference. When refusing invitations from equals, the bilinguals responding in Turkish also included statements of positive opinion (14%) in their refusals. The additional adjunct may be included as a way of continuing to keep an equal status while showing appreciation to the invitation, even if it is being refused.

Table 4.5: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	38%	33%	32%	37%
Regret	15%	20%	28%	23%

Nonperformative (ii)	12%	13%	N/A	9%
Statement of Positive Opinion	N/A	N/A	12%	12%
Gratitude	N/A	N/A	N/A	9%
Wish	12%	N/A	N/A	N/A

In the situation wherein the respondents were of a lower status, the data suggests that monolingual Turks prefer regret and reason but will once again use nonperformative statements (ii) (12%) and include wish (12%) in their refusals.

When refusing from an individual of higher status, the bilinguals no longer utilized statements of positive opinion in a perceptible way. Nonperformative statements (ii) (13%) were again used by the group. The occurrence of Nonperformative statements (ii) when at a lower status is similar to the strategies used by the monolingual Turks when refusing invitations at a lower status. The response patterns of bilinguals using English for refusing invitations at all of the statuses were roughly the same statistically.

When at a lower status, the monolingual English respondents used reason and regret to a similar degree as with the higher and equal status scenarios. What makes the lower status refusals different is the inclusion of nonperformative statements (ii) (9%) and statements of positive opinion (12%) which were not present in previous refusals at other statuses. As with the data for refusals to invitations from equals, the lower status scenario also included gratitude (9%).

Offers.

When examining the data for refusals of offers, all groups predominantly let the interlocutor off the hook, “hey, don’t worry about it”, when the respondents are at a

higher status. This is the only status level within the category of offers where this semantic formula occurs. One can see in the data that all of the Turkish participants used statements of philosophy “it’s only a vase, it can be replaced”. One may also notice that the monolingual English respondents used statements of philosophy but at a much lower percentage.

Table 4.6: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Let interlocutor off the hook	45%	44%	50%	51%
Statement of Philosophy	31%	29%	21%	13%
Reason	10%	18%	14%	15%
Nonperformative (i)	N/A	N/A	N/A	13%

The monolingual Turks express philosophy and letting the interlocutor off the hook while at a higher status yet these formulas do not occur in other status levels. Responses from the bilingual groups to the scenario of being at a higher status are roughly equal in frequency. Monolingual English respondents showed a preference for letting the interlocutor off the hook (51%) when at a higher status. They are also the only group to use nonperformative statements (i) (13%), “no”, in the higher status level scenario.

Table 4.7: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor: Part One

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Gratitude	38%	38%	25%	33%
Reason	24%	31%	25%	21%
Nonperformative (i)	21%	22%	33%	33%
Endearment	N/A	9%	N/A	2%

When refusing an equal the first time, the Monolingual Turkish group relied heavily on gratitude (38%) as well as reasons (24%) and nonperformative statements (i), “no” (21%). With refusing an equal the first time, both bilingual groups used the same strategies although the bilinguals using Turkish were more prone to use gratitude (38%) and reasons (31%) than when responding using English which used both gratitude and reasons 25% of the time. As a note, the bilinguals responding in Turkish had used terms of endearment (9%) while the bilingual English responses did not.

The use of nonperformative statements (i) (33%) increased in the first refusal of an equal and tied with gratitude (33%) as the most common formula used. The monolingual English users also were found to use a term of endearment for only the first refusal of an equal; it is not evident but it is worthy of noting in order to see how the group reacts.

Table 4.8: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor: Part Two

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	40%	22%	28%	23%
Gratitude	27%	N/A	11%	13%
Non-Refusal	20%	44%	39%	23%
Nonperformative (ii)	N/A	17%	N/A	N/A
Nonperformative (i)	N/A	N/A	11%	17%

The second time the monolingual Turkish respondents had to refuse an equal, they predominantly used reason (40%) with gratitude (27%) as a second most common formula. With the occurrence of the second refusal to an equal, in this case refusing a slice of cake twice, non-refusals (20%), “I’ll take a slice”, occurred. In Turkish culture, it

is important to refuse offers of food initially, generally three times before accepting. Since the cake was only offered twice, one could speculate that many decided not to refuse or that if a third chance were given, more would accept the offer of food.

When in the scenario of refusing the offer of cake a second time, both the Turkish and English responses from the bilinguals were overwhelmingly non-refusals (44% and 39% respectively). Only the bilinguals responding in English used the semantic formulas of gratitude (11%) and nonperformative statements (i) (11%). The bilinguals responded using nonperformative statements (ii) (17%) but only when replying in Turkish.

The second refusal of an offer from an equal, a second offer of a slice of cake, elicited equal amounts of non-refusals (23%) as with the most common refusal type, reasons (23%). Nonperformative statements (i) (17%) were the second most common formula.

Table 4.9: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Gratitude	33%	26%	34%	45%
Reason	26%	29%	31%	N/A
Nonperformative (ii)	N/A	16%	24%	21%
Statement of positive opinion	N/A	13%	N/A	N/A

In the scenario of being in a position of lower status, the monolingual Turks again used refusals (33%) and gratitude (26%) when refusing. One can see that the monolingual Turks prefer to let people off or philosophize when at a higher status and generally use gratitude and reasons to refuse offers at the other levels.

When in a position of lower status, the response types and percentages between the two languages of the bilinguals were similar. In both cases, gratitude and reasons were the most common formulas. The bilinguals responding in English did use gratitude more often, but only by 8% compared to the Turkish responses. The bilingual Turkish responses were the only ones of the entire lower status refusal of offers scenario to use statements of positive opinion (13%) to any great extent.

When at a lower status, the monolingual English respondents primarily used two semantic formulas, gratitude (45%) and nonperformative statements (ii) (21%). The data suggests that the monolingual English group is willing to be very direct and say “no” to those of lower and equal status. For the most part, the group will let those of a lesser status off for making an offer, in this case an offer to pay for a broken vase. When communicating with those of higher status, the group will still be direct but prefers to use refusals such as “I can’t” rather than “no”, which did not appear often. The nonperformative (ii) refusal is mitigated with the heavy use of the adjunct of gratitude.

Suggestions.

Table 4.10: Speaker has higher status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	29%	44%	29%	31%
condition for future/past acceptance	11%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Philosophy	11%	16%	13%	N/A
Promise of future acceptance	N/A	12%	N/A	N/A
Regret	N/A	12%	13%	N/A
Statement of Positive Opinion	N/A	N/A	13%	14%

The data presented for monolingual Turks refusing a suggestion from an individual of lower status shows a preference for reasons (29%) with a condition for future or past acceptance (11%), “if you’d told me earlier I could have put it in my schedule”, and statements of philosophy (11%) tied as the second most common formula. What the data suggests is that when in a higher status, the bilinguals tend to present reasons for refusing as well as statements of philosophy to possibly further explain their refusal. Regret shows a level of sympathy for the interlocutor in that they are refusing a suggestion. As with the other groups, monolingual English respondents favored reasons (31%) as the most common method of refusing suggestions from those of a lower status. Statements of positive opinion (14%) also occur.

Table 4.11: Speaker has equal status with the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	56%	58%	65%	61%
Nonperformative (ii)	N/A	21%	12%	N/A
Pause Filler	N/A	N/A	12%	N/A

With equals, philosophy and conditions are not commonly employed, with the use of reasons (56%) as the primary formula used. Reasons and philosophy are shown to be most common among both bilinguals responding in English and Turkish while both uniquely use regret as a refusal type. With those of equal status, both bilingual groups predominantly used reasons as well as nonperformative statements (ii). With equals, the data implies that the bilingual will be more direct by refusing with nonperformative statements (ii) as well as with reasons, an indirect form of refusal. The most frequent formula used in refusing suggestions from those of an equal status is “reason” (61%).

Table 4.12: Speaker has lower status than the interlocutor

Semantic Formulas	Monolingual Turkish	Bilingual Turkish	Bilingual English	Monolingual English
Reason	32%	33%	43%	50%
Gratitude	16%	13%	24%	N/A
Self-Defense	11%	13%	N/A	N/A
Postpone	N/A	N/A	N/A	10%
Statement of Positive Opinion	N/A	N/A	N/A	10%
Let Interlocutor Off the Hook	N/A	N/A	10%	N/A

When in a position of lower status, the monolingual Turks still prefer reasons (32%) but also use gratitude (16%) and self-defense (11%), “I’m doing the best I can”. Reasons are shown to be the preferred option regardless of status and the data suggests that when at the lower status the monolingual Turks tend to express gratitude to those of higher status or take it as an attack and defend themselves from the perceived face-threatening situation of being given a suggestion by a higher status interlocutor.

Gratitude and reasons were the most common formulas for both bilingual groups when in a lower status. Gratitude is only significant in the lower status, showing appreciation for the suggestion from one of a higher status along with reasons why the participant is refusing. Bilinguals responding in Turkish also use self-defense (13%) when refusing at a lower status. The suggestion from a higher status interlocutor could be perceived as face-threatening and must be mitigated through the use of self-defense as a form of facework.

When placed in a scenario wherein the monolingual English respondents were of a lower status, reason (50%) was the most common. Statements of positive opinion (10%) and postponements (10%) were also present.

The data suggests that when at a higher status, monolingual English respondents will refuse using reasons and potentially give a positive opinion to the interlocutor. With equals, they will present only a reason for why they cannot accept the suggestion. While giving a reason is most common when at a lower status, the monolingual English respondents may also express positive opinion or attempt to postpone that acceptance of the suggestion.

Comparative Analysis/Examination for Transferrals

In examining requests, one can see that when in a situation of higher status, all participant types predominantly used nonperformative (ii) statements and reasons. The data also indicates that at a higher status, both the monolingual English users and the bilingual Turks responding in English are the only groups that use statements of positive opinion. The occurrence of statements of positive opinion in both English response groups suggests that in the scenario of higher status it is a form of cultural script, as defined in Table 1.0 in chapter I, to reply in such a way in English.

In the scenario of equal status requests one can see that all three Turkish responses, be they in English or Turkish, heavily utilized both reason and regret. Noticing that the monolingual English participants did not use regret a great deal suggests that the use of regret as a refusal by the bilingual users of English may be a transfer from

the L1 to the L2. This is further suggested by the percentages, as all of which are roughly equal. The monolinguals were also the only group to use criticism or nonperformatives (ii) when communicating with equals. The lack of use of such formulas in the bilingual English data may also suggest an L1 to L2 pragmatic transfer.

As an individual of lower status requests, all groups used reasons most heavily with the added use of statements of alternatives (i). Monolingual Turks did not use regret very much while both bilingual groups as well as the monolingual English speakers did. The occurrence of such a formula may also suggest a transfer. Opposite to this is the fact that monolingual Turkish group was the only group that used guilt trips as a type of refusal in any noticeable way.

In examining the refusal to an invitation data, one can see that all groups use reason as the primary formula of refusal. A trend seen in the scenario of the participants being of a higher status is that only the monolingual Turks use gratitude (20%) and nonperformatives (ii) (16%). These do not occur with the bilingual Turkish participants responding in Turkish. Perhaps the use of this strategy by bilingual Turkish participants responding in English may be due to an adoption of English cultural scripts. The idea of pragmatic transfers is from English and may be seen in the use of regret, a formula not used by the monolingual Turks in an apparent way in the higher status scenario.

Refusals to invitations presented by interlocutors of equal status also showed interesting results. Only the monolingual English speakers did not use a statement of positive opinion with equals. The monolingual Turkish group was the only group not to use the formula of regret in a noticeable way. With regard to the use of a statement of

positive opinion, the data suggests a pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. Conversely, the use of regret by the bilingual Turkish users responding in Turkish could be a sign of a transfer from L2 to L1.

In the lower status refusal of an invitation, one can see that the two groups responding in English used a statement of positive opinion; possibly meaning that the formula may be a cultural script for English in the lower status invitation refusal scenario.

Data from the offer-refusal scenarios also present some trends. When examining the higher status situation, the monolingual Turks and the bilingual responses in Turkish both use “let the interlocutor off the hook” formula with only one percent difference. The same is found with the bilingual responses in English and the monolingual English users. These are signs of a shared cultural script when in such a situation.

The monolingual English users were found to use statements of philosophy a great deal less than the other groups of participants. The data suggests that the high usage of philosophy by the Turkish language responses may mean that this is a cultural script and that in the case of the bilingual Turks responding in English, a L1 to L2 transferral may have occurred as they have a higher usage of said formula.

In the first equal status refusal scenario one can see that all groups made use of nonperformative statements (i) but that in the English responses were a great deal more frequent than the responses in Turkish. Both the bilingual English and the monolingual English responses were equal in percentages. This could be a cultural script for both but one that is used more readily in the English language. In the same scenario, both the bilinguals responding in Turkish and the monolingual English users both used terms of

endearment, although neither percentage was large, the usage by both may be coincidental or the bilinguals responding in Turkish used the formula as a pragmatic transfer.

When refusing the offer from an equal a second time, the monolingual Turkish participants used reasons far more than any other group. Also of note, both the bilinguals responding in Turkish and English had extremely high levels of non-refusals when compared to the two monolingual groups. This may be related to the idea discussed by Ewert (2008) wherein bilinguals become more (in the current case) “Turkish” than monolingual Turks due to their multicompetence. The phenomenon may occur with the cultural norm of refusing food a certain number of times before accepting so as not to appear to only be visiting to acquire food from the host of the home.

Examining the results from respondents when in a lower status one can see that the monolingual English respondents have a higher level of usage of gratitude than the Turkish groups. The data shows that the Turkish groups use gratitude at a fairly similar rate and while this may not be a transferral, it is of note because it suggests that generally speaking, the native English users will more often show gratitude to those of higher status for presenting an offer to them.

The data implies that there may be an L1 to L2 transferral with the usage of reasons as a refusal at a lower status. The reason semantic formula is not dominant in the monolingual English user data but does appear in the English responses of the bilinguals at a percentage similar to those of the responses in Turkish. Similarly, nonperformative statements (ii) are not of a high rate of use in the monolingual Turkish data but appear in

both bilingual data as well as in the responses on the monolingual English users, in the case of the bilingual responses in Turkish; this very well may be a L2 to L1 pragmatic transfer.

Among the four groups, all predominantly are found to use reasons as the main refusal type to suggestions while at a higher status. Transferrals may also exist in the usage of reasons as a refusal when at a higher status. The monolingual Turks and the bilinguals responding in English both have the same percentage use of reasons (29%); the similar usage may be a L1 to L2 transfer. The bilinguals responding in Turkish used reason more than the other groups (44%) and the monolingual English participants used reasons a great deal as well (31%). These may be anomalies or the increased usage among the bilinguals responding in Turkish may be a L2 to L1 transfer that greatly affected their refusal style in such a scenario.

What may be an example of an L2 to L1 pragmatic transfer occurs with the usage of the “condition for future or past acceptance” formula. The formula is only found at a noticeable percentage among the monolingual Turkish data. The lack of usage by the bilingual respondents may be a transfer from English as it is not utilized much by the monolingual English participants.

The use of statements of philosophy by the bilinguals responding in English may be an L1 to L2 transferral as it is not found to be of high frequency in the monolingual English user data. The usage of regret as a formula is a sort of anomaly in the data set as only the bilingual respondents used it. It was not found at all in the data of either of the monolingual groups. This may be the result of multicompetence or the benefits of

bilingualism discussed in Chapter II. The use of a statement of positive opinion was only found to be of any great amount in the responses of the bilinguals using English and the monolingual English speakers. The data suggests that this may be a cultural script found in English refusals of suggestions when at a higher status than the interlocutor

An oddity occurs among the bilingual responses again in the scenario of refusing an equal's suggestion. The bilingual participants were the only ones to really use nonperformative statements (ii) in their replies. The rest of the data for that scenario is roughly equal among the groups with the reason formula being most common. The bilingual responses in English were found to contain pause fillers (12%) which were not found of any great percentage in any of the other respondent's data. Such an occurrence could be that the L2 speakers may be more aware of using pause fillers as a strategy than their native speaker counterparts. As the L2 speakers are more aware of their usage, they may be more prone to actually write out the pause fillers while the native speakers may skip it as pause fillers may be perceived as useless in written dialogue.

The use of reasons in the situation of being at a lower status was most common among all groups. The use of gratitude was found in high percentages among all three Turkish groups but not among the monolingual English users. The bilinguals responding in English used the formula more than the other Turkish respondent types. This suggests a L1 to L2 transferral in the usage of gratitude. Self-defense was only noticeable in the data from the monolingual Turks and the bilinguals responding in Turkish. The data implies that the use of self-defense when of a lower status is a cultural script used in Turkish.

Postponement and statements of positive opinion were only found in large amounts in the monolingual English data. While this may suggest a possible L1 to L2 transfer in the case of the bilingual replying in English or a cultural script for English, due to the fact that the percentages are so low, yet still perceptible, the author of the current study is unable to take a position. Comparable to this is the data showing that only the bilingual users of English made any detectable use of the “let the interlocutor off the hook” formula.

Content of Refusals

This section examines how specific or vague the reasons given are for the refusal by the four groups of respondents. The first group to be discussed is the monolingual English participant group. The findings of the current study appear to match the outcomes of Chang (2008) as the data found generally shows the monolingual English users to be vague in the reasons provided within their refusals. In some specific cases, the author of the current study found that a majority of the monolingual English respondents were much more specific.

The second question in the Discourse Completion Task is a scenario wherein the participant is a student refusing to loan his or her notes to another student of equal status. In this scenario, almost all of the respondents used a reason similar to “I need to study for the test, too. I can’t lend you my notes.” This is a specific reason for why they are unable to comply with the request.

The fifth DCT scenario was designed to have the participants refuse to start a diet with a friend. Generally, the reasons provided were an explanation of failed attempts in

the past or that the individual is currently on a diet. Question nine required participants to refuse a slice of cake from a friend. Nearly all of the responses were either “I’m full” or “I’m on a diet.”

A pattern emerges when examining the data that suggests that when communicating with an individual of equal status, monolingual English speakers will be more specific than when communicating with those of a higher status. When communicating with those of a higher status, they are either vague “I have other plans tonight” or very specific “We are already committed to attending a wedding out of town for the daughter of an old friend of mine.” When in a position of higher status, the responses are also predominantly specific.

When bilingual respondents, responding in English, use the semantic formula of reason, the reasons are vague in nature. When in situations of higher status, the findings suggest a more specific type of reasoning is presented. In the first question, denying a raise to a music store employee, the responses all discussed economic hardships and the inability to increase wages to poor sales. When refusing the bribe in question three, the responses were vague, as opposed to questions one and eight (more conversation practice in class, which met with specific reasons related to curriculum restraints). The vague responses to the bribery may conflict with the other higher status scenarios in the fact that it becomes a scenario of morality, while the other situations are rather black and white.

When communicating with equals, the reasons are all vague, with one exception. In the case of question nine, refusing cake, the responses were essentially the same as those of the monolingual English respondents. The reasoning behind almost all of the

responses revolved around being full. In refusing a person of lower status the reasons are split, with scenarios six and twelve being specific and four and eleven being more vague. Further examination of the vague versus specific situations may provide insight to some specific traits.

In the two scenarios wherein the reasons are generally specific, to comply with the request and suggestion requires the participant to either do more work after hours or begin to change their routine. This could be perceived as threatening and thus the reasons are more specific to ensure the refusal is clear. The situations where the reasons are vague, the consequences are not as immediate in nature. Refusing a party thrown by one's boss and the refusal to accept a promotion that requires one to move to an undesirable location are more of a distant commitment thus respondents can be more vague in their refusals.

When examining the responses made by the bilingual Turkish participants using Turkish, the conclusions drawn are a mirror image of what was found while examining the bilingual Turks' responses in English. In the case of the monolingual Turkish respondents, their refusals while in a higher status match the findings of both of the bilingual responses. The monolingual Turks were specific with the exception of the bribery scenario, where their reasons tended to be vague.

How vague or specific the monolingual Turks were with equals was split half and half. The reasons were specific when refusing to loan class notes and eat cake offered by a friend yet vague when refusing a diet and the invitation to a dinner at a friend's home with a spouse disliked by the participants. When placed in a situation of lower status, the

results were mixed. When refusing scenario four, a boss's party invitation, a tie occurred. There were equal numbers of vague and specific reasons provided in this scenario.

Similar to the bilingual responses, the monolinguals were specific with scenario twelve, staying late at work, yet unlike the bilinguals, the monolingual Turkish responses to situation eleven, promotion with a move to an undesirable location, was specific in the reasons. Also unlike the bilingual responses, the monolingual Turks gave vague responses to question six, writing reminder notes.

Discussion

When examining the data of the current study, the results show a similarity to the conclusions of Chang (2008) in that the monolingual English respondents tend to give vague reasons. In further examination of the monolingual English response data, it suggests that specificity increases when communicating with equals and those of a lower status, while simultaneously being specific and vague with interlocutors of a higher status. All of this tends to support previous findings in relation to monolingual English response patterns.

The data tends to show that the English language users tend to be very positive, even when refusing, while the Turkish data seems to show that regret is used quite often when refusing. The monolingual English group appears to be very direct and reply to offers with a "no" to those of lower and equal status. When refusing to those of a higher status, the monolingual English group tend to use nonperformatives such as "I can't" with a great deal of gratitude used as possible mitigation.

When the bilinguals communicated with equals, the data showed that the reasons were mostly vague, with one exception. When refusing cake from an equal, the responses were typically similar to those of the monolingual English participants. Both bilingual groups produced a large amount of non-refusals for the second offering of cake by an equal. The finding seems to reflect the cultural tendency not to refuse food if offered more than once.

Pause fillers were found to occur when the bilinguals refused an equal's suggestion. The use of pause fillers in the monolingual English responses was not found at any great percentage. The higher use of this strategy by bilingual speakers could be due to the bilinguals' knowledge of the use of pause fillers in English; they may be more aware and more willing to use the strategy than the native speakers.

The data generally suggests that the Turkish participants prefer a more indirect method of refusing as a general strategy. With the main exception of refusing a request when at a higher status than the interlocutor, the Turkish responses across all of the scenarios showed a lack of direct refusals which are prominent in the English replies. The results for the Turkish responses seem to be similar to those of the Chinese (Chang, 2008) and the Japanese (Beebe et al., 1990). This similarity draws mostly from the preference for indirect refusals and possibly the use of regret. In contrast to the English responses, the Turks use a great deal more statements of philosophy when letting the interlocutor off of the hook. While this is generally only found within the context of refusing an offer when at a higher status than the interlocutor, it is still a piece of the profile of Turkish response style. Also of interest, in the situation wherein the participant

refused the offer from an equal the second time, the monolingual Turkish participants were found to have given reasons more than any of the other groups.

A similarity found among all response groups was the high usage of nonperformative (ii) statements and reasons when refusing a request when at a higher status than the interlocutor. Another similarity is found with the refusals to an invitation data; all groups use reason as the primary formula of refusal. All groups used a direct “no” when refusing the first offer of cake from an equal. The direct “no” was more frequent in English, which suggests a shared cultural script. As mentioned previously, this is most likely due to a cultural trend to not accept food immediately.

Chapter V: Conclusion

It has been found that when students learn new languages, certain aspects of their native language can transfer to their L2 in usage and the L2 may alter the usage of the native language. One method used to examine the possibility of transfers between languages, or compare languages, is the discourse completion task (DCT). The DCT is a text-based, survey-like document that requires a participant to reply to specific scenarios. The scenarios many times require the subject to refuse requests from other people, generally of various statuses. This approach has been employed in investigating responses of Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Polish native speakers. The present study extends this research to Turkish. The current study examines monolingual Turkish speakers, monolingual English speakers of North America and bilingual Turkish/English individuals in Turkey.

The significance of this study is highlighted by Turkey rising in importance as a geographical and cultural bridge from Europe to the Middle East. The history of Turkey is a crucial piece of the puzzle as it brings a certain amount of contextualization to the present study. As alluded to previously, a great deal of research has been accomplished in this segment of language studies but the examination of refusal speech acts is still in its infancy. The present study has outlined many important concepts, tying them to past studies and to the current study.

The methodology of the present study is based upon many years of trial and error by others in the field of linguistics. The elicitation method, the DCT, was created by Beebe et al. (1990) and re-used and modified in the following years by others such as Nelson et al. (2002 a) and Chang (2008). While the DCT is not a perfect elicitation method, it is a beginning and has met the needs of past and present research.

The results of the present study show differences as well as similarities in the way that Turkish and English refusals are conducted in specific situations. The current study has provided data that appears to be reaffirming the findings related to English refusals and has presented new data regarding Turkish and its related refusal strategies.

Limitations of the study

Nelson et al. (2002a) comments that the use of a DCT, specifically the DCT produced by Beebe et al. (1990), is an attractive route as the scenarios are pre-created and have already been tested for their efficacy. Therefore the results can be compared to those found by other researchers more easily and the fidelity of the scenarios increases this comparability in cross-cultural examinations. It is further noted that due to the use of prescribed refusals, DCTs can be used for collecting larger amounts of samples efficaciously and dependably (Ewert, 2008). Despite these positive attributes, DCT does have numerous drawbacks.

According to Ewert (2008), DCTs are not perfect: one major issue with the use of DCTs is that the elicited responses do not always accurately replicate natural spoken discourse. The DCT dialogue is also contrived and the situations are constructed in such a way that the participants are forced to answer in a specific way. The fact that the

scenarios are made in order to elicit a refusal was purposeful, in order to subtly tell the participant that they must refuse the stimulus type presented by Beebe et al. (1990). The scenarios are not reflective of real speech and usually contain less diversity of content and words, compromise, hedging, less expansion on ideas, and reiterations. Ewert (2008) notes that the participants present a response that fits a seemingly socially prescribed refusal that adheres to their society's necessary rules of politeness and lucidity.

Another limitation to be discussed in the current study is that of test-retest intervals; the limitation is only applicable for the bilingual participants. The author of the present study had asked that the bilingual participants wait four weeks after completing the first DCT and beginning the second. Unfortunately, some of the participants completed both DCTs back-to-back. The data found, however, suggests that this occurrence did not become detrimental as the tracked responses of the bilinguals showed differences in the style and type of responses provided in the DCTs. The data is still relevant, although it must be noted as a limitation.

Originally, the creator of the present study preferred participants that were not Turks studying Turkish or Americans studying English as this may have skewed responses in terms of being representative of the cultural norms. In the case of some of the bilinguals and monolingual English speakers, this did not occur. Some of the individuals were English majors. The issue of the participants' course of study most likely did not have an adverse affect on the responses.

Nelson et al. (2002a) also raised concerns in regard to the use of Discourse Completion Tasks. When answering the scenarios presented to them, participants

provided a contrived responses, how they believe that they would react in a specific situation. Also of issue is the organization of the scenarios within the DCT. Nelson et al. (2002a) postulated that when answering a specific status scenario, the response manipulated how the participant would react to subsequent scenarios.

As with the present study, the order of scenarios was the same in the DCTs of both Turkish and English. A caveat related to the participants in the study deals with age and profession. The monolingual English participants were predominantly students while many of the bilinguals and monolingual Turkish participants were older and held professional positions. The author of the current study must also recognize that the use of only one data elicitation method, the Discourse Completion Task, cannot provide complete insight into the examined languages and their respective approaches to refusals and the direct/indirectness of the languages. Despite the issues discussed, the current study provides a solid examination of both languages in regard to refusals and the direct/indirect nature of English and Turkish.

While the results of the present study appears to back the findings of previous research in the area of English refusals, the data also suggests similarity between the communication styles of the Turks and that of the Chinese and Japanese. With the exception of a refusal of a request when of a higher status, the data presents the Turkish responses as lacking direct refusals, which are prevalent in the English refusals.

In the situation where one must refuse an offer from an individual of lower status to pay for a broken vase, the Turkish responses showed a large amount of use of statements of philosophy. While both language groups used the "let the interlocutor off

the hook" semantic formula, on the Turkish responses contained a noticeable usage of statements of philosophy.

When refusing, a characteristic found among the English responses is a certain level of positivity. The English responses tended to use statements of positive opinion frequently. Parallel to the usage of positive statements in English is the usage of statements of regret in Turkish. Both became a trend in the data. The bilingual responses when refusing equals were generally vague, with the exception of the first refusal of an equal. In the case of refusing an equal the first time, the responses were similar to those of the monolingual English responses.

Possible future research

There are countless languages and dialects in the world that provide plenty of opportunities for future research. Scenarios other than refusals can be researched as well. There are other elicitation methods besides the discourse completion test that could be utilized in recreating this study, or any other similar one; the use of role-plays or audio-recorded scenarios is also viable elicitation methods. In the area of Turkish native speakers, replication of the present study with greater number of participants might possibly yield new similarities or differences between languages. Re-performing the present study would also allow for the usage of more in-depth ways of examining the data, such as a statistical analysis in order to further the ideal of discovery.

References

- Başkan, Ö. (1986). *The transformation of turkish culture: the atatiürk legacy*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Kinston Press.
- Beebe, L., Takahashi, T., Uliss-Weltz, R., (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In Scarcella, R. et al. (Eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 55–73). New York, New York.: Newbury House.
- Celce-Murcia, M, & Olshtain, E. (2007). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, Y-F. (2008). How to say no: An analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Science Direct*, 31, 477–493.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: a resource book for students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ewert, A., Bromberek-Dyzman, K. (2008). Impossible requests: L2 users' sociopragmatic and pragmlinguistic choices in L1 acts of refusal. *EUROSLA Yearbook* , 8, 32–51.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2008). Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness*, 17, 195–211.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2009). Interlanguage refusals: Dispreferred responses in interlanguage pragmatics refusal sequences in learner-NS interactions. *Applied Language Learning*, 19, 1–27.
- Kandemir, N. (1997). Turkey: secure bridge over troubled waters. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 8(4), 1-12.
- Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua*,

31, 339–364.

Morrison, A., Holmes, J.(2003). Eliciting refusals: A methodological challenge. *Te Reo*, 46, 47–66.

Nelson, G.L., Al Batal, M. & El Bakary, W. (2002 a). Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 39–57.

Nelson, G.L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M. & El Bakary, W. (2002 b). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 163-189.

Turnbull, W., Saxton, K.L.(1996). Modal expressions as facework in refusals to comply with requests: I think I should say 'no' right now. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 145–181.