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Abstract  
This study investigates refusals using the DCT framework developed by Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990). Focusing on some similarities and differences between Iranian EFL learners’ use of English and Persian refusals, it also examines the influence of participants’ social status and gender on the provided responses. Sixty Iranian senior level students majoring in English were divided equally into male and female groups. The study was done in two phases with an interval time distance of about four months to reduce the probable effects of the first phase on the second. The same subjects participated in both phases. The data gathered from the DCT were analyzed to show the average frequencies of direct and indirect strategies, the types of employed strategies, and the effects of participants’ social status and gender on the responses. The results showed that subjects used more indirect strategies in the Persian test in comparison to the English. No significant difference was observed between males and females refusal strategies, however. Finally, as Nelson, Carson, Al-Batal & Al-Bekari (2002) and Marti (2006) point out while DCTs are suitable devices for gathering pragmalinguistic data, they fail to reveal the sociopragmatic complexities of face-threatening acts such as refusals.
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Introduction
Our lives are, to a great extent, shaped by the way we use language. As people use language differently, their perceptions of appropriateness of use and politeness phenomena are different. Regarding politeness, one especially sensitive field is making refusals. Refusals are types of speech acts that are proposed as a reaction to another individual’s request, invitation, offer or suggestion, and not as speaker-initiation. Since refusals are speech acts involving a certain level of offensiveness and are inherently discourteous, applying improper refusal strategies, often in the case of EFL learners, may damage the relationship between the people concerned. Consequently, appropriate perception and production of refusals necessitates a certain degree of culture-specific awareness. To avoid appearing rude or discourteous, non-native speakers often overuse indirect strategies which might be misunderstood by the target community.

Successful presentation of speech acts, which is central to communication, in a second language demands not only the speaker’s linguistic proficiency, but also his/her socio-pragmatic perception of speech acts. To perform the speech acts appropriately in a second language is very challenging, and the challenges stem from the linguistics variations between the languages as well as the variations between cultures. This study investigates the speech act of refusals as performed in English and Persian by Iranian EFL learners of English with a three-fold purpose. First, it purports to seek the type and frequency of the direct and indirect strategy used among the refusals
these learners employ on the same task in English and in Persian. Second, it aims at examining the probable effects of participants’ social status. And third, the influence of gender on the subjects' refusals is sought.

**Review of Literature**

Ueda (1974) investigated sixteen different ways of how Japanese native speakers avoid direct rejection of a task, as a mere NO may convey selfishness and unfriendliness. The social status of the interlocutors in the study was unequal, anyway. In the cases studied, the lower status person tried to provide an indirect reply to a person with a superior status. The results of Ueda’s study showed that for Japanese the most preferable strategy was lying. While the older subjects preferred delayed response, the younger used apology as the most effective strategy. Also the male subjects used a flat "no" more than the female ones.

Over the past decade other series of studies have examined refusals and refusal strategies. Perhaps one of the most prominent studies on refusals is done by Beebe et al. (1990) who created a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and a comprehensive categorization of refusals which have been advantaged by much of the later research carried out on refusals. Primarily, they administered the DCT to 60 subjects 20 of whom were Japanese speaking in Japanese, 20 others Japanese speaking in English, and 20 Americans speaking in English. The focus of the study was on the status of the interlocutors.
The study investigated variations in the order, frequency, and content of semantic formulas used by Japanese and Americans. The results of the study revealed that there is an interaction between the participants' status and the directness of refusals. Americans usually employ indirect strategies in refusing all situations, whereas Japanese tend to use more direct strategies when addressing a lower status person and more indirect strategies when refusing persons of higher ranks.

Another study by Beebe and Cummings (1996) deals with refusal responses collected with two different data collection procedures. Eleven ESL teachers completed a questionnaire while another eleven teachers were asked the same questions on the phone to be answered verbally. The comparison of these naturally occurring talks and DCTs indicated that DCTs are an efficient data-eliciting device for quick collection of a large amount of data and classification of refusals. On the other hand, the oral data resulted in more lengthy responses that were deeper both emotionally and psychosocially.

Nelson et al. (2002) applied a modified version of the DCT for studying similarities and differences between Americans and Egyptians in making refusals. Two requests, three invitations, three offers, and two suggestions were presented to 30 American and 25 Egyptian subjects that produced 298 and 250 refusals respectively. An interviewer read the situations aloud to the participants and asked them to respond verbally on audiotape. Ten different situations requiring a refusal in the answer were presented to the participants. Then the responses were analyzed in terms of frequencies of direct
and indirect refusal strategies. The effect of the interlocutors’ status on the selection of strategy types was also examined. The findings of this study were counter to Al-Issa’s (1998) results, which showed a wider range of use of indirect strategies by Jordanian native speakers.

To broaden the scope of the study, two comparisons were made in this investigation. These included a comparison between the subjects' responses to a series of refusals once in English and with a long delay in Persian. This was to measure the influence of first language pragmatic concepts on the target language. A further concept taken up in this study was the comparison between genders. We thought this might influence the application of the refusal strategies too.

**Methodology**

**Subjects**

The subjects of this study were 60 Iranian university students studying English. They were selected randomly from senior level students. The same subjects participated in both phases of the study to respond to two sets of questions on refusals (see below for more description). The subjects were divided equally into males and females; i.e. each group involved 30 males and 30 females.
Materials and procedures
The data collection instrument in this study was the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) developed by Beebe et al. (1990). For the Persian version a translation of the same test was used. It is worth noting that many discourse studies conducted on speech acts have utilized DCTs (see the most recent study by Marti, 2006). Simplicity and high degree of control over variables are some main reasons of DCTs widespread use. The DCTs are not without shortcomings, however. They have been criticized for lack of contextual variation and simplifying complex interactions. The imaginary interactional settings are another problem of DCTs. As Nelson et al. (2002:168) state "what people claim they would say in a hypothetical situation is not necessarily what they actually would say in a real situation". That the collected data via this method is not a reflection of natural data is a problem of other forms of elicited data too (Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Rose, 1992; Golato, 2003).

The DCT used in this study involves twelve situations designed to elicit refusals for four different speech act categories. Each category consists of three situations. Among the twelve DCT items, items 1, 2 and 12 are requests which are expected to be rejected by a refusal. Items 3, 4, and 10 present an invitation to the subjects. Items 7, 9, and 11 are three offers aiming to elicit refusals. Suggestions are the other category presented in items 5, 6, and 8. Note that the order of the number of items presented here corresponds to the order that appeared in the original DCT test by Beebe et al. (1990). As the influence of the
interlocutors’ social status on the indirectness of the refusals is one of the main concerns of the present study, it is worth mentioning that in items 1, 3, 7 and 8 subjects are in a higher social status in comparison to their addressees, whereas in items 4, 6, 11 and 12, participants have a lower social rank. Finally, an equal status between the subjects is seen in items 2, 5, 9 and 10. (See appendix 1 for the questions and the situations in English.)

This study was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, the original DCT was administered to the subjects. Then, with a time distance of about four months, the Persian translation of the test was administered. The time distance between the two phrases was assumed to highly reduce the probable effects of the first phase on the second phase. Then the subjects’ answers to English and Persian DCTs were compared and analyzed to show similarities and differences between the Persian and the English elicited data.

Data analysis
In order to analyze the data, first the subjects’ responses to each situation were divided into some related moves. Then the moves were assigned a refusal type according to Beebe et al.’s (1990) classification of refusals. For example, one of the subjects’ responses to item 12 of the DCT, which was a request for staying late at night, is as follows (The responses in italics are the direct words of the participants, and no attempt was made to make changes for ungrammaticalities):
I'd really like to, boss. But I’m invited to a dinner party tonight. I’m sorry.

This typical answer was analyzed in the following way:
(a) I’d really like to, boss. (Statement of positive feeling)
(b) But I’m invited to dinner party tonight. (Reason)
(c) I’m sorry. (Statement of regret)

In this study, assessment of central tendency and dispersion for the research questions were done via descriptive statistics. The statistical package SPSS version 11.5 was run to do the calculations. For measuring the difference in indirect strategy use by the two groups, the mean of each strategy in each group with three different social states was calculated. To investigate the statistical significance of the observed differences, a T-test was conducted. In all these calculations, the alpha level for the statistical computations was set at $p<0.05$. That is, if the alpha value was less than 0.05, the difference was considered as statistically significant.

Results
Type and Frequency of Refusals
In order to observe the frequency and type of direct and indirect strategy application between the two groups, first a comparison was made between the means of total direct strategies with the means of total indirect strategies for the English and Persian group. The results showed that in both groups the average ratio of indirect strategy use in
Persian data was higher than the English ones. While the means of indirect strategy use for the Persian group showed a value of 25 per 12 items, the related value for the English group was 22 (see Table 1). This difference was found statistically significant for the indirect strategy use ($p=0.014$) while for the direct strategy use no difference was found between the English responses and the Persian ones.

**Table 1.** Means and standard deviations of total direct/ indirect strategy use by the subjects on English and Persian refusals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect strategy use</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.1167</td>
<td>6.99417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct strategy use</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.4333</td>
<td>4.60790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect strategy use</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>2.87179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct strategy use</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>1.95110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To answer the second part of the first research question, concerning the variation in the strategy type between the two groups, the average utilization of each strategy by each group was calculated. Then a T-test was conducted to check the significance of differences. Certain patterns preferred within the two tests indicate some similarities. The first, second, third, fourth, and sixth most frequent strategies (reasoning, consideration of addressee’s feeling or opinion, statement of regret, letting interlocutor off the hook, and gratitude or appreciation, respectively) were similar.

The Influence of Interlocutors’ Social Status on Refusal Strategies
The influence of social status on direct and indirect strategy use was another concern of this study. To investigate the subjects’ variation in strategy indirectness based on social rank, three social states were determined as follows: refusals to a lower status person (lower status); refusals to an equal status person (equal status) and refusals to a higher status person (higher status).

First, the means of total indirect, direct, and adjuncts to refusal strategies in each social status were calculated for each group. The findings show that the Persian group used more indirect strategies when making refusals to someone of higher social status. On the other hand, in the English responses the relevant group used more adjuncts than the responses in the Persian group when refusing someone’s request with an equal status. Other observed differences between the
two groups showed no statistical significance when a T-test was applied (see Table 2).

**Table 2.** Means and standard deviations of indirect, adjuncts & direct refusals based on social status distinction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-ind.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.6833</td>
<td>2.89061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-ind.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.0667</td>
<td>2.19295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-ind.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.4167</td>
<td>2.99882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-ind.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.7333</td>
<td>2.21602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-ind.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.0167</td>
<td>2.48037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-ind.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.6333</td>
<td>2.37905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-adj.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9333</td>
<td>4.04997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-adj.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4500</td>
<td>1.91714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-adj.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.5593</td>
<td>1.39298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-adj.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>1.86735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-adj.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9333</td>
<td>1.56082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-adj.st.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.1500</td>
<td>1.69571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dir.st.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
<td>1.00338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9833</td>
<td>1.48999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Influence of Interlocutors’ Gender on Strategy Use

In order to answer the third question of this study several comparisons were made to check the probable effects of subjects’ gender on the responses. First, the means of all females’ direct and indirect strategies were compared with those of males, without considering the languages into account. This comparison showed no statistically significant difference between the means of the two sexes. Then another comparison was made between the two gender groups based on language distinction. The 30 males and 30 females who provided the English responses in the relevant group proved no significant difference in using direct and indirect refusal strategies. When we examined the results of the responses in the Persian group, we came to a similar conclusion.

Then, the effects of social status on the produced refusals within each language group between males and females were examined. In this part the females’ indirect, adjuncts and direct responses to refusals in each of the three social states (lower, equal, and higher) were compared with those of the males. For the responses in the English
group, the only observed difference was males' and females' variation in using adjuncts when talking to someone of a higher social status. In the responses in the Persian group, the same comparison showed variation between the two sexes, when applying direct refusals to someone of equal status. Females appeared to refuse a request more directly when talking to someone of equal status (see Tables 3.1 & 3.2 at the end of the Discussion section that follows). As observed in these tables, despite the fact that there is no significant difference between male and female subjects in making refusals, a few variations were noticed when the social status was taken into account. Although these differences are trivial, they involve some newsworthiness which will be expanded on in the discussion section.

In sum, the results of the study concerning the third question of the research showed that there are not very great differences between males and females in refusal strategy use. That is, gender was not found to be an influential factor on subjects’ refusals in terms of type and frequency. However, when the interlocutors’ social status was taken into account some variations were observed.

Discussion
Findings of this study indicate more similarities than differences between Iranian EFL learners’ use of English and Persian refusals. That the frequency of indirect refusals in the responses of both language groups exceeded the direct ones seems to be an indication of
a degree of universality of politeness as a mutual face-saving strategy (Kasper & Rose, 2003:165).

The observation that there were more similarities than differences in the results may also be a manifestation of Ochs’ (1996:425) Universal Culture Principle which states that "There are certain commonalities across the world's language communities[,] and communities of practice in the linguistic means used to constituent certain situation meanings. This principle suggests that human interlocutors use certain similar linguistic means to achieve certain similar social ends. In this sense, the Universal Culture Principle is a limited (linguistic) means-ends principle".

An element generally absent from the refusal data was the direct refusal. Few participants used direct refusals in their responses, such as "I can't" or "No, I don't". This is in accordance to findings of Chen (1996:73) who also found, in employing refusals, the majority of subjects avoided a direct refusal (mere no) and tended to provide reasons, explanations or excuses as a way to imply their lack of ability or unwillingness.

Another point concerning the first question of the research is the greater number of indirect refusals in the subjects' Persian data in comparison to the English one (see Table1). The higher number of indirect refusals in participants' native language may be due to their greater mastery over Persian language in comparison to English as a foreign language. Another justification may be the cultural norms of Iranian society in which making a refusal directly even to someone of
lower social status is pragmatically considered discourteous. Still another point worth noting is Marti’s (2006:1837) assertion that aside from cultural differences, ‘lack of linguistic competence’ and ‘lack of knowledge of values or rules’ of non-native speakers could be influential parameters.

Regarding the type of refusal strategies used in the two versions of the test, the reasoning strategy, mentioned earlier, proved the most frequent strategy type within both. Since it was the most frequent strategy present in most studies on refusals, this strategy type can be considered as a universal feature in politeness strategies for reacting to the speech act on refusals. Moreover, in social status and gender distinction analysis, this strategy again gained the first place among other types of strategies. So, this strategy is not significantly affected by the interlocutors’ social rank or gender.

Certain patterns preferred within the two tests indicate some similarities. The first, second, third, fourth, and sixth most frequent strategies (reasoning, consideration of addressee’s feeling or opinion, statement of regret, letting interlocutor off the hook, and gratitude or appreciation, respectively) were similar. It seems that pragmatic failure would be improbable on the two tests. The remarkable similarity in the type of refusal strategy application and employing reasons in combination with a variety of indirect strategies in making refusals in both tests is in accordance with Kasper & Blum-Kulka (1993) and Kasper (1997) who believe that the speech act strategies that are similar between two languages (in our case English and
Persian) often result in pragmatic success. Nelson et al. (2002) indicate that the degree of this success depends on learners’ ability to recognize the proper degree of sociopragmatic appropriateness that the DCT cannot capture.

The second research question concerning the social status influence on the strategy types showed that in their Persian responses, subjects used more indirect strategies when making refusals to someone of higher social status (see Table 2). In addition to the Iranian culture-specific characteristics in which refusing someone directly even with a lower social status is considered somewhat impolite, another justification for this outcome may be the greater consciousness of the hierarchical nature of employer-employee relationship, where people tend to defer to the individual with higher status and more power (Nelson et al., 2002:183).

A quick look at the refusal strategies employed by the subjects confirms Richards, Platt & Platt’s (1992:238) statement that in contrary to cases like greetings and leave-takings in which the sequence of moves is strictly regulated, in cases like making refusals, the relationship between the moves is not so much predictable and there is a range of possibilities depending on the situation, topic, participants and their intention at the moment of declaration. Investigating the influence of interlocutors’ gender on strategy use was another concern of this study. Despite no significant difference between male and female subjects in making refusals, a few variations were observed when the social status was taken into account. In the
English responses, the female group's more use of adjuncts (particularly statement of positive feeling or opinion) when talking to someone of higher status (see Table 3.1) may be the result of women's more consciousness of the negative politeness. As Holmes (1995:84) points out "for females being negatively polite involves agreeing with others,……, expressing support verbally…..". In the Persian translated version of the test, female subjects' making more direct refusal to addressees of equal status in comparison to men (Table 3.2) may be an indication of more intimacy and friendship ties that alleviate the need to use extra face-saving strategies.
Table 3.1. *Males' & females' refusals on the English test*  social status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low- dir.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
<td>.84486</td>
<td>.15425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low- male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>.99655</td>
<td>.18194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low- ind.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.3667</td>
<td>2.07586</td>
<td>.37900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low- adj.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>1.89979</td>
<td>.34685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal- dir.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3667</td>
<td>1.51960</td>
<td>.27744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal- ind.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>1.08543</td>
<td>.19817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal- adj.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7000</td>
<td>2.03673</td>
<td>.37185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High- dir.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7667</td>
<td>2.41666</td>
<td>.44122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High- male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>2.06670</td>
<td>.37733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High- ind.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>1.65536</td>
<td>.30223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High- adj.st.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1667</td>
<td>.87428</td>
<td>.15962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- N refers to the number of participants.
- Mean, Std. Deviation, and Std. Error Mean are calculated for each group.
- The table compares the average refusal rates for males and females across different social status levels.
Table 3.2. *Males’ & females’ refusals on the Persian test based on social status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-dir.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0333</td>
<td>.55605</td>
<td>.10152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dir.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1667</td>
<td>1.31525</td>
<td>.24013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-ind.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.7333</td>
<td>2.33317</td>
<td>.42598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-ind.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.6333</td>
<td>3.39861</td>
<td>.62050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-adj.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
<td>1.44198</td>
<td>.26327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-adj.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>5.58374</td>
<td>1.01945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-dir.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3667</td>
<td>1.49674</td>
<td>.27327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-dir.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>1.40443</td>
<td>.25641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-ind.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.5000</td>
<td>2.86176</td>
<td>.52248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-ind.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.3333</td>
<td>3.17678</td>
<td>.58000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-adj.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
<td>1.21296</td>
<td>.22145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-adj.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4483</td>
<td>1.57176</td>
<td>.29187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-dir.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.25945</td>
<td>.22994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-dir.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.17444</td>
<td>.21442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-ind.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.5333</td>
<td>2.14530</td>
<td>.39168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-ind.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.5000</td>
<td>2.71331</td>
<td>.49538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-adj.st. female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1333</td>
<td>1.71672</td>
<td>.31343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-adj.st. male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.7333</td>
<td>1.38796</td>
<td>.25341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The result of this study has shown that Iranian EFL learners used more indirect strategies in the Persian test in comparison to the English one. This may be due to their greater mastery in Persian. Inadequate understanding of cultural variation and insufficient knowledge of linguistic competence as well as rules or values are noticeable parameters.

Moreover, subjects on both tests used remarkably larger number of indirect strategies in comparison to the direct ones. Also the influence of interlocutors' social status on the employed strategies was not something unexpected. However, some differences were observed in the English and Persian data in this study. While the subjects' performance of the Persian test used more indirect strategies in encounters with addressees of higher social status (which may be due to their higher level of consciousness about hierarchical nature of social ranks or their native language society cultural norms), the subjects' performance of the English test used more adjuncts when refusing someone of an equal status' request (which may be due to their friendship ties). Participants' gender influence on the refusal strategies was also investigated but no significant difference was observed between males and females in making refusals.

This study has shown the capabilities and limitations of using DCTs as data eliciting device. Despite their being criticized for lack of contextual variation and having imaginary interactional settings, this data collection is still used abundantly in discourses studies.
particularly those conducted in the field of the speech acts for its simplicity and high degree of control over variables in comparison to other data eliciting devices. One modification to the present data collection could have been narrowing the broad and extensive classification of refusals by eliminating or revising the strategies which were not used at all or were found statistically insignificant. Another appropriate modification was eliminating or revising the ninth situation on the DCT which proved sociopragmatically inappropriate both in Persian and English tests. At the same time, the participants’ pragmatic failure in this situation is an indication of more instruction requirement in such problematic situations.

Implicated pedagogically is the fact that such findings mostly emerging from classroom context, as Dippold (2004) maintains, are very restricted in providing pragmatic input and opportunities for productive language use. In the institutionalized setting of foreign language classroom, pedagogical goals override social goals expressed through language. To improve pragmatic competence, learners should be persuaded to participate actively and purposefully in interactions.
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Instructions: Please read the following 12 situations. After each situation you will be asked to write a response in the blank after “You”. Respond as you would in actual conversation. *(Feel free to expand your answers. You may use the other side of the page).*

*Example*: One of your close friends asks you to go camping with him next weekend, but you don’t feel like going.

Your friend: I’m planning to go camping next weekend with my friends. How about going with us?

You: *Uhm, that looks fun, but I’m sorry. I am so busy next weekend. Sorry.*

Your friend: O.K., perhaps another time.

1. You are the owner of a bookstore. One of your best workers asks to speak to you in private.
Worker: As you know, I’ve been here just over a year now, and I know you’ve been pleased with my work. I really enjoy working here, but to be quite honest, I really need an increase in pay.

You: -------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------.

Worker: Then I guess I’ll have to look for another job.

2. You are a junior in college. You attend classes regularly and take good notes. Your classmate often misses a class and asks you for lecture notes.

Classmate: Oh God! We have an exam tomorrow but I don’t have notes from last week. I am sorry to ask you this, but could you please lend me your notes once again?

You:-------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------

Classmate: O.K., then I guess I’ll have to ask somebody else.
3. You are the president of a printing company. A salesman from a printing machine company invites you to one of the most expensive restaurants in New York.

Salesman: We have met several times to discuss your purchase of my company’s products. I was wondering if you would like to be my guest at Lutece in order to firm up a contract?

You:-----------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------
---------------.
Salesman: Perhaps another time.

4. You are a top executive at a very large accounting firm. One day the boss calls you into his office.

Boss: Next Sunday my wife and I are having a little party. I know it’s short notice but I am hoping all my top executives will be there with their wives. What do you say?

You:--------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------
Boss: That’s too bad. I was hoping everyone would be there.
5. You are at a friend’s house watching TV. He/She offers you a snack.

You: Thanks, but no thanks. I’ve been eating like a pig and I feel just terrible. My clothes don’t even fit me.
Friend: Hey, why don’t you try this new diet I’ve been telling you about?
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------.
Friend: You should try it anyway.

6. You’re at your desk trying to find a report that your boss just asked for. While you’re searching through the mess on your desk, your boss walks over.

Boss: You know, maybe you should try and organize yourself better. I always write myself little notes to remind me of things. Perhaps you should give it a try!
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------.
Boss: Well, it’s an idea anyway.
7. You arrive home and notice that your cleaning lady is extremely upset. She comes rushing up to you.

Cleaning lady: Oh God, I’m so sorry! I had an awful accident. While I was cleaning I bumped into the table and your china vase fell and broke. I feel just terrible about it. I’ll pay for it.

You: (Knowing that the cleaning lady is supporting three children.)

You:------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------------------------.

Cleaning lady: No, I’d feel better if I paid for it.

8. You’re a language teacher at a university. It is just about the middle of the term now and one of your students asks to speak to you.

Student: Ah, excuse me, some of the students were talking after class recently and we kind of feel that the class would be better if you could give us more practice in conversation and less on grammar.
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Student:  O.K., it was only a suggestion.

9.  You are at a friend’s house for lunch.

Friend:  How about another piece of cake?
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Friend:  Come on. Just a little piece?
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

10. A friend invites you to dinner, but you really can’t stand this friend’s husband/ wife.

Friend:  How about coming over for dinner Sunday night? We’re having a small dinner party.
You:------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Friend: O.K., maybe another time.

11. You’ve been working in an advertising agency now for some time. The boss offers you a raise and promotion, but it involves moving. You don’t want to go. Today, the boss calls you into his office.

   Boss: I’d like to offer you an executive position in our new office in Hicktown. It’s a great town—only 3 hours from here by plane. And, a nice raise comes with the position.

   You:---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------

   Boss: Well, maybe you should give it some more thought before turning it down.

12. You are at the office in a meeting with your boss. It is getting close to the end of the day and you want to leave work.

   Boss: If you don’t mind, I’d like you to spend an extra hour or two tonight so that we can finish up with this work.

   You:---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------
   ---------------------------------------------

   ---------------------------------------------
Boss: That’s too bad. I was hoping you could stay.

Appendix 2: The Persian DCT

dعویضعم ملیحیا فذإ را یخواشید، یک هر موقعیت شما باستیتی پاسخی را در چای خالی بعد از شما قرار دهد. به گونه ای به ستواات پاسخ دهید که در یک گفتگو واقعی عمل می کنید.

محدودیتی در حجم پاسخ ارائه شده وجود ندارد و شما می توانید از پشت برهگ نیز برای پاسخگویی استفاده نمایید.

نمونه: یکی از دوستان صمیمی شما از شما می خواهد که آخر هفتاه آینده به اتفاق به اردو بروید، اما شما مایل به رفتن نیستید.

دوست شما: من می خواهم آخر هفته بعد با دوستم می به اردو برم. تو هم یا می آنی شما؟ اوه جالب به نظر می رسه، ولی من توافتم، هفته آینده خیلی گرفتنام مننافتم.

دوست شما: خب، باشی به وقت دیگه.

***************

(1) شما صاحب یک کتابفروشی هستید. یکی از بهترین کارگران شما تفاوت می کند که به طور خصوصی با شما صحبت کند.

کارگر: همواره که می دومنید، الان بیشتر از یک ساله هم می انجا کار می کنم، و می دونم که شما از گران نه رضایت دارید. من از کار گردید راحل واقعاً لذت می برم، اما راستش رو یخواشید، من واقعاً نیاز دارم که حقوقم افزایش پیدا کنه.

شما:
کارگر: در این صورت فکر می‌کنم باید به دنبال شغل دیگه ای باشم.

۲- شما دانشجوی سال سوم دانشگاه هستید. به طور مرتبت در کلاس‌ها حاضر می‌شوید و یادداشت‌های خوبی بر می‌دارید. همکلاسی شما غالباً در یکی از کلاس‌ها غیبت دارد و از شما می‌خواهد که یادداشت‌هایی درس ارائه شده را به او بدهید. همکلاسی: یا هر خدا! من فردا امتحان دارم اما من یادداشت‌های مربوط به کلاس هفته گذشته روندیارم. من سفم گاه در هر سه روز این خواهش رو می‌کنم، ممکنه لطفاً به یار دیگه یادداشت‌هات رو به من فرض بدهی؟

شما:

۳- شما مدیر یک چاپخانه هستید. فروشندگه ای از یک شرکت تولید کننده ماسنیه داده شما را به یکی از گرانترین رستوران‌های نیویورک دعوت می‌کند.

فرشندگه: تا حالا چندین ملاقات در رابطه با بحث خرید ماسنیه چابک از شرکت ما با هم داشتیم. می‌خواستم بدونم اگه مایلید ضمن دعوت شما به رستوران لوتیس (Lutece) قراردادی روز در این مورد امضای کنیم.
شما:

فورشده: یس باشه یک وقت دیگر.

4- شما یکی از مدیران اجرایی ارشد در یک شرکت حسابداری هستید. یک روز رئیس شما را به دفترش دعوت می کند.

رئیس: یکشنبه آینده من و همسرم یک مهمانی کوچکی داریم. می دونم... اما امیدوارم تمام مدیران اجرایی ارشد با تفاوت همسرانشان در این مهمانی حضور پیدا کنند. نظرتون چیست؟

شما:

رئیس: خیلی بد شد. امیدوار بودم همه در این مهمانی شرکت کنند.

5- شما در خانه یکی از دوستانتان مشغول تماشا تلویزیون هستید. دوستان شما را به خوردن یک دعوت می کنند.

شما: متشکرم، نه متشکرم واقعاً زیاد خوردم و حالم خیلی بد ه. لباسهام دیگه اندازه ام نیست.
دوست شما: چرا این برنامه رژیم غذایی روکه قیل‌گر در موردش باهات عرف زدم امتحان نمی‌کنی؟
شما:

دوست شما: به حرکت بايد امتحانش کنی.

6- شما پشت میزتان نشسته اید و در تلاش هستید گزارشی را که رئیس‌تان درخواست کرده پیدا کنید. وقتی مشغول جستجو در روی میز به هم ریخته خودتان هستید، رئیس‌تان وارد اتاق می‌شود.
رئیس: می دوئی، شاید بهتر باشه سعی کنی کمی منظم تر باشی من. همیشه بادداشت‌های کچکی برای بخاطر سیر دن کارها برای خودم می‌نویسم. شاید به نبایش این شیوه رو امتحان کنی!
شما:

رئیس: خب، به حرکات این هم یک نظر بود.

7- به خانه می‌رسید و متوجه می‌شود که خانم نظافتی شما بسیار مضطرب است. وی به سرعت به سوی شما می‌آید.
خانم نظافتی: وای خداان، خیلی مناسفم! واقعاً اتفاق وحشتاناگی بود. موقعیت به میز خوردم و گلدن چینی تون افتاد زمین و شکست. در این مورد خیلی مناسفم. خسارت رو میدم.

شما: با دانشتن این موضوع که خانم نظافتی سربرستی سه کودک را بر عهده دارید.
شما:

خانم نظافتی: نه، اگر خسارت رو بدم راحتترم.

۸-استاد زبان یک دانشگاه هستید. اکنون تقریباً نیمه های ترم است که یکی از دانشجویان تنها می کند با شما صحبت کند. دانشجو: آه، ببخشید، چندتا از دانشجوها بعد از کلاس صحبت می کردند ما احساس می کنیم که اگه شما با ما در زمینه مکاتبه تمرين پيشرفته داشته باشيد و کمتر تمرين گرامر داشته باشيم خيلي بهتر ميشته.
شما:

دانشجو: خيلي خوب، اين فقط یک پيشنهاد بود.
۹ - شما در خانه یکی از دوستان برای صرف ناهار دعوت هستید.
دوست شما: یا یه تکه دیگه کیک چطوری؟
شما:

دوست شما: باشه، فقط یه تکه کوچیک.
شما:

۱۰ - یکی از دوستان شما را به شام دعوت میکند، اما شما اصلا تحمل نمی‌کنید.
زن/شوره دوستان رانتارید.
دوست شما: نظرت در یکه مهمونی شام برای یکشنبه شب چیه؟ ماما مهمونی شام کوچیک داریم.
شما:
دومست شما : خیلی خوب ، باشه یک وقت دیگه.

(11) اکنون مدتی است که در یک موسسه تبلیغاتی مشغول به کار شده اید . رئیس‌تان به شما پیشنهاد اضافه حقوق و ترقی می‌دهد . اما این مستلزم نقل مکان شما به چاپی دیگر است . شما مایل به رفتن نیستید . امروز رئیس شما را به دفترش دعوت می‌کند.

رئیس : مایلم که یک سمت اجرایی رو در دفتر جدیدمون در هیک تون بی‌پایه پیشنهاد کنم . شهر بزرگی که یا هوایما فقط سه ساعت دنیا اینجا فاصله داره و به همراه این سمت ، اضافه حقوق خوبی هم در نظر گرفته شده .

شما : 

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

رئیس : بسیار خب ، شاید بهتر باشه قبل از رد این پیشنهاد . بیشتر در موردش فکر کنی.

(12) در نشستی در اداره به اتفاق رئیس‌تان هستید . به پایان روز نزدیک می‌شوید و شما قصد دارید محل کارتان را ترک کنید .

رئیس : اگه مسئله ای نیست . مایلم امشب یکی - دو ساعت اضافه هر بموند تا بتوانیم این کار رو تمام کنیم .

شما : 

-----------------------------------------------
رئیس: خیلی بد شد. امیدوار بودم بتوانید بمونید.