



Journal Homepage: -[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/20133  
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/20133>



### RESEARCH ARTICLE

#### A LINGUISTIC STUDY OF REFUSAL STRATEGIES USED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF HAIL'S UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

**Ibrahim Thaher**

University of Hail, Hail, Saudi Arabia.

Email: [ibrahimthaher@yahoo.com](mailto:ibrahimthaher@yahoo.com)

#### Manuscript Info

##### Manuscript History

Received: 25 October 2024

Final Accepted: 28 November 2024

Published: December 2024

##### Key words:-

Low-Context Culture, High-Context  
Culture, Language

#### Abstract

The present study examines the refusal strategies used by the students at the University of Hail (UOH). It tackles two main questions related to what refusal strategies, classified by Beebe et al. (1990), Saudi students at the University of Hail (UOH) employ in their refusal responses and their reasons for using the refusal strategies. The current study has used a modified written discourse completion test (DCT). The students are asked to provide written responses to express their refusals to the given situations. The collected data are analyzed according to the content, number of students, and order of formulas employed by Beebe et al. (1990). The findings indicate that Saudi students at the (UOH) use more expressions of excuses/ reasons/ explanations followed by expressions of regrets. In many cases, they avert the use of “no” in their refusal strategies, except in some cases where it is followed by excuses or explanations. Moreover, this study reveals that Saudi students have three reasons for justifying their refusals indirectly. These reasons are respect, face-saving, and indirect communication.

*Copyright, IJAR, 2024, All rights reserved.*

#### Introduction:-

Language is the general umbrella for communication. People communicate with others for so many purposes and in many various means. Hall (1968, p.158) declares that language is “the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other using habitually used oral-auditory arbitrary symbols.” Sometimes, they use explicit language because they have nothing to hide, or they do not have time to waste. Other people live in a society that highlights the direct way of interaction, the low-context cultures (see Hall, 1977). On the contrary, some people use implicit language because the society in which they live uses this form of language as a part of their cultural background. For sure, there are many reasons for talking with others implicitly, such as saving someone’s self-image, kidding, and hiding something from the hearer(s). The purpose of this study is to uncover the refusal strategies Saudi students employ in their daily talk.

Generally speaking, the speech act of refusal is a sensitive issue because it affects the image of the interactant whose offer, suggestion, and invitation have been refused. Thus, it is not welcomed or accepted if it is used directly. Eslami (2010, p. 217) states that “Refusal can be a difficult speech act to perform. As a dispreferred response, it is complicated in form, and it usually involves various strategies to avoid offending one’s interlocutor.” Therefore,

**Corresponding Author:- Thaher**

Address:- University of Hail, Hail, Saudi Arabia.

different cultures treated it from different angles. Some cultures, as well as Oriental ones, have been scrambled to use direct refusals because the social norms do not allow using the harsh way of refusals.

Ramos (1991) as cited in Hartuti (2014, p.169) indicates that “it is very crucial for refusing others’ invitations, offers, and suggestions without hurting their feelings since the ‘incapability to say ‘no’ clearly has led many non-native speakers to offend their interlocutors.” It carries a strong effect on the inviter, the speaker, etc., and leads the other interactant to avoid using the direct way of refusal. Such a way varies from one society to another.

To have a panoramic overview of the speech act of refusal, we have to distinguish between interactants who use the refusal as an act to decline someone’s invitation, offer, help, and other speech acts in different cultures; cross-culture (see Beebe, et al., 1990; Felix-Brasdefer, 2003; Guo, 2012, and Kown, 2003) and those who use it within the same language (see Al-Mahrooqi & Al-Aghbari, 2016 and Tuncer, 2016).

There are many ways of saying “No.” In low-context societies (see Hall 1977), people from these cultures use it directly and ostensibly without the need to provide justifications. Even in courteous language, such societies use “No” with a smile to reduce the negative effect that may be attached to it. Meanwhile, the hearer accepts it because s/he may say ‘No’ if s/he is in the position of the speaker. Hartuti (2014, p. 169) points out that “refusals are a pragmatic breakdown that may certainly trigger unintended offense and/or fail in communication.”

Hall (1977) differentiated between two types of cultures, high context-culture and low context-culture. The speakers from the high-context culture employ implicit and nonverbal language whereas speakers from the low-context culture use explicit and obvious language. Hall (1977) argues as cited in Alhaidari (2009, pp.8-9) “that people in high context- cultures rely on the use of the context itself to deliver high context- messages instead of spoken utterances. Some of these cultures include Japan, China, India, and Arabic cultures.” Meanwhile, low-context-cultures are European, American, and English cultures. This study adopts Hall’s (1977) categorization of high-context and low-context cultures to better understand the nature of Saudi undergraduate students’ employment of refusal strategies in their casual talks.

### **Literature Review:-**

Many studies have tackled the issue of refusal in different cultures. For example, Beebe et al. (1990) studied it from the scope of American and Japanese cultures. The study uncovered that the Japanese are less direct in using refusal when interacting with someone with a higher status. Besides, it clarified that the Japanese are less specific and vague than American excuses and pretexts.

Al-Shboul et al. (2012) compared how Jordanian EFL postgraduate students and Malay ESL students differed in their refusal of employment. The data collection was based on a modified DCT from Beebe et al. (1990). This study showed that while both groups of students used comparable refusal strategies, Jordanian students were more likely to use indirect strategies than Malaysian students. Moreover, the study revealed that the Malay respondents expressed more gratitude than their Jordanian counterparts in the invitation refusal of someone with equal and lower status.

Four years later, Al-Shboul & Huwaris (2016) conducted a comparative study of Jordanian Arabic and American English refusal strategies. Fifteen male Jordanian speakers and the same number and gender of Americans were selected to be the basis of their study. The researchers used the discourse completion test (DCT), which was taken from Al-Issa’s (1998) study. Al-Shboul & Huwaris (2016, p.59) explained in their study that “the Jordanian participants at all social statuses (i.e., higher, equal, lower) were more likely to employ more indirect strategies than the American participants who used direct refusal style in higher and equal status.” The overall view of the two studies revealed that Jordanian students tend to use more indirect strategies of refusals than their counterparts, Americans or Malays. This could be explained as the nature of the Jordanian society is sensitive toward using direct refusals.

In her study of Basra learners of English as a foreign language, Muhmmmed (2012, p.59) found that they often use indirect methods of refusal, such as expressing regret and providing excuses, reasons, or explanations. Most often, they avoid refusal with “no.” Therefore, this study concurs with what Hall (1977) points to regarding high-context cultures. It also agrees with the study conducted by Alhaidari (2009, p. 91), in which he found that Saudis use

implicit language of refusal “to mirror a collectivistic culture as they were more concerned with group harmony and face maintenance rather than clarity of messages.”

Kwon's (2004) study of forty Korean speakers in Korea and thirty-seven Americans in America investigated their refusal strategies. Kwon (2004, p. 339) found that “Korean speakers' refusals at times sounded less transparent and more tentative than those of English speakers. In addition, Korean speakers frequently paused and apologized before refusing, while English speakers often stated positive opinions and expressed gratitude for a proposed action.” Korean speakers tended to take a more mitigating approach in dealing with a higher-status person as compared to other status types. Whereas English speakers did not seem to be particularly sensitive to one status versus another in their refusals across the different situations. This study is consistent with the study of Al-Shboul & Huwari (2016) in that the Jordanian participants, as well as the Korean speakers, are categorized by Hall (1977); the high-context culture employs indirect refusal strategies. Whereas American participants use direct and explicit rejection styles, specifically in higher and equal status.

Another study conducted by Tunce (2016) in which she investigated the refusal strategies of Turkish university lecturers of English. The study sample included twenty instructors of English. The study showed that the participants were in favor of employing the indirect strategies of refusal rather than the direct ones. Furthermore, the status of interactants played a significant role: “The higher the interlocutor's status is, the more refusal strategies the participants employ.”

In the same country, Han & Burgucu-Tazegül (2016) applied their study to nine lower-intermediate and nine upper-intermediate Turkish students of EFL—English as a Foreign Language—and eighteen native English speakers to investigate the Turkish students of English realization of refusal strategies and, at the same time, to recognize the differences between Turkish and native English students in the use of refusals. Role plays were the only resource for collecting the data. The study concluded that the participants tended to use indirect refusal strategies instead of direct ones. Furthermore, Turkish EFL students used pragmatic transfer when they employed the strategies of refusals. Finally, it revealed that Turkish students paid more attention and gave more importance to social status than English native speakers do. This confirms the outcomes of the study of Tuncer (2016) in that Turkish participants played a higher role in the indirectness of refusals than clarity in this matter. Besides, they paid more attention to social status in that they used more refusal strategies depending on the higher status of the recipient of the refusal.

Liao and Bresnahan (1996) studied the speech act of refusal of 570 Taiwanese and 516 Americans. The two researchers employed a Discourse Completion Test (DCT). The study revealed that Taiwanese and Americans used various expressions in refusals. Taiwanese employed fewer strategies of refusals when they made excuses. The study suggested that American and Taiwanese cultures were interested in politeness, but the chances of achieving politeness reflected the differences between Western and Eastern countries.

Nelson et al. (2002) examined the similarities and differences between American English and Egyptian Arabic strategies of refusals in which they employed a modified version of the DCT made by Beebe et al. (1990). The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) included three invitations, three offers, three suggestions, and three requests. The study found that both American and Egyptian groups employed similar strategies of refusals. It uncovered that Egyptian respondents could not refuse the invitations of someone who is from a higher status, such as their boss.

Another attempt by Geyang (2007) investigated the refusal strategies of suggestions in the academic setting concerning power variations by Chinese and Japanese students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The study revealed that Chinese and Japanese students were in favor of using refusal utterances accompanied by justifications. The study found that social variables such as power have the most impact on Japanese students. This finding agrees with the previous study of Nelson et al. (2002), in which they both claimed that higher social status and power played a significant role in the participants' refusals in oriental societies.

In the Iranian context, Abarghoui (2012) studied the differences between Iranian and Australian students regarding refusal strategies. The study included twenty male students and twenty female students from Iran who learn English as a foreign language (EFL) and the same number and gender of Australian students from different specializations. The researcher based his study on the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) to collect data from the participants. The study results clarified that Iranian EFL students used specified refusal strategies when they rejected others' requests. However, the Australian strategies of refusals were largely different from the Iranian students.

In general, the cross-cultural studies examined the speech act of refusals and indicated that although there are differences between various cultures, there could be some similarities in refusal strategies, such as indirectness to save the image of others. Furthermore, the status of the interactants plays an important role, as seen in the cross-cultural studies of refusing someone's offer, invitation, and suggestion. Such forms of refusals, whether they are direct or indirect, can be seen in high-context cultures.

Ostensibly, the related studies of two cultures, specifically those studies whose participants are students of a foreign language, reveal that they use limited strategies of refusals due to their lack of knowledge of the second language and that advanced learners level of a second language can provide various strategies of refusals. Therefore, the current study investigates the indirect refusal strategies in Arabic of Saudi students to better understand such a speech act within the same language of the participants rather than their studied language as an attempt to grasp hidden uses of refusals about socio-pragmatics.

### **The Study**

This study aims to investigate the use of direct and indirect strategies by Saudi undergraduate students at the University of Hail. It also seeks to provide further interpretations of the hidden utterances of indirect refusals. It is based on Hall's (1977) categorization of high-context culture and low-context culture, which was included in many studies such as Alhaidari (2009).

The literature review indicates that some researchers have studied strategies of refusals used by Arab speakers of English, namely Jordanians and Egyptians. However, few studies have investigated the employment of refusal strategies by Saudi students of English as a Foreign Language. What makes this study different is its nature. It is based on the Saudi participants' refusal strategies in Arabic rather than English or any second language. This study aims to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What refusal strategies do the Saudi students use to say 'No' to the requester?
2. What makes the Saudi students use direct or indirect strategies of refusals?

### **Mhodology:-**

#### **Participants**

The participants of this study are twenty-two male native speakers of Saudi Arabic (SA) at The University of Hail (henceforth, UOH), Saudi Arabia. The ages of the participants range from 23-26 years old. The selection of students was based on the non-random sample technique. The present study applied the convenience sampling method in choosing the students. Etikan & Babetope (2019, p.52) state that "This is a sampling selection based on the accessibility of respondents within reach [...] subjects or units are merely selected because they can easily be found around and the researcher has regular access to them." The study participants are from the central region of Saudi Arabia, from the English Department at the UOH.

#### **Instrument and Procedure**

In the present study, twelve modified situations, within the Saudi context, of the discourse completion test (DCT) adopted from Beebe et al. (1990), Al-Issa (1998), and Chen (1996) are used to elicit Arabic refusal strategies employed by the participants. For information, the participants were asked to write their responses in Arabic to the given situations to elicit as many refusal responses and encourage them to write their natural responses to such contexts. The participants used Saudi Arabic, the accent that they preferred in this study. The situations were classified into two requests, three invitations, four offers, and three suggestions. Moreover, the discourse completion test used in this study included two variables: social status and power to the interlocutor (lower, equal, and higher). These two variables were helpful to this study because they influenced the participants' responses when they used the refusal strategies.

The discourse content test was distributed to the participants and included three pages. The participants were given one hour to write their answers. The researcher read the test's instructions aloud and explained some of the situations in Arabic because some of the participants had a problem understanding English. They also were asked to read the situations carefully, ask for help if they needed help, and write in the spaces provided for them their responses in Arabic.

**Table 1:-** The design of the DCT.

No.	Social status in relation to the interlocutor)	Speech Act	Situation
-----	--	------------	-----------

1.	Higher	request	Asking for promotion
2.	Equal	request	Borrowing lecture notes
3.	Lower	request	Working overtime
4.	Higher	invitation	Lunch
5.	Equal	invitation	Dinner
6.	Lower	invitation	Dinner
7.	Higher	offer	Compensating for a brokenchandelier
8.	Equal	offer	Suiting extra dessert after meal
9.	Lower	offer	Meritorious increment with move
10.	Higher	suggestion	Modifying the teaching techniques
11.	Equal	suggestion	Trying a new diet
12.	Lower	suggestion	Organize your work

### Data Analysis

The elicited data of the refusal strategies were analyzed by the semantic formula employed by Beebe et al. (1990). Cohen (1996, p. 19) refers to the “semantic formulas in that an act such as apology may be composed of several phases (e.g., acknowledging responsibility, promising non-recurrence, etc.).” Consider this example,

A: I’m so sorry (regret).

My handwriting is not clear. I’m afraid you won’t be able to read it. (explanation)

Why don’t you ask Ahmad? (Suggestion)

The refusal strategies adopted in this study were originally classified into two major categories, direct and indirect.

**Table 2:-** Direct/Indirect refusal strategies, percentage for each strategy, and ranks of the semantic formulas

#	Refusal strategy	Direct strategy	Percentage	Indirect Strategy	Percentage
1.	Excuses or explanations	8	36.36%	14	63.63%
2.	Expressing regrets	11	50%	0	0%
3.	Alternatives	0	0%	4	18.18%
4.	Fake agreement or promise	1	4.54%	0	0%
5.	Expressing the gratitude	0	0%	2	9.09%
6.	Comforts come before refusals	0	0%	2	9.09%
7.	Conditional acceptance	0	0%	2	9.09%
8.	Insult/Attack/Threat	0	0%	0	0%
9.	Dissuading interlocutors	0	0%	1	4.54%
10.	Letting off the hook	0	0%	11	50%
11.	Wish	0	0%	2	9.09%
12.	Postponement	1	4.54%	9	40.90%
13.	Reprimand	0	0%	0	0%
14.	Switching topics	0	0%	0	0%
15.	Swearing to God	0	0%	1	4.54%
16.	Criticize the requester	0	0%	0	0%

Table 2 shows that the study respondents at the UOH use various direct and indirect refusal strategies. It presents that strategies such as switching topics, reprimanding, criticizing, insulting, attacking, and threatening the requester are not used by Saudi students. This means that the Saudi students at the UOH do not use refusal strategies to attack the self-image of the requester. The table demonstrates that more than 36% of the respondents present their excuses and explanations directly. However, over 63% of the study respondents indirectly say their excuses and explanations. Also, Table 2 illustrates that half of the study respondents express their regrets directly when they refuse the request of someone. Another issue Table 2 presents is that 50% of the study respondents use ‘letting off the hook’ indirectly, which is equal to expressing regrets. This means there is variation in students’ responses regarding the refusal strategies in the Saudi community of practice. Besides, Table 2 shows that more than 40% of

the study respondents use the indirect strategy to make postponement. By and large, Table 2 demonstrates that the study respondents prefer to use indirect strategies to refuse the proposal of the requester.

Hence, research question number one was formulated to find the refusal strategies the Saudi students use to say 'No' to the requester. In terms of the refusal strategies consistent with the works of Al-Issa (1998), Al-Shalawi (1997), and Al-Shboul et al. (2012), the study respondents agreed on their indirect strategy; hence, they preferred indirect strategies (e.g., letting off the hook, explanation/excuse, and postponement) followed by direct strategies (e.g., expressing regret). For example, the excuse/explanation strategy was the most common indirect strategy used by them with over 63%. The result concurs with the studies on Jordanian Arabic refusals by AL-Issa (1998) and Al-Shboul & Huwari (2016). Al-Shboul et al. (2012) unfold that both Jordanians, Americans, and Malays used explanation/excuse more than any other strategies.

This study has tackled another issue regarding the reasons that inspire the Saudi students at the UOH to use refusal strategies. Table 3 presents students' reasons.

**Table 3:-** Reasons for using refusal strategies.

#	Reason	No. students	Percentage
1.	Respect	12	54.54%
2.	Face- saving	14	63.63%
3.	Indirect communication	16	72.72%

As it is clear in Table 3, there are three reasons for the study respondents at the UOH to use the strategies of refusals. The second research question was formulated to investigate the reasons that encourage the Saudi students at the UOH to use direct or indirect refusal strategies. The study shows that there are several reasons for the students to use the refusal strategies. These reasons are as follows:

1. Respect
2. Face-saving
3. Indirect communication

Table 3 shows that more than 72% of the study respondents claim they use the refusal strategies as an indirect communication style. The study respondents argue that students at the UOH favor the indirect communication style and prefer to hint at needs or desires rather than direct pronouncements. In addition, the respondents point out that refusal is a way to avoid bluntness or potential offense. Table 3 illustrates that UOH students claim they utilize refusal strategies to maintain the requester's self-image. The table also indicates that 66% of the study respondents used the refusal study for the sake of face-saving of the requester. The respondents added that they use refusal strategies to protect their self-image from being attacked, embarrassed, or losing dignity. For them, using the refusal is a good way to maintain face. The last reason for using the refusal strategies is respect. Table 3 shows that more than half of the study respondents claim that they use refusal strategies to show respect to the requester. The respondents indicated that their Saudi culture is based on respect, prioritizing group harmony, and respecting elders. Therefore, refusal could be seen as disrespectful or disruptive to the requester.

## Results:-

The study reveals that Saudi students use a variety of refusal strategies, which can be divided into the following categories:

### Indirect refusal:

This is the most common method among Saudi students. It is used when an individual finds it difficult to refuse a request directly, as he expresses his refusal in an indirect way, such as providing an excuse or justification. Examples of this strategy include saying: أنا أسف مشغول ما أقدر أساعدك /ana ?sef mashghu:l ma a'gdar asadak/"I'm sorry, but I have something else to do," or أعتقد ان ما يناسبني /?3taqid anu ma jinasebni/"I think this isn't suitable for me," or ما أعتقد أنني أقدر أساعد /ma ?3taqid ani ?gdar ?sa3dak/"I'm not sure I can do this."

**Direct and explicit refusal:**

This method is used by Saudi students, in which the individual expresses his refusal clearly and directly. Examples, which are transcribed using the Arabic IPA, of this strategy include saying: "لا أريد ذلك" /la ʔurid:u θalik/I don't want to", "أنا مشغول" / ana mafʔu:l/"I'm busy," or "أنا لست مهتما" / ʔna lastu muhtaman/"I'm not interested."

**Passive refusal:**

This method is used when an individual ignores a request or obstructs its implementation without expressing his refusal directly. Examples of this approach include saying: "بفكر" / bafaker/ "Okay, I'll think about it," or "بحاول" /bahawal/ "I'll try," or "بسال" /basʔal/ "I'll ask someone else."

**Angry refusal:**

This strategy is used when an individual feels angry or frustrated with a request and expresses his rejection aggressively or insultingly. Examples of this strategy include saying: "لا ما أساوي كذا أبد" /la ma ʔsawi keda ʔbad/ "No, I would never do that," "انتمجنون" /ʔnta maʔnu:n/ "You're crazy," or "أنت تطلب شي كثير" / ʔnta tutʔlub faj kθi:r/ "I think you're asking too much."

**Conclusions and Limitations of the Study:-**

In brief, the current study has increased our understanding of how the strategy of refusal is performed in Saudi Arabic. This study also has revealed that speech acts of refusal reflect Saudi cultural norms and values and that Saudi culture generally favors indirect communication, emphasizing politeness and maintaining social harmony. This translates to refusals often being conveyed through subtle cues, excuses, or apologies, rather than direct pronouncements.

As this study has generally answered the raised research questions, more research on the refusal strategies by Saudi respondents needs to be discussed in various regions of Saudi Arabia. The generalization of findings could be limited by the following considerations.

The respondents for this study were selected from one region in Saudi Arabia (i.e., the central region, Hail). Besides, the sample size only includes a small number of male participants whose ages ranged from 23-26 years old. Population with different locations in Saudi Arabia, genders, ages, and educational backgrounds will give different results. Moreover, using one research tool to collect data is not enough to provide a panoramic view of the refusal strategies. In this regard, Rose and Ono (1995, p. 207) point out that "we should not expect a single data source to provide all the necessary insights into speech act usage".

Researchers should utilize this study across diverse Saudi Arabian regions for a comprehensive understanding of Saudi refusal strategies, avoiding regional or student-specific limitations. Also, future studies should use observation and other data collection tools because they will help the researchers to have a clear view of the investigation of the refusal strategies in Saudi society.

**References:-**

1. Abarghoui, M. A. (2012). A comparative study of refusal strategies used by Iranians and Australians. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2439.
2. Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Al-Aghbari, K. (2016). Refusal strategies among Omani EFL students. *Sage Open*, 6(4), 2158244016672907.
3. Al-Shboul, Y., & Huwari, I. F. (2016). A comparative study of Jordanian Arabic and American English refusal strategies. *British journal of English linguistics*, 4(3), 50-62.
4. Al-Shboul, Y., Maros, M., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2012). An intercultural study of refusal strategies in English between Jordanian EFL and Malay ESL postgraduate students. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 18(3).
5. Beebe, L., M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcelle, E. Anderson, & S. C. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*, (pp. 55-73). Newbury House, New York.
6. Chen, H. (1996). Cross-cultural comparison of English and Chinese metapragmatics in refusal. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indiana University, USA.
7. Cohen, A. D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 253-267.

8. Eslami, Z. R. (2010). How to develop appropriate refusal strategies. AM n. Flor & EU Juan (Eds.), *Speech Act Performance: Theoretical, Empirical and Methodological Issues*. Amsterdam.
9. Etikan, I., & Babetope, O. (2019). A basic approach in sampling methodology and sample size calculation. *Med Life Clin*, 1(2), 1006.
10. Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2003). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in American English and Latin American Spanish.
11. Geyang, Z. (2007). A pilot study on refusal to suggestions in English by Japanese and Chinese EFL learners. *Bulletin of the Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University*. Part. II, Arts and science education, 56, 155-163.
12. Guo, Y. (2012). Chinese and American Refusal Strategy: A Cross-cultural Approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2, 2, 247-256.
13. Hall, E. (1977). *Beyond Culture*: New York: Bentam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.
14. 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.
15. Hastuti, M. (2014). A study of refusal strategy used by English teachers in Madiun Regency in declining an invitation, an offer and a suggestion. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 15(2), 168-180.
16. Kwon, Jihyun. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua-journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. 23. 339-364. 10.1515/mult.2004.23.4.339.
17. Liao, C. C., & Bresnahan, M. I. (1996). A contrastive pragmatic study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. *Language sciences*, 18(3-4), 703-727.
18. Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Batal, M. A., & Bakary, W. E. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied linguistics*, 23(2), 163-189.
19. Rose, K. R., & Ono, R. (1995). Eliciting speech act data in Japanese: The effect of questionnaire type. *Language learning*, 45(2), 191-223.
20. Tuncer, H. (2016). Refusal Strategies Used by Turkish University Instructors of English. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 10(1), 71-90.