

Please cite this paper as follows:

Jazaeri, F. (2022). Politeness Strategies Used by English Native Speakers, Persian Native Speakers, and Iranian EFL Learners in the Production of Refusal Speech Act. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 10 (43), 11-19.

Research Paper

Politeness Strategies Used by English Native Speakers, Persian Native Speakers, and Iranian EFL Learners in the Production of Refusal Speech Act

Farahat Jazaeri¹

¹Department of English, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran
farahjz@gmail.com

Received: November 18, 2021

Accepted: September 30, 2022

Abstract

A key aspect of effective communication is the use of appropriate speech acts. This study investigated the difference between Persian native speakers, Iranian EFL learners, and English native speakers in terms of the speech act realization of refusal and uncovered the reasons for which, each group of participants produced the refusal speech act regarding the Rapport Management Approach. To this end, 100 (male and female) intermediate EFL learners were chosen based on their performance on the Oxford Placement Test. 100 Persian native speakers among 140 students studying Persian literature at Najafabad Azad University were randomly chosen and they were asked to fill out a Discourse Completion Test (DCT), consisting of 12 situations realizing the refusal of four types of eliciting acts. Additionally, 12 English native speakers (6 males and 6 females) were also contacted through emails to participate in the study. The English DCT was given to two groups of participants and the Persian DCT was given to Persian native speakers. The politeness model proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) was adopted to show the differences between Iranian EFL learners, English native speakers, and Persian native speakers who were participants in this study. By using the SPSS software program, the results indicated 'negative' strategies as the most frequent ones and highlighted the significant role of face, social rights, and obligations in interaction. The findings revealed that among politeness strategies 'negative' strategies are the most frequent ones. The results also indicated that English native speakers use negative politeness strategies more than Iranian EFL learners. Therefore, English native participants regard themselves as having rights and obligations about other people more than Iranian EFL learners. The results of this study highlighted the importance of pragmatic knowledge in international communications.

Keywords: Politeness Strategies; Refusal Speech act; Rapport Management Approach

اسرآتری های موافق زبانان انگلیسی، ارسای نون و ن آموانی یکی از جنبه های کلیدی یک ارتباط موثر، استفاده از کنش های گفتاری مناسب است. این مطالعه به بررسی تفاوت بین فارسی زبانان، زبان آموزان ایرانی و زبان آموزان انگلیسی از لحاظ درک کنش گفتاری استفاده از لایه های گفتاری که هر گروه از شرکت کنندگان از گفتاری امتناع را با توجه به رویکرد مدیریت ارتباط ارائه کردند، انجام شد. برای این منظور، 100 زبان آموز فارسی (مرد و زن) بر اساس عملکرد آنها در آزمون تعیین سطح آکسفورد انتخاب شدند. 100 فارسی زبان بومی از بین 140 دانشجوی رشته ادبیات فارسی دانشگاه آزاد نجف آباد به صورت تصادفی انتخاب شدند و از آنها خواسته شد تا آزمون تکمیل گفتمان (DCT) شامل 12 موقعیت را تکمیل کنند که متوجه امتناع چهار نوع کننده می شود. علاوه بر این، با 12 زبان مادری انگلیسی (6 مرد و 6 زن) نیز از طریق ایمیل برای شرکت در مطالعه تماس گرفته شد. DCT انگلیسی به دو گروه از شرکت کنندگان و DCT فارسی به فارسی زبانان بومی داده شد. مدل ادب ارائه شده توسط براون و لوینسون (1987) برای نشان دادن تفاوت بین زبان آموزان ایرانی زبان انگلیسی، انگلیسی زبانان بومی و فارسی زبانان شرکت کننده در این مطالعه اتخاذ شد. نتایج با استفاده از نرم افزار SPSS، اسرآتری های «منفی» را به عنوان متداولترین راهبردها نشان داد و نقش معنادار چهره، حقوق و تعهدات اجتماعی در تعامل را برجسته کرد. یافته ها نشان داد که در بین راهبردهای ادب، راهبردهای «منفی» بیشترین فراوانی را دارند. همچنین نتایج نشان داد که انگلیسی زبانان بیشتر از زبان آموزان ایرانی از راهبردهای ادب منفی استفاده می کنند. بنابراین، شرکت کنندگان انگلیسی خود را دارای حقوق و تعهداتی در رابطه با سایر افراد نسبت به زبان آموزان ایرانی زبان انگلیسی می دانند. نتایج این مطالعه بر اهمیت دانش عملگراییه در ارتباطات بین المللی تاکید کرد.

Introduction

Using different speech acts by men and women, native speakers and non-native speakers draw more attention to the study language of practitioners. Pragmatic knowledge as a part of communicative competence (Bachman & Palmer, 1996) facilitates using appropriate different speech acts based on the context. Hymes (1971) proposed "communicative competence" which refers to a grammatical and social knowledge of a language user about how and when to use utterances appropriately. He stated that communicative competence consists of four types of abilities: (1) To what extent something is formally possible (2) To what extent something is feasible in the advantage of implementation (3) To what extent something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) about a context in which it is used and assessed (4) To what extent something is performed, and what it is doing entails (Hymes, 1972).

Crystal (1997) defined pragmatics as the study of communicative action in its sociocultural context and the way it is interpreted by the users. Boxer (2002) stated that individuals from the interactions with different communities are based on their pragmatic norms, so they may have different expectations and misperceptions.

Austin (1962) defined speech act as an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance in language and communication, such as stating, promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting, and congratulating. As Spencer-Oatey (2005) mentioned, people have specific goals when interacting with each other. These can be relational as well as transactional in nature. These goals can significantly affect their perceptions of rapport because any failure to achieve them can cause depression and dissatisfaction. According to Al-Errani (2007), the speech act of refusal occurs when a speaker directly or indirectly says 'no' to a request or invitation. He stated that a refusal is a face-threatening act to the listener/ requester/ inviter, because it contradicts his or her suspense, and is often realized through indirect strategies.

The rapport Management Approach examines the way that language is used to make, keep and threaten social relationships, but it also includes the management of sociality rights and interactional goals. Additionally, the rapport management approach suggests a great balance between self and others, (Spencer-Oatey, 2008). The rapport Management approach is the basic and necessary concept in this study that should be interpreted. Management of harmony-disharmony among people consists of three interconnected components: the management of face, the management of sociality rights and obligations, and the management of interactional goals.

Face management involves the management of face sensitivities. Based on Goffman's (1967) definition, 'face' is one public image or social sense that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. The face appears with personal social value and is connected to people's sense of worth and respect. Sociality rights and obligations, on the other hand, are concerned with social expectancy and show people's concerns over fairness, consideration, and behavioral appropriateness. This aspect has two parts: equity right which denotes that every member of society should have fair behavior and association that is the individual right to have a friendly relationship with others.

The present study aimed at investigating the politeness strategies when making a refusal according to the rapport management approach. Because Iran has the highest international tourist numbers, Persian native speakers and Iranian EFL Learners may face the biggest challenges of refusing the requests of English native speakers. It is important to know the different functional use of Politeness strategies by English native speakers and Persian native speakers to produce refusal speech acts. Moreover, the results of this study can be used as a reference for other language practitioners.

Literature Review

In the comparative study on refusal speech acts among Chinese and American English, Honglin (2007) demonstrated that both Chinese and Americans used varied expressions to refuse something. In addition, they were different in the directness of refusals based on situations and cultures. Direct and indirect speech acts of refusals were utilized in both languages.

Baranova (2008) scrutinized the politeness strategies used by two different cultures (American and Japanese). In this regard 73 American and 70 Japanese wrote rejection letters which consisted of three basic parts: preparation for the rejection, the actual rejection, and some remedy. Each part consisted of supportive moves to soften the impact of refusal. The written rejection letters were collected to examine the effect of Brown and Levinson's social variables on the choice of politeness expressionists. According to the results, in American letters 11% of participants used the direct method, 63% used the indirect and 26% used both methods. However, in Japanese letters, there was little variety. 99% of letters used direct rejection which 10% of them followed by an explanation, whereas 80% of them were without explanation, and 99% were preceded by an explanation, also in 1% of letters indirect rejection was used.

Hashemian (2012) studied the cross-cultural differences in performing refusal between Persian native speakers and English native speakers regarding the frequency of the semantic formulas. He also examined whether Persian EFL learners would transfer their L1 refusal patterns into the L2 or not. His study revealed no fundamental differences in the use of direct refusal strategies between English and Persian native speakers. The results of this study indicated the existence of pragmatic transfer in the use of Indirect and Adjuncts to refusals by both highly proficient and low proficient L2 learners.

Han and Burgucu-Tazegül (2016) investigated the discrepancies between native and non-native speakers of English in the use of refusals. They also scrutinized whether possible pragmatic transfer falls under the influence of L2 proficiency. The data were gathered via role-plays. The results indicated the participants frequently use indirect strategies for refusals in preference to direct ones. Turkish EFL learners preferred to use pragmatic transfers while utilizing refusal strategies. High proficiency level students rarely use pragmatic transfer. English native speakers gave less importance to status than EFL learners.

Tabatabaei (2019) investigated the language proficiency effects of using the refusal speech act by Iranian EFL learners. She used DCT to collect the data. The findings showed language proficiency as a neutral factor in the degree of pragmatic knowledge. She highlighted the role of teaching pragmatics and cultural behaviors of the target language in language classrooms to promote language learners' pragmatic competence.

Živković (2022) compared the use of refusal strategies by advanced Serbian EFL learners and English native speakers. DCT was used to examine refusal strategies. The results underlined some variances in terms of the frequency and content of special strategies. The EFL learners preferred to overuse regret/apology statements, more family-oriented excuses and explanations than the ones used by the English native speakers.

Shahi (2022) analyzed the use of refusal speech acts by Iranian EFL learners. The results indicated that female participants prefer indirect strategies but male participants prefer direct strategies. Female participants prefer accepting micro functions as refusal responses. However, reinforcing micro as refusal responses were used by male learners.

Previous speech act studies made use of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness' model or Leech's model; however, some disadvantages are associated with them. The disadvantage of Brown and Levinson (1987) is that it does not consider the social aspects of life. Therefore, the face was considered the only criterion for politeness. As a result, this study used Spencer-Oatey's

(2002, 2005) rapport management approach to study speech acts. Therefore, the Rapport Management model is a new model which the researcher is persuaded to work on it.

Concerning Rapport Management, an attempt was made in this study to find appropriate answers to the following questions:

RQ1. What are the differences among politeness strategies used by English and Persian native speakers and Iranian EFL Learners in the use of refusal speech act?

RQ2. Why do Persian native speakers use politeness strategies in Persian?

RQ3. What reasons are perceived by Iranian EFL learners in using politeness strategies in English?

RQ4. Why do English native speakers induce them to use politeness strategies?

Method

Research design

The design of the research was a descriptive comparative one in which Iranian EFL learners and English and Persian native speakers' responses were compared to find the difference between the politeness strategies and the reasons perceived by them in using such politeness strategies. In this research, the researcher attempted to investigate the speech act of refusal with regard to the Rapport Management approach. The components of methodology; participants, instrumentation, and data analysis are explained below.

Participants

One hundred Iranian EFL learners out of 140 students (based on their performance on OPT) and 100 Persian Native speakers among 140 students (studying Persian Literature at Islamic Azad University, Najafabad Branch) were randomly chosen based on their availability to participate in the study. Moreover, 12 English native speakers, and Linked In network users (6 males and 6 females), were selected as participants. English questionnaire was sent to them via email so they could fill them out. In terms of gender, the participants included both males and females; i.e. each group consisted of 50 males and 50 females. Participants fall between the ages of 20-30.

Instruments

According to Cohen (1996), the discourse completion test (DCT) was used to gather data on speech acts. Two forms of (DCT) were typed, one in English and the other in Persian. The (DCT) consisted of 12 scenarios. Each participant had to answer in both Persian and English, since answering the English (DCT) may have an effect on the Persian (DCT) or vice versa, each person was asked to answer 6 Persian and 6 English questions. Hence, there was one questionnaire in two languages. These situations were in the form of a conversation and students were asked to put themselves in each situation and respond as if they were in the actual conversation. Moreover, each situation in DCT was followed by a three 5-point Likert scale. The Likert scale was utilized to find the cognitive reasons (face, interactional goals, sociality rights, and obligations) for participants in choosing the politeness strategy in performing refusal speech acts. This questionnaire was confirmed by 5 professors who had Ph.D. in English. There is one example from English DCT and the translation of it in Persian DCT below:

1. *You are the owner of a bookstore. One of your best workers asks to speak to you in private.*

Strategies	Persian native speakers	ALL	NESs	Total
Bald-On-Record	22	20	2	43
Negative	57	58	7	122
Positive	14	16	2	32
Off-Record	7	6	1	14
Total	100	100	12	212

Table 1 indicates negative politeness strategy (N Total = 122) was used more than any other strategies by the three groups of participants in the study, and it was followed by bald-on-record (N Total = 44), positive (N Total = 32), and off-record strategies (N Total = 14). Table 2 determines whether there was a difference among Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English native speakers in terms of their frequency of using different types of refusal acts or not.

Table 2

Chi-Square Results for Comparing Politeness Strategies of Refusal Speech Act Used by Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English Native speakers

		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson	Chi-Square	.496	6	.99
Likelihood	Ratio	.499	6	.99
Linear-by-Linear	Association	.149	1	.69
N of Valid Cases		212		

The p -value under the *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* column in front of Pearson Chi-square was found to be larger than the specified level of significance (i.e. $.99 > .05$). It indicates that the differences among Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English native speakers in terms of the frequency of using refusal speech act were not statistically significant. In other words, the three groups of participants were not different in terms of their frequency of use of the bold-on-record politeness strategy (although this strategy was more used by Persian native speakers than the other two groups), nor were they differ concerning their frequency of use of negative strategy, positive and off-record strategies (although the proportions of these three strategies were higher for English native speakers than for the participants of the other two groups).

Table 3

Frequencies of Reasons for Using Different Politeness Strategies by Male and Female Persian native speakers

Strategies	Sociality Rights and Obligations	Face	Interactional Goals	Total
Males	28	13	9	50
Females	11	19	20	50
Total	39	31	29	100

Table 3 indicates the frequencies of various reasons for males and females were different, with the biggest difference for *sociality rights and obligations* (Difference = $28 - 11 = 17$), while the differences for *face* and *interactional goals* were 6 and 11, respectively. Table 4 revealed whether the difference between males and females concerning the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act was statistically significant or not.

Table 4

Chi-Square Results for Comparing Male and Female Persian native speakers' Reasons for Using Politeness Strategies of Refusal Speech Act

		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson	Chi-Square	12.70	2	.002
Likelihood	Ratio	13.07	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear	Association	11.58	1	.001
N of Valid Cases		100		

If you read across Pearson Chi-square to *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* column, you can find that the *p-value* was less than the set alpha level (i.e. $.002 < .05$). It indicated that the difference between male and female Persian native speakers regarding the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act reached statistical significance.

Table 5

Frequencies of Reasons for Using Different Politeness Strategies by Male and Female EFL learners

Strategies	Sociality Rights and Obligations	Face	Interactional Goals	Total
Males	31	14	5	50
Females	10	13	27	50
Total	41	27	32	100

Table 5 shows that the frequencies of different reasons for male and female EFL learners were different: the differences were 22, 21, and 1 for *interactional goals*, *sociality rights, obligations*, and *face*, respectively. Table 6 shows whether the difference between male and female EFL learners regarding the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act reached statistical significance or not.

Table 6

Chi-Square Results for Comparing Male and Female EFL Learners' Reasons for Using Politeness Strategies of Refusal Speech Act

		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson	Chi-Square	25.91	2	.000
Likelihood	Ratio	27.94	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear	Association	25.35	1	.000
N of Valid Cases		100		

In Table 6, Pearson Chi-square to *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* column, shows that the *p-value* was less than the set alpha level (i.e. $.000 < .05$). This means that the difference between male and female EFL learners regarding the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act was statistically significant.

Table 7

Frequencies of Reasons for Using Different Politeness Strategies by Male and Female English Native Speakers

Strategies	Sociality Rights and Obligations	Face	Interactional Goals	Total
Males	5	1	0	6
Females	2	0	4	6
Total	7	1	4	12

Table 7 indicates differences were 2 and 5 for *sociality rights and obligations*, 0 and 4 for *interactional goals*, and 1 and 0 *faces*. Table 4.8 determines whether the difference between male

and female English native speakers concerning the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act was statistically significant or not.

Table 8

Chi-Square Results for Comparing Male and Female NESs' Reasons for Using Politeness Strategies of Refusal Speech Act

		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson	Chi-Square	6.28	2	.043
Likelihood	Ratio	8.26	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear	Association	4.38	1	.036
N of Valid Cases		12		

Table 8 shows a *p-value* less than the alpha level (i.e. $.043 < .05$), which means that the difference between male and female English native speakers regarding the reasons for using politeness strategies of refusal speech act was statistically significant.

Discussion

This study aimed to answer the main question and sought to reveal the differences among politeness strategies used by English and Persian native speakers and Iranian EFL Learners in the use of the refusal speech act. To answer this question, results indicated no significant differences among Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English native speakers in terms of the frequency of using the refusal speech act. The current findings indicated that Persian native speakers used the bold-on-record politeness strategy more than other groups. English native speakers intended to use negative strategy, positive and off-record strategies than others. A general comparison between Persian native and English native participants indicates that they select the same strategies. The results of this study are in line with Hashemian's (2012) study. He indicated no fundamental differences in the use of direct refusal strategies between English and Persian native speakers.

The other purpose of this study was to the reasons why Persian native speakers use politeness strategies regarding Rapport Management. Males prefer to use sociality rights and obligations. Because males considered social rights and advantages for themselves, they used sociality rights and obligations more than females. In Iranian society, most males are more independent than females economically, so they suppose certain rights for themselves such as their order to be performed and also to be responded to with respect. This is why they prefer to use sociality rights and obligations. In line with this study, Shahi (2022) analyzed the use of refusal speech acts by Iranian EFL learners and indicated that female participants prefer indirect strategies but male participants prefer direct strategies. Female participants prefer accepting micro functions as refusal responses. However, reinforcing micro as refusal responses were used by male learners.

To answer the third question, it shows that the frequencies of different reasons for male and female IEFLs were different: the differences were 22, 21, and 1 for *interactional goals*, *sociality rights*, *obligations*, and *face*, respectively. Additionally, social rights and obligations as the first reason which was chosen by IEFL learners. According to the chi-square chart, it had a statistically significant effect on the rating of participants since the *p-value* is smaller than 0.05. Additionally, this factor has more effect on males' strategy selection than females, but interactional goals in females' view have more effect than males. In Iran society, most males are more economically independent than females, but according to this statistical outcome in using Interactional goals by females, the researcher came up with this reason that Iranian females IEFLs have more specific goals in their interactions with others, maybe they are more face-

sensitive than Males. Han and Burgucu-Tazegül (2016) pointed out that the participants frequently utilized indirect strategies for refusals in preference to direct ones. Turkish EFL learners preferred to use pragmatic transfers while utilizing refusal strategies. English native speakers gave less importance to status than EFL learners.

Considering the last purpose of the study, the results indicated that English native male and female speakers have different reasons to choose refusal speech acts. The role of the Spencer-party's opinion in selecting a politeness strategy is proved here. Therefore, the results highlighted the effect of the other reasons that be equally accepted by Iranian EFL learners, English native speakers, and Persian Native speakers.

According to Spencer-oatey (2005), interactional goals exist in the minds of the interlocutors, but rights and obligations are *social*. In other words, if people don't observe their expected rights and obligations in interacting with others, they may feel annoyed. To achieve harmony in interaction, both speaker and hearer must share similar conceptualizations of face and rights, and obligations or, at least, understand each other's worldview to manage rapport properly. At the same time, harmony does not depend on sharing interactional goals, but on managing them properly. Interactional goals do not affect males selecting the strategy because the interlocutors may not find each other's goal, so they just notified the interactions as being developed socially. Results show that females are more sensitive to this kind of phenomenon. In brief, people expect social rights and obligations for themselves. This phenomenon is more common in intercultural interaction.

The consequences of this have some theoretical and pedagogical implications as to the use of proper speech act in different situations as well as teaching and learning techniques. Regarding implications, the findings of this study revealed different strategies exist among Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English native speakers.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to investigate the refusal speech acts regarding Rapport Management Approach. This investigation also finds out the role of gender among Iranian EFL learners, Persian native speakers, and English native speakers as well. Generally, the greatest amount of strategies used by Persian native speakers, EFL learners, and English native speakers are the same, however, the percentage and frequency of each differ respectively.

Findings revealed differences in reasons observed and the frequency of using different strategies among Iranian EFL learners, Persian natives, and English native speakers. Also, gender plays a role in the use of politeness strategies among EFL learners, Persian natives, and English native speakers, and also supports reasons induced by 3 groups of participants. Since sociality rights were considered by Males of these 3 groups of participants, so the difference between males and females was observed.

In conclusion, teachers as direct practitioners of language in academic settings are, thus, suggested to raise EFL learners' pragmatic awareness besides their proficiency level. In other words, as learners' level enhances, pragmatic aspects should be taught to them which expose learners to authentic materials. In different situations, they can correctly recognize the situation and use the proper speech act. Consequently, students as other practitioners of language can benefit from this study by finding the difference between their native language and the target one. Comprehending these differences can help them to realize the situation where they are and they use appropriate speech acts. The findings of this study can shed light on politeness issues and provide EFL practitioners to manage more successful EFL classes. The present research can be a source for future studies on politeness strategies used by Persian Native speakers and EFL learners from a rapport management perspective. Further research can be done with larger numbers of English native speakers.

Also, the results suggested opportunities for future studies on politeness regarding different proficiency levels or distances among the interlocutors. Additionally, it would also be interesting to investigate the use of politeness strategies among bilinguals. However, in the present study, the DCT was used for collecting data for future studies on the current topic is recommended to use of another instrument like different scenarios or use interviews.

References

- Al-Eryani, A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved May 2013 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june07aaae.php>.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words?* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Barešová, I. (2008). *Politeness strategies in cross-cultural perspective: Study of American and Japanese employment rejection letters*. Ivona Baresova.
- Boxer, D. (2002). Discourse issues in cross-cultural pragmatics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 150-167.
- Brown P. and Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1996). Investigating the production of speech act sets. *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language*, 21-43.
- Crystal, D (1997). *English as a Global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Han, T., & Burgucu-Tazegül, A. (2016). Realization of speech acts of refusals and pragmatic competence by Turkish EFL learners. *The reading matrix: An international online journal*, 16(1), 161-178.
- Hashemian, M. (2012). Cross-Cultural Differences and Pragmatic Transfer in English and Persian refusals. *JTLS*, 4(3), 23- 46.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory*. London: Academic Press.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory*. London: Academic Press.
- Keshavarz, M. Eslami-Rasekh, Z. and Ghahraman, V. (2006). Pragmatic transfer and Iranian EFL refusals: a cross-cultural perspective of Persian and English. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 11, 359- 402.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lim, T. S. (1994). *Facework and Interpersonal Relationships*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Lin, G. H. C. (2009). A case study about communication strategies. (Ph.D. dissertation) Changhwa: Grace Hui Chin Lin, 3rd Edition, ISBN Number: 978-957- 41-6666-4 Published in worldwide online book stores and library: http://ebooks.lib.ntu.edu.tw/1_file/author_provided/20110725/02.pdf.
- Markus, N. (2010). A Cross-Cultural Investigation of Refusals in Arabic and English. The Paper was presented as a Web-poster presentation at the 4th International Conference on Intercultural Pragmatics and Communication, November 16, Madrid, Spain.
- Nelson, G. L. Carson, J. Al Batal, M. & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy used in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), 163-189.

- Pearson, L. (2006). Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatic acquisition: An analysis of novice learners' production of directives. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 473- 495.
- Shahi, B. M. V. (2022). Pragmatic Competence of Iranian EFL Learners in the Light of Refusal Speech Act. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 58-65.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). *Rapport management: A framework for analysis*. In *Culturally Speaking. Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London: Continuum.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in the talk: Using rapport-sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 529-545.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (I'm)Politeness, face, and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 95-119.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Jiang, W. (2003). Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: moving from politeness maxims to sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1633-50.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Xing, J. (1998). Relational management in Chinese-British business meetings. In S. Hunston (ed.) *Language at Work*. Clevedon: British Association for Applied Linguistics in association with Multilingual Matters Ltd., pp. 31-46.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Xing, J. (2003). Managing rapport in intercultural business interactions: A comparison of two Chinese-British welcome meetings. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 24 (1), 33-46.
- Tabatabaei, S., & Tabatabaei, S. (2019). Language proficiency and appropriateness of using refusal speech acts by Iranian EFL learners. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 4(1), 35-45.
- Živković, E. (2022). Pragmatic Competence of Advanced Serbian EFL Learners: A Study of Refusal Strategies. *Philologia Mediana*, 14(14).

Biodata

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
 رتال جامع علوم انسانی