

IRANAN EFL LEARNERS GENDER DIFFERENCES AND THEIR ABILITY IN REFUSAL RECOGNITION

***Marhamt Hayati¹, Saeid Yazdani¹ and Mojgan Yarahmadi²**

¹*Department of English, Saveh Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran*

²*Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran*

**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not there exists any difference between the recognition of male and female English learners regarding their refusal knowledge and language proficiency. The participants of this study were 64 Iranian students including 34 males and 30 females from Saveh (A city in Iran) institutes. The participants were placed in the intermediate levels based on the results of the proficiency (Nelson) test. The corpus comprises of responses to Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) those were analyzed and categorized according to the refusal taxonomy according to Beebe *et al.*, (1990), to determine the strategies used and the frequencies of their use. Then the DCT's provided data were analyzed to show the average frequencies of direct and indirect strategy use, the types of employed strategies, and the effects of participants' gender on the responses. The data for this study was collected through a multiple choice discourse completion test in which the subjects were asked to choose the best option in the given scenarios. There were 20 situations in the DCT, with three options. The result showed that the participants used more indirect strategies in comparison with the direct ones. There was also found significant difference between males and females in refusal strategies.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Interlanguage Pragmatics, Speech Act, Refusal*

INTRODUCTION

Learning a foreign language is a necessary element in the educational levels; Kasper explained "Learning English language has become necessary all over the world" (2000). Inter language pragmatics is the study of and the use of different speech acts in the target language by second language learners (Nguyen, 2005). Linguists developed as a theory in pragmatics called speech act theory. And this theory is the most important part of pragmatics. Under speech act theory, speakers accomplish illocutionary acts by utterances. An illocutionary act is a language use carries out by a statement. Speech act has been one of the main facets of pragmatics since long ago. Speech acts can be concept of as roles of language, such as complaining, thanking, apologizing, refusing, requesting, and inviting. The definition of pragmatics according to Liu (2007), Charles Morris introduced the first modern definition of pragmatics. The term pragmatics itself was invented by Charles Morris, (1938) as a compliment the philosophy of C.S. Peirce, i.e. pragmatism. Many studies in late have stressed the important role pragmatics performances in second/foreign language learning. According to Tanck (2003), speakers employ a variety of speech acts, to achieve their communicative goals. According to Gass and Selinker (2001), there are factors in the connection between the speakers, the socials and the condition of cultural contexts.

Language learners also need to learn the social and pragmatic conventions of the target-language. And focus exclusively on the features of the target-language linguistic systems. Speakers use a variety of communicative acts, or speech acts, to achieve their communicative aims, including: Searle's original broad categories – classification, commissives, declarations, directives, expressive, and representatives, as well as more specific acts such as apologies, requests, complaints, and refusals. In addition, a major objective of cross-cultural speech acts, the researcher who to describe similarities and differences in the way communicative. Interactions are performed by similar circumstances across different languages and cultures. In Speech act researches can also have significant roles in identifying the social and cultural norms and beliefs that inform speech acts realization in a given speech community. The thought of the speech act was first presented by (Austin, 1962). And he declared an important feature of language;

Research Article

saying something can also involve doing something. For example, by saying “I am sorry”, a speaker is not only uttering a phrase in English but is also performing an act, that of expressing regret.

As discussed, the studies of speech acts appear to be crucial to the understanding of international communication styles and differences. Learners of whole languages are shown to have difficulty understanding the intended meaning communicated by a speech act, or producing a speech act by using appropriate language. In fact, Bardovi-Harlig (2001) provided evidence that learners differ significantly from native speakers in their perception and production of speech acts. A refusal is a negative response to an offer, request, invitation and suggestion. Refusals are prominent because of their communicatively location in the places of in everyday communications. It is often difficult to reject requests. Rejecting requests properly include not only linguistic knowledge, but also pragmatic knowledge. This strategy was not included in the classification scheme that proposed by (Beebe, *et al.*, 1990) and that is because their classification scheme was based on data elicited through a DCT. It is also important to point out that Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990) explained that interlocutors use this strategy in a refusal sequence as an avoidance strategy that is as a way of delaying the refusal in the interaction in order to have enough time to plan for the refusal.

Direct Refusals

Direct refusals refer to strategies speakers use to make soft the illocutionary force of their refusals in order to minimize the offense to the interlocutor's positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). In fact, these direct strategies have been found to be used more frequently than the indirect (El Bakary, 2002) these strategies are explained in detail below and examples from are provided.

A. *Per formative* (e.g., “I refuse”)

B. *Non per formative statement*:

1. “No”

2. *Negative willingness/ability* (“I can't.” “I won't.” “I don't think so.”)

Indirect Refusals

From the data, three major types of indirect refusals are identified, including: excuses/reason, request for information or clarification, and suggesting alternatives. According to Sadler &Eröz, In relation to the direct ones, indirect refusals are comparatively common. (2001, p.22) Due to space constraints, she will discuss only the three major types.

A. *Statement of regret* (e.g., “I'm sorry . . .” “I feel terrible . . .”)

B. *Wish* (e.g., “I wish I could help you . . .”)

C. *Excuse, reason, explanation* (e.g., “My children will be home that night.” “I have a headache.”)

D. *Statement of alternative*

1) I can do X instead of Y (e.g., “I'd rather . . .” “I'd prefer . . .”)

2) Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., “Why don't you ask someone else?”)

E. *Set condition for future or past acceptance* (e.g., “If you had asked me earlier, I would have).

F. *Promise of future acceptance* (e.g., “I'll do it next time.” “I promise I'll . . .” or “Next time I'll; using the “will” of promise or “promise”)

G. *Statement of principle* (e.g., “I never do business with friends.”)

H. *Statement of philosophy* (e.g., “One can't be too careful.”)

I. *Attempt to dissuading interlocutor*

1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester (e.g., “I won't be any fun tonight” to refuse an invitation)

2. Guilt trip (e.g., waitress to customers who want to sit a while: “I can't make a living off people who just order coffee.”)

3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack (e.g., “Who do you think you are?” “That's a terrible idea!”)

4. Request for help, empathy or assistance by dropping or holding the request.

5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., “Don't worry about it.” “That's okay.” “You don't have to.”)

6. Self-defense (e.g., “I'm trying my best.” “I'm doing all I can do.” “I didn't do anything wrong.”).

Research Article

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methodology

Subjects

The participants of the present study comprised of two groups of 64 Intermediate learners, male and female, (30 female and 34 male). All participants were native Persian speakers. They were Intermediate EFL learners, each between 16 to 19 years of age, learning English in institutes in Saveh. They were selected through a proficiency test that is a standard test, Nelson language proficiency test (Fowler & Coe, 1976). The researcher decided to choose those participants whose score range fell one standard deviation above and below the mean (i.e. $\text{mean} \pm 1$). All of the ninety eight students randomly met this homogeneous criterion and then the researcher selected sixty four homogenous participants for this study. They were divided in two groups (male and female), with mean 26/26 for male and mean 27/63 for female and also with standard deviations 5/66 and 6/66 as noted earlier. Also, the subjects were intermediate levels with enough knowledge to understand each test. As observed earlier: the two groups consisted of Iranian native speakers who did not have the experience of living among native English speakers. They were high school students attending foreign language classrooms. The participants had been learning English for about 7 years. In order to accomplish this study, Completion Test (DCT) presented (Beebe, et al., 1990). The DCT comprise of twenty situations designed to extract from refusals for requests, invitations, and offers; each of these three categories contains three situations aiming at finding out the differences between the participants in refusal recognition. Before administering the DCT questionnaires to the participants, the researcher managed a pilot study with 20 students to examine if any confusion might occur concerning the situation. Then, DCT's were given to the pilot group.

Instrument

A) Proficiency Test: For the present study, a Nelson language proficiency test from (Fowler & Coe, 1976) was used for two purposes: first, to evaluate the overall language ability of participants, and second, to choose participants. The test included 50 multiple choice items comprising grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension, and learners were presumed to choose correct answer among the alternatives. The time needed for the completion of the test was 45 minutes. And the scores were given by the researcher.

B) Discourse Compliment Tests: Another instrument is a multiple choice Discourse Completion Test (DCT). DCTs have their own advantages in interlanguage pragmatic research; Discourse completion Test is developed by (Beebe, et al., 1990). Some of these tests cited of the thesis pragmatic development in the acquisition of indirectness in a second language .by Murat Barak. And another some questioner cited of cross-cultural pragmatics questionnaire University of Grana by Dr. Ángeles Linde.

Procedure

To achieve the objectives of this study the following procedures were considered by the researcher: first, administration of the proficiency test (assess background knowledge of language learning) Second, Administration of the refusal tests and finally, analysis of collected data. In the process of carrying out the study, the researcher proceeds with the following procedures to achieve the objectives of the current study. All the procedures are explained in detail below.

In order to collect information first of all, the researcher should take permission of the institutes' boss. The questionnaire was carried out during the students' usual class hour and their teachers were formerly informed that the subjects were going to have a test. Before the participants started to answer the positions in the questionnaire, they were given a brief instruction. The respondents were told that they were going to read twenty situations and then to circle the option that they believed they would use in that context. It was also added that they had twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire. The respondents were given the DCT and were supported to respond quickly. They were inquired not to carefully analyze what they thought their response should be. Responses were returned to the researcher directly. And they were corrected by the researcher. All subjects responded immediately, taking about 20 minutes in the researchers' attendance. The responses were reviewed to determine which were present or absent as compared with two groups of genders. The collected data were examined for components of each speech act present in the responses. In order to have a sound analysis of the data, the produced refusals were

Research Article

analyzed into strategies. Utilizing the subjects' responses to the DCTs, the speech act sets were formulated for each item. The same classification of semantic formulas as employed by (Beebe et al., 1990). The data for this study was gathered through one or more multiple choice Discourse Completion Test (DCT). In this kind of DCT, participants were going to read the written situation and then pick out what they think would be the best to say next in the situation from a list of options. For each scenario, the respondents were considered to choose the item which they believed they would say in the context given. Three options were given for each situation and only one of them was indirect. Discourse Completion Test (DCT) consisting of 20 items was piloted to a group of students with a proficiency level comparable to that of the main group.

The participants were chosen two groups; male groups consisted of 34 participants and female groups 30. These subjects were randomly selected out of 98 participants. The participants took two exams (Nelson language proficiency test and refusal tests) simultaneously during the class time in institutes in Saveh, at 10 in the morning. First of the participants took proficiency test at 45 minutes and after gathering those test papers at the same time they took refusal tests. Two tests were taken in three days in three institutes with intermediate level students. This research includes two variables: student's gender variable and refusal recognition variable.

RESULT AND DISSCUSSION

The Results of the DCT

This multiple choice questionnaire test consisted of twenty different scenarios; six of them were indirect patterns for request situations (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 9). Correspondingly, in the other remaining eleven situations participants dealt with nine offers (4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 17, 12, 20, and 18) and five invitation (10, 13, 14, 16 and 19) situations. The students were expected to give non-conventional indirect answers to all situations.

Tables 1 and 2 below show the descriptive statistics of the scores earned by the two groups on the request of refusal test.

Group Statistics		Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Request	Boy	34	6.8529	1.04830	.17978	
	Girl	30	4.9000	2.04011	.37247	

Refusal of request

Defendants were asked to refuse requests each from two groups.

Situation 1: A manager tells an employee to spend an extra hour or two at work.

Situation 2: A cup president asks the defendant to borrow the pen.

Situation 3: A house-mate asks the defendant extra chores.

Situation 6: A lead teacher tells the defendant to call all of the other teachers.

Situation 7: A co-worker asks the defendant to give a massage.

Situation 9: A customer asks the defendant to give quarters.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
request	Equal variances assumed	17.219	.000	4.900	62	.000	1.95294	.39856	1.15623	2.74965
	Equal variances not assumed			4.722	42.079	.000	1.95294	.41359	1.11833	2.78755

Research Article

The above tables show the mean scores for the two groups males and females (6, 85% and 4, 90%). Therefore, it can deduce that the learners in the two groups differ from one another in terms of their knowledge of the reject the refusal. Table 4.23 shows that there is a significant difference in the scores obtained from the request of refusal because probability value is significantly smaller than the specified critical value ($.000 < 0.05$). In this part the boy rejected the requests more than the girls.

Tables 3 and 4 include the descriptive statistics on the offer of refusal

Group Statistics					
	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
offer	boy	34	3.6176	1.32607	.22742
	girl	30	3.4000	1.61031	.29400

Refusal of offer

Respondents were asked to refuse offers each of two groups.

Situation 4: A manager offers the defendant to reschedule because of a family funeral.

Situation 5: A repair shop offers the defendant to finish two week.

Situation8: A salesclerk offers a new product.

Situation11: A friend offers a cup of tea.

Situation12: A friend suggests a movie full of unnecessary violence.

Situation15: A friend offers the defendant to pay for broken the joystick.

Situation17: A friend offers a free trip.

Situation18: A friend offers a lift in his car.

Situation20: A friend offers another beer.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
offer	Equal variances assumed	1.626	.207	.593	62	.556	.21765	.36719	-.51636	.95165
	Equal variances not assumed			.586	56.356	.561	.21765	.37169	-.52684	.96214

The researcher wants to investigate whether or not the observed difference is between two groups on offer refusal. The comparison of the obtained mean scores of the participants (B, 3.61% and G, 3.4%) and also the probability value is significantly bigger than the specified critical value ($0.556 > 0.05$) there is no different between two groups on offer refusal.

Tables 5 and 6 include the descriptive statistics on the invite of refusal.

Group Statistics					
	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
invite	boy	34	3.4706	1.16086	.19909
	girl	30	2.4000	1.06997	.19535

Research Article

Refusal of invite

Situation10: A friend invites the defendant to the wedding ceremony.

Situation13: A friend invites the defendant a summer house and a swimming pool.

Situation14: A friend invites the defendant for dinner.

Situation16: A friend invites the defendant for a party.

Situation19: A friend invites the defendant to a concert.

The review of the mean scores given in Table 5, one can clearly see that the boys mean gained is higher than the girls mean (3.47 and 2.4). But, the researcher has to go further to realized whether or not the observed difference is significant. Therefore, the result of the t-test is 3.819 in the table. The probability value (%000) is less than the critical value (%05). In sum, there's a significant difference in their recognition refusal.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
invite	Equal variances assumed	.710	.403	3.819	62	.000	1.07059	.28036	.51015	1.63103
	Equal variances not assumed			3.838	61.871	.000	1.07059	.27892	.51301	1.62816

Mann-Whitney Test

The classification categories used in this thesis was discussed by the researcher and the total number of refusal recognized by the participants in each of the two groups and in each of the twenty refusal situations presented. Now the researcher wants to explain about the subcategory of details between two groups. The researcher preferred to use Mann-Whitney Test because of this test is a nonparametric test which is used to analyze the difference between the medians of two data sets, most frequently used to assess whether two independent groups are significantly different from each other.

Self-Defense: it is used to remember the interlocutor that the speaker is doing his or her best and the refusal should not decrease from that. As Von Canon (2006) also described this strategy is used by the speaker to suggest the injustice of the request.

Tables 7 and 8 include the descriptive statistics on the self-confidence of request refusal

Ranks				
	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Self confidence	Boy	34	35.65	1212.00
	Girl	30	28.93	868.00
	Total	64		
Test Statistics(a)				
Mann-Whitney U				Promise 403.000

Research Article

Wilcoxon W	868.000
Z	-1.683
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.092
a Grouping Variable: group	

Situation1; You know I have a conflict with a personal commitment I have tonight. What possibility would there be that I come in tomorrow or put in extra time on Monday?

Participant: 23 males and 14 females with 35.9% and 21, 9%.

In situation 1, for example, the participants used the strategy in this refusal to a request made by 37 persons of intermediate level. Statement of self-confidence (e.g., you know I have a conflict with...) Table 1 presents the details descriptions of the refusal strategy. According to mean rank (35.65, 28.93) between two groups in chart 4.28 and also the probability value (%092) on chart 4.29 is bigger than the critical value (%05). There is a no significant difference between genders. However, the answer is mostly preferred by the boys.

Tables 9 and 10 include the descriptive statistics on the excuse of request refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
excuse	boy	34	37.00	1258.00
	girl	30	27.40	822.00
	Total	64		

Test Statistics(a)

	Excuse
Mann-Whitney U	357.000
Wilcoxon W	822.000
Z	-2.238
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.025
a Grouping Variable: group	

Situation10; I will be out of the city that Sunday.

Participant: 24 males with 37.5 correct answers and 15 females with 23.4 correct answers.

Situation19; I will have to go to meet my guests from Istanbul that night.

Participant: 26 males with 37.5 correct answers and 17 females with 26.6 correct responds.

According to table 9 mean ranks two groups (B, 37 and G, 27) and the probability value (0/25) in chart 4.31 is less than the critical value (%05). Thus there is a significant difference between genders.

Tables 11 and 12 include the descriptive statistics on the regret of request and offer refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
regret	boy	34	40.62	1381.00
	girl	30	23.30	699.00
	Total	64		

Test Statistics(a)

	Regret
Mann-Whitney U	234.000
Wilcoxon W	699.000
Z	-3.794
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
a Grouping Variable: group	

Research Article

Situation2; Oh, sorry, it's my only one. Maybe John has an extra, let me check.

Participant: 28 males and 19 females with (43.8 % and 29.7%) correct responses.

Situation3; Oh, I'm sorry. I'm really busy at work this week. Maybe you could ask someone else.

Participant: 31males and 20females with (48.4%and 31.3%) correct answers.

Situation4; I'm sorry but I can't reschedule the interview because I have an extremely tight schedule.

Participant: 29males and 17 females with (45.3%and 26.6%) correct responds.

Situation5; I'm sorry but this can't be completed in just a day. It'll probably take a week or more. Why not give them a card describing the present tomorrow at the party and then give it to them after it's repaired?

Participant: 27 males and 16 females with (42, 2%and 25%) correct answers.

Situation6; I'm sorry, but I have friends coming over to my house tonight, so I won't have time. Maybe you could ask one of the other teachers.

Participant: 26 males and 17 females with (40% and 26%) correct answers.

Situation7; Sorry, but I can't. I won't be seeing her because the meeting was cancelled today.

Participant: 23males and 17 females with (35.9%, 26.6) correct respond.

Situation8; I'm sorry, but I've got a lunch date.

Participant: 24males and 15 females with (37.5% and 23.4%) correct answers.

Situation9; I'm sorry, I don't have enough quarters. I could give you two singles and four quarters.

Participant: 22 males and 12 females with (34.4 %and 18.8%) correct answers.

The total number of refusal strategies above used by the two gender groups that are used by male and female EFLs (210,133). The percentages indicated in all tables are those related to each group. The mean rank of two groups on above tables 40.62 %and 23.30% and $p=000$, these numbers and percentages indicate there is different between two groups. The male groups chose regret indirect strategies more than the female groups.

Tables 13 and 14 include the descriptive statistics on the agreement of offer refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
agreement	Boy	34	30.90	1050.50
	Girl	30	34.32	1029.50
	Total	64		
Test Statistics(a)				
				Agreement
Mann-Whitney U				455.500
Wilcoxon W				1050.500
Z				-.780
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)				.435
a Grouping Variable: group				

Situation11;I like coffee but I feel a bit unwell at the moment, thanks.

Participant: 16 males and 17 females with (%25, 26.6%) correct respond.

Situation17; I'd love to but I have a project to finish this weekend.

Participant: 15 males and 15 females with (%23, %23) the same correct answers.

The situation 17 shows a similarity between participants even the percentages of indirect strategies are relatively different. The strategy agreement use by males and females with (31, 32). This section looks at the difference between the two groups with regard to mean rank and other side $p=0.453$ is bigger than the critical value (0.05) the difference doesn't seem between the genders.

Research Article

Tables 15 and 16 include the descriptive statistics on the gratitude of offer and invite refusal

Ranks				
	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
gratitude	Boy	34	38.99	1325.50
	girl	30	25.15	754.50
	Total	64		

Test Statistics(a)		Gratitude
Mann-Whitney U		289.500
Wilcoxon W		754.500
Z		-3.071
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
a Grouping Variable: group		

Situation13; Thanks, but I have hurt my foot

Participant: 23 males and 13 females with 35.9%, 20 correct answers.

Situation14; Thanks, but I have an appointment that night.

Participant: 24 males and 15 females with 37.5%, 23.5% correct respond.

Situation16; Thank you, but I have three important exams on Monday.

Participant: 21 males and 12 females with 32.8%, 18.8% correct answer.

Situation18; Thanks, but I have to wait for one of my friends here.

Participant: 22 males and 14 females with 34.4%, 27.9% correct responds.

90 males and 54 females EFLs use gratitude indirect refusals strategy. Table 4.38 and 4.40 indicates that the boys refused high ranking's gratitude more than the girls. Because of obvious data like mean, number and the probability value (.02) there is difference between two genders.

Tables 17 and 18 include the descriptive statistics on the criticize of offer refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Criticize	boy	34	35.03	1191.00
	girl	30	29.63	889.00
	Total	64		

Test Statistics(a)		Criticize
Mann-Whitney U		424.000
Wilcoxon W		889.000
Z		-1.406
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.160
a Grouping Variable: group		

Situation12; I don't think we will enjoy it.

Participant: 25 males and 17 females with 39.1%, 26.6% correct answers.

Table 19 and 20 demonstrate that in criticizing the friend's *insists on seeing a movie full of unnecessary violence and you don't like such films*, the strategy of criticizing used by 42 participants. This strategy was used more frequently by the males (39.1%) and females (26.6%) in sum, the boys criticized offer more than the girls. According to the above table $p = .160 > .05$ the difference is not between two groups.

Research Article

Tables 19 and 20 include the descriptive statistics on the let inter --- of offer refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
let_inter	boy	34	30.32	1031.00
	girl	30	34.97	1049.00
	Total	64		
Test Statistics(a)				
				let_inter
Mann-Whitney U				436.000
Wilcoxon W				1031.000
Z				-1.210
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)				.226
a Grouping Variable: group				

Situation 15; you don't need to feel sorry; I have got another one.

Participant: 20 males and 22 females with 31.3, 34.4 correct answers.

According to the information's above table 20 the mean for girls is 30.32% and for boys is 34.97% and also probability value .226 bigger than critical value .05. In total, there is a no significant difference between two genders. Although the girls' answers is a little distinct with boys' responds in Let-inter offer strategy.

Tables 21 and 22 include the descriptive statistics on the negative willing of offer refusal

Ranks				
	group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
negativ_will	boy	34	35.03	1191.00
	girl	30	29.63	889.00
	Total	64		
Test Statistics(a)				
				negativ_will
Mann-Whitney U				424.000
Wilcoxon W				889.000
Z				-1.406
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)				.160
a Grouping Variable: group				

Situation 20; No Thanks. I don't feel like another.

Participant: 25 males and 17 females with 39.1%, 26.6 % correct respond.

By the percentage of the above, the participant boys' with 39.1% are more than the participant girls' with 26.6% and the boys' mean rank is slight bigger than the girls' mean rank. Although; there is a no significant difference between two groups because of $p = .160 > .05$.

Tables 23 and 24 include the descriptive statistics t-test on the total refusal

Group Statistics					
	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
tot	boy	34	13.9412	2.07352	.35560
	girl	30	10.7000	3.26053	.59529

The t-test compares the actual difference between two means in relation to the variation in the data.

The t-test can be used to compare a sample mean to an accepted value (a population mean), or it can be used to compare the means of two sample sets.

Research Article

Independent Samples Test		t-test for Equality of Means								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances								
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Interval of the Difference	Confidence of the Difference
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
tot	Equal variances assumed	5.014	.029	4.802	62	.000	3.24118	.67498	1.89192	4.59043
	Equal variances not assumed			4.674	48.017	.000	3.24118	.69341	1.84699	4.63537

The t-test has intent to compare the obtained mean scores of the participants in refusal strategy, between genders to indicate the differences.

Given the information in Table 25 one can clearly see that the mean score obtained on the males 13.94% is higher than the mean score obtained on the females 10.7%. The researcher had to go further to find out whether or not the observed difference is significant. Therefore, the result of the refusal test is taken into account. It can be concluded from the information presented in Table.

Group Statistics					
	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
tot	Boy	34	13.9412	2.07352	.35560
	Girl	30	10.7000	3.26053	.59529

Table 26 shows that there is a significant difference in the scores obtained from the refusal test. As mentioned above, these mean that the groups being compared are significantly different from another one. And also another comparison is made between the two gender groups based on probability value (000) is less than critical value (0.05), the result of this study reveals that there is difference between males and females in refusal strategy use. Therefore, with 95 percent confidence, the null hypothesis which states there is significant difference between the levels of pragmatic competence of Iranian EFL learners who use refusal strategies

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	20	100.0
	Excluded	0	.0
	Total	20	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the equation

Conclusion

The results of this study revealed that the boys understood indirect refusal strategies more than girl. Moreover, both subjects recognized tests notably the number of indirect and direct strategies. This study has exhibited the abilities and recognition of DCTs as data bring out device., this data collection is still used plentifully in discourses unites specially those managed in the field of the speech acts for its plainness and high degree of control over variables in likeness to other data eliciting devices. DCTs are appropriate devices for collection data, but they were expressed to show the complicated qualities of face-threatening acts like refusals. The goal of this study was to investigate whether there is a difference between genders in speech act refusal. Three speech acts were chosen, requests, offers and invitations.

Research Article

The results of the study suggested no accurate sign of refusal between the two groups. In requests, there is not a great sort at the answers of the participants. The expectation was that the girls' students would get the high grade. However, the boy students were the most successful group in selecting indirect options. The least choice of indirect responses in request situations was made by the girl students. The general inclination for request situations was the selection of the self-confidence strategy. The findings of the offer situations showed that the most preferred answers are regret types. However, it is difficult to say that the answers are systematic. Students are inclined to reject offers in an indirect way instead of direct strategies. The frequencies and the percentages of the criticize, agreement, let-inter are very close to each other; however the regret responded more with the boys' answers in the offer situations. As for the invitation situations, the results of the DCT showed that participants preferred gratitude type more than the other options.

REFERENCES

- Austin J (1962).** *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Bardovi-Harlig K & Hartford BS (1990).** Learning to say 'no': Native and--non-native rejections in English. *The Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Urbana-Champaign, IL.*
- Bardovi-Harlig Kathleen (2001).** Empirical evidence of the need for instruction in pragmatics. In *Pragmatics in language teaching* edited by KR Rose and G Kasper (Cambridge University Press, New York) 12-32.
- Beebe L, Takahashi T & Uliss-Weltz R (1990).** Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* edited by R Scarcella, E Andersen & S Krashen (Newbury House, New York) 55-73.
- Brown Penlope & Levinson Stephen (1987).** *Politeness: Some Universals in Language 289 Usage.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Fowler WS & N Coe (1976).** *Nelson English Language Tests* (Bulter and Tannerltad, London).
- Gass S and Selinker L (2001).** *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course.* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc: Mahwah, NJ)
- Kasper G & KR Rose (2002).** *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language* (Blackwell, Mahwah, NJ).
- Liu S (2007).** What is pragmatics? Available: <http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/definition.html>
- Nguyen TTM (1998).** Modifying L2 criticisms: How learners do it? *Journal of Pragmatics* **40** 768-791.
- Sadler R and Eröz B (2002).** I Refuse You! An Examination of English Refusals by Native Speakers of English, Lao, and Turkish. *Arizona Working Papers in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching* **9** 53-80.
- Tanck S (2003).** Speech acts sets of refusals and complaint: A comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *TESL Second Language Acquisition* 1-22.