

A Study on Comparison of Refusal Strategies Used in Korean and English

Kang, Gi-Cheol*

- I. Introduction
- II. Research Method
 - 1. Participants
 - 2. Procedures
- III. Results and Discussion
 - 1. Refusals of Requests
 - 2. Refusals of Invitations
- IV. Conclusion

I. Introduction

When learners are not aware of specific cultural norms of speaking involved in the target language, they may transfer their native language sociocultural rules to the target language, known as pragmatic transfer. In relation to learners' second language speech act performance, it is defined as "transfer of first language (L1) sociocultural communicative

* 숭실대학교 인문대학 교양 영어 시간 강사

competence in performing target language (L2) speech acts” (Takahashi and Beebe, 1987, p. 134). Pragmatic transfer may result in pragmatic failure when learners rely on pragmatic knowledge of their native language that is inappropriate for the target language situation.

However, pragmatic transfer caused by difference between Western and Eastern cultures is to exist. Our language as the principal means whereby we conduct our social lives, when used in contexts of communication especially with foreigners, is bound up with our own culture in some way or another. Ahn (2010) suggested a new point of view about pragmatic errors. She sees them, chiefly caused by pragmatic transfer, as an inevitable phenomena, not to depreciate them as foreign learners of English's simple errors because of their ignorance. Actually, her study shows as a source of its argument that even high-proficient Korean speakers of English can successfully realize their refusals with their own formulas, that is, without exactly copying target-like strategies for refusals.

The difference between Western and Eastern cultures can easily be recognized by comparing Brown and Levinsons' (1978, 1987) politeness concept, and those of Mao (1994) and Yu (2002, 2003). According to Brown and Levinson (1978), in communication and interaction, two aspects of people's feelings are involved with face. One is the desire of the individual “not to be imposed on,” which is the “negative face,” and the other, the “positive face,” is the desire of the individual “to be liked and approved of.” A face-threatening act tends to risk either the speaker's or the hearer's positive or negative face.

Although maintaining face when carrying out such a face-threatening

act is considered a universal phenomenon in interpersonal communication, how face is defined and how face work is done vary greatly across cultures. Taking a pre-dinner activity (invitation) and a post-dinner activity (offering the leftover) in China as two counterexamples of Brown and Levinson's claim that the concepts of negative and positive face are universally valid, Mao (1994) argued that face in the Chinese context has two specific meanings conveyed, respectively by *mianzi* and *lian*. With the similar view to Mao's, Yu (2002) compared the concepts of politeness in American English, Japanese and Korean. She investigated how Koreans conceptualize politeness. Her study showed that Korean concept of *gongsonhada* 'polite' was different from Western concept of polite. Whereas American English polite was closer to *considerate* than to *appropriate* and oriented to volition, Korean concept of *gongsonhada* 'polite' is *appropriate* and *considerate* and oriented to both discernment and volition. In another article of hers (Yu, 2003), she concluded that Korean politeness was primarily expressed by use of *jondaemal* 'deferential language' and secondarily by what Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) called face-saving strategies.

This study focuses on refusal based on the following premise: Refusal is thought to be the speech act suitable for understanding what the difference is like in realization of the concept of politeness between English and Korean, because it is realized as a response to relatively many other speech acts such as request, invitation, offer and suggestion and provides researchers with more examples to compare than any other speech act.

The purpose of this study is as follows: This study can be expected

to provide a comprehensive description of the politeness strategies used by Korean native speakers and English native speakers when refusing toward a person with higher, middle, or lower status. Refusals were collected using a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). Responses were analyzed as consisting of a sequence of semantic formulas based on both the taxonomy of Takahashi and Beebe (1987) and Beebe et al. (1990) and the one additionally obtained from this study. The frequency and the content of the refusal strategies are examined in order to compare difference in Korean and English in carrying out a speech act of refusal.

II. Research Method

1. Participants

1) Native Korean Group

The Korean subjects for native Korean speakers in this study were undergraduate students at Soongsil university in Seoul. University students were selected as Korean subjects because they are expected to have acquired the appropriate sociolinguistic rules that represent “norms” of the society. In addition, practically speaking, university students were the most accessible population to the investigator.

Sixty-two native Korean data were gathered. Of the 62 data, one was incompletely filled in and was not considered. The remaining 61 data were all elicited from the students enrolled in my grammar class

at the first semester of 2010. 33 were from males and 28 females. They were all monolingual speakers of Korean though a few of them have experience of studying in English-speaking countries from 6 months, a minimum to 5 years, a maximum.

2) Native English Group

Three and eight native English data were gathered from two Teachers' Training Centers in Seoul and Incheon, Korea, respectively. They were all from English-speaking countries and English lecturers who teach English to Korean English teachers at secondary schools.

Three native English data were additionally gathered from the foreign faculty teaching everyday English conversation at Soongsil university in Seoul, Korea. They were all from English-speaking countries.

2. Procedures

1) Frequency of Refusal Strategies

Refusal strategies are a word, phrase, or sentence that is used to deliver the meaning of refusal. In coding refusals in terms of refusal strategies, the taxonomy of refusals formulated by Takahashi and Beebe (1987) and Beebe et al. (1990) and the one additionally obtained from this study were used. For example, in the situation in which one's classmate requests to borrow lecture notes, the participant may refuse by saying 'I'm afraid I can't. I already promised to lend them to my friend, so why don't you ask someone else?' This response would be coded as [negative willingness] plus [reason] plus [statement of

alternative]. After the coding was completed, data were analyzed in terms of the frequency of the refusal strategies. Based on Kwon's study (2003), all the frequencies were converted into percentages.

The frequency of each refusal strategy used by each group in each situation was compared. For each group, the total number of a given refusal strategy in each situation was converted into a percentage by:

$$\frac{\text{Total number of a given refusal strategy used in a given situation}}{\text{Total number of subjects in each group}} \times 100$$

When a subject used the same refusal strategy(e.g., providing an apology in the beginning and again at the end of the refusal) more than once in his/her response to each situation, the strategy was tallied only once. By counting the strategy once for each subject, the percentage of each strategy in each situation obtained actually represents the number of subjects who used the strategy. This provides a more accurate pattern of how many subjects selected a given refusal strategy in each situation and how many did not.

2) Content of Refusal Strategies

The content of the refusal strategies used by each group was examined. Specifically, the types of reasons, the degree of directness and the typical examples of refusal strategies were investigated.

III. Results and Discussion

This section shows difference in refusal strategies used by each group in terms of frequency and content in each situation of the DCT.

1. Refusals of Requests

1) Refusing a Higher Status Person's Request (Situation 1)

In refusing a boss' request to work overtime, NKs (Korean native speakers) and NEs (English native speakers) gave different reasons for their refusals. If enumerated in a descending order of frequency, the most frequently used reasons for NKs were 'having a previous engagement', followed by 'being sick', 'having an important appointment', and 'having to do homework', which were seemingly not different from those for NEs. Actually, the most frequently used reason for NEs was 'having a prior plan', followed by 'having something to do at home', and then 'having a plan with family'.

However, except for the aforementioned reasons, NKs gave many other reasons specifically related to family: 'grandma's birthday', 'dinner with family members', 'a promise with parents', etc. This means that NKs' reasons arose not only from personal matters but also from the society around themselves. On the other hand, NEs did not give any specific reasons related to family. Their reasons mainly arose from personal matters, not from the society around themselves.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, NKs and NEs differed in

terms of the degree of directness expressed in their refusals. NKs used more 'negative willingness' ('I can't') without any 'No', whereas NEs used fewer 'negative willingness' with some 'No's. This means that NEs refused a little more directly than NKs.

NKs and NEs also differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs hesitated to do refusal a little more than NEs in that NKs used 'pause fillers' ('Well...' 'Uhr...') occasionally, while NEs did not at all. Besides, NKs 'elaborated on the reason' more frequently and 'criticized the request' less frequently than NEs, sounding softer. Both NKs and NEs rarely used 'gratitude' and 'statement of positive opinion', reflecting that the sudden request for working overtime without notice was a nuisance and felt unpleasant to both of them. NKs used one address form ('사장님' (*sajangnim*), boss) relatively a lot, whereas NEs didn't any, reflecting that Koreans are sensitive to the status of interlocutor. In fact, in English-speaking countries like the U.S.A. and the U.K., in informal or private conversations, address forms are rarely used.

In terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were the same even though there were some differences in order: 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'negative willingness.'

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 1 are as follows:

- NK

“사장님, 저, 죄송합니다만 못할 거 같아요. 제가 아홉시 이전에 가
 봐야 합니다. 다음에 시간이 되면 서점 일을 도울 수 있는데요.”
 (*Sajangnim, jeo, joesonghamnidanaman motal geo gatayo. Jega ahopsi*

ijeone gabwaya hamnida, daeume sigani doemyeon seojeom ireul doul ssu inneundeyo, annyeonghi gyeseyo.)

Boss, well, I'm sorry but I'm afraid I can't make it. I have to go before 9. Next time I'm free, I'll help in your bookstore. Have a nice day!

- NE

"No, I have already made plans for this evening. I'm sorry that I can not help you."

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies - direct strategy, indirect strategy, and adjunct to refusal, Korean native speakers used more indirect formulas and adjunct to refusal than English native speakers but direct strategy as frequently as them.

2) Refusing an Equal Status Person's Request (Situation 2)

In refusing a classmate's request to lend class notes, NKs and NEs gave similar reasons for their refusal. Actually, both NKs and NEs said as their most frequently used reason for refusal that they need the notes to study today. In addition to this reason, NKs mentioned as the second most frequently used reason for refusal 'they already lent them to other classmates', followed by 'their notes are too messy to read', and 'they lost their notes.' NEs gave similar reasons to NKs.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, NKs sounded a little indirect than NEs. NKs used 'No' less frequently than NEs but almost twice as many 'negative willingness'es as NEs.

NKs and NEs differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs 'elaborated on the reason' and 'stated

alternatives' more frequently than NEs. Especially, NEs did not 'state any alternatives' at all. Both NKs and NEs used some 'pause fillers'. It is noticeable that both NKs and NEs hardly used 'statement of positive opinion' and 'gratitude', while both of them occasionally employed 'criticism on the request.' The reason seemed to be that borrowing other person's notebook was not a praiseworthy act but a blamable act, a kind of cheating to both NKs and NEs. In short, NKs made more various attempts to soften the awkward situations caused by refusal than NEs.

In terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were the same: 'statement of regret', 'reason', and 'negative willingness.'

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 2 are as follows:

- NK

“아, 미안하지만 그럴 수가 없는데. 노트를 다른 친구에게 빌려줘서 지금은 나한테 없어. 혹시 그 친구가 빨리 돌려주면 그때 연락줄게.”
(*Ah, mianhajiman geureol ssuga eomneunde. Noteureul dareun chingguege bilyeojwoseo jigeum nahante eopsseo. hoksi geu chingguga ppali dollyeojumyeon geuttae yeollak julkke.*)

Ah, I'm sorry but I can't. I have lent my notebook to another classmate so I don't have it. If he returns it earlier than expected, I'll contact you immediately.

- NE

“I can't do it bud, I'm sorry. I really need my notes for my own study today.”

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies, Korean native speakers used slightly more direct formulas and adjunct to refusal than English native speakers but indirect strategy as frequently as them.

3) Refusing a Lower Status Person's Request (Situation 3)

In refusing one of your juniors' request for making a flyer, NKs and NEs gave almost the same reasons for their refusals such as 'too busy', 'having too many things to do', and 'I have never made it'.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, NKs sounded more indirect than NEs since they used a weaker version of direct refusal, 'negative willingness' more frequently without any use of 'No', while NEs used 'negative willingness' less frequently but with occasional use of 'No'.

NKs and NEs also differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs softened their refusals by employing various other strategies which were seldom used by NEs, including 'wish' (e.g., 'I wish I could help'), 'statement of alternative 1' (e.g., 'I'd rather introduce someone as a helper'), 'set conditions' (e.g., 'I'm very busy. If you had asked me earlier, I could have helped you'), and 'promise of future acceptance.' (e.g., 'Next time, I will help you. I promise') On the other hand, NEs more frequently used such strategies as 'statement of alternative 2' (e.g., 'I have too many things going on right now. Maybe you can ask someone else') and 'statement of solidarity' for sustaining their existing relationship with the other part (e.g., 'This would be a great time to get to know each other but I'm

really too busy'). Unlike NEs, NKs used 'address forms' and 'pause fillers' frequently. It is also noticeable that both of NKs and NEs rarely used 'statement of positive opinion' and 'gratitude'. The reason seemed to be that like other request situations in this study, the request for making a flyer felt burdensome and not worthy of gratitude.

As in the two previous situations, i.e. situation 1 and 2, in terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were the same even when there were some differences in order: 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'negative willingness.'

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 3 are as follows:

- NK

“미안, 선배가 좀 바빠서. 도와줄 수가 없네. 4학년이라 취업준비 때 문에. 다음에 도와줄게.” (*Mian, seonbaega jom bappaseo. Dowajul ssuga eomne. sahangnyeonira chwieopjunbi ttaemune. Daeume dowajulkke.*)

Sorry, I am a little busy. I can't help you. Because I'm a senior, I have to prepare for getting a job. Next time, I will.

- NE

“This would be a great time to get to know each other, but I'm really too busy to commit to this right now.”

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies, Korean native speakers used more adjunct to refusal than English native speakers but direct and indirect strategy as frequently as them.

[TABLE 1]
 Frequency of Refusal Strategies Used When Refusing
 Requests from Higher, Equal, Lower status Persons

Refusal Strategies	Frequency of Refusal Strategies (% of each group that used a given refusal strategy)					
	Higher Status		Equal Status		Lower Status	
	NK *n=(183) 61×3	NE n=(42) 14×3	NK	NE	NK	NE
Direct strategies (subtotal)	47	45	36	31	33	31
'No'	0	5	3	14	0	7
Negative willingness/ability	46	33	31	17	33	24
Elaboration on the negative willingness	1	7	2	0	0	0
Indirect strategies (subtotal)	233	197	206	200	233	227
Statement of regret	75	81	68	81	74	83
Wish	8	10	1	10	8	0
Excuse, reason, explanation	87	74	72	74	87	81
Elaboration on the reason	21	10	17	10	21	26
Statement of alternative 1	2	0	7	0	2	0
Elaboration on the alternative 1	1	0	2	0	2	0
Statement of alternative 2	0	0	9	0	0	24
Elaboration on the alternative 2	0	0	1	0	0	2
Set conditions	11	5	5	5	11	2
Elaboration on the set conditions	0	0	0	0	1	0
Promise of future acceptance	14	7	3	7	14	0
Statement of principle	1	1	3	2	1	0
Statement of philosophy	0	1	2	2	0	0
Elaboration on the philosophy	0	1	0	2	0	0
Threat of negative consequences	1	0	1	0	1	0
Elaboration on the threat	0	0	1	0	0	0
Criticism on the request	2	5	4	5	2	3

Elaboration on the criticism	0	0	1	0	0	0
Request for help	1	1	0	2	1	2
Letting interlocutor off the hook	1	0	0	0	1	0
Joke	0	0	1	0	0	0
Postponement	0	0	1	0	0	0
Asking for permission to accept later	4	0	0	0	4	2
Promise of future compensation	0	0	1	0	0	0
Asking a question	1	0	2	0	1	2
Saying I tried	0	1	0	0	0	0
Statement of advice	0	0	2	0	0	0
Elaboration on the advice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seeking approval	0	0	1	0	0	0
Postponing some other time	1	0	0	0	1	0
Elaboration on the postponing	1	0	0	0	1	0
Suggestion that functions as a refusal	0	0	1	0	0	0
Adjuncts to refusals (subtotal)	22	3	10	4	28	9
Expression of embarrassment	0	0	0	0	1	0
Expression of surprise	0	0	1	0	0	0
Statement of solidarity	2	0	0	0	2	7
Statement of acknowledgment	0	0	1	0	0	0
Statement of address	16	1	3	2	16	0
Statement of positive opinion	1	1	1	0	1	0
Statement of empathy	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pause fillers	3	0	3	2	7	2
Gratitude	0	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	302	245	252	235	294	267

* n = total number of subjects in each group

** The number given under each refusal strategy means % of that one used by one member of each group. That number is always less than 100. It is because each of the refusal strategies used per capita is counted only once even though used more than twice.

[TABLE 1-1]

Percentage of Key Refusal Strategies Used

When Refusing Requests from Higher, Equal, and Lower Status Persons

Refusal Strategies	Percentage of Key Refusal Strategies (% of a given one out of the total refusal strategies used by each group)					
	Higher Status		Equal Status			
	NK	NE	NK	NE	NK	NE
Direct strategies	16 (47)	18 (45)	14 (36)	13 (31)	11 (33)	12 (31)
'No'	- (0)	2 (5)	1 (3)	6(14)	- (0)	3 (7)
Negative willingness/ability	15(46)	13(33)	12(31)	7(17)	11(33)	9(24)
Indirect strategies	77 (233)	80 (197)	83 (206)	85 (200)	80 (233)	85 (227)
Statement of regret	25(75)	33(81)	27(68)	34(81)	25(74)	31(83)
Wish	3 (8)	4(10)	- (1)	4(10)	3 (8)	- (0)
Excuse, reason, explanation	29(87)	30(74)	29(72)	31(74)	30(87)	30(81)
Elaboration on the reason	7(21)	4(10)	7(17)	4(10)	7(21)	10(26)
Statement of alternative 1	1 (2)	- (0)	3 (7)	- (0)	1 (2)	- (0)
Statement of alternative 2	- (0)	- (0)	4 (9)	- (0)	- (0)	9(24)
Set conditions	4(11)	2 (5)	2 (5)	2 (5)	4(11)	1 (2)
Pronise of future acceptance	5(14)	3 (7)	1 (3)	3 (7)	5(14)	- (0)
Criticism on the request	1 (2)	2 (5)	2 (4)	2 (5)	1 (2)	1 (3)
Adjuncts to refusals	7 (22)	2 (3)	3 (10)	2 (4)	9 (28)	3 (9)
Statement of solidarity	1 (2)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	1 (2)	3 (7)
Statement of address	5(16)	1 (1)	1 (3)	1 (2)	5(16)	- (0)
Statement of positive opinion	- (1)	- (1)	- (1)	- (0)	- (1)	- (0)
Pause fillers	1 (3)	- (0)	1 (3)	1 (2)	2 (7)	1 (2)
Gratitude	- (0)	- (1)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
TOTAL	100 (302)	100 (245)	100 (252)	100 (235)	100 (294)	100 (267)

* The number in the parenthesis is the same as that under a given refusal strategy in TABLE 1

** The number on the left of the parenthesis means % of a given one out of the total refusal strategies used by each group.

2. Refusals of Invitations

1) Refusing a Higher Status Person's Invitation (Situation 4)

In refusing your boss' invitation to a party for all the employees, the top three reasons in frequency for NKs were 'having a previous engagement', 'having something to do', and 'having an important appointment.', which were almost the same as those for NEs. Actually, the most frequently used reason for NEs was 'having another plan', followed by 'having a previous engagement', and then 'too busy'.

However, except for the aforementioned reasons, NKs also gave many reasons specifically related to family: 'a family event', 'mother's birthday', 'going down to grandma's on weekend', etc.. This means that NKs' reasons arose not only from personal matters but also from the society around themselves, while NEs' chiefly arose from personal matters.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, NKs used 'negative willingness'('I can't') more frequently with a single use of 'No', whereas NEs used 'negative willingness' less frequently with a lot of 'No's. This means that NEs refused more directly than NKs.

NKs and NEs also differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs 'elaborated on the reason' and 'promised future acceptance' more frequently than NEs. They also used 'statement of solidarity'('즐거운 파티 보내세요' (*jeulgeoun pati boneseyo*), Have a nice party!), statement of address('사장님' (*sajangnim*), Boss), and 'statement of positive opinion'('I'd love to ...), while NEs rarely used them..

On the other hand, NEs used 'gratitude' more frequently than NKs. This means that NEs expressed their ideas straightforward and with clarity, while NKs felt guilty about not accepting the invitation. Therefore, NEs expressed gratitude over regretfulness than NKs, and vice versa. Both NKs and NEs hardly used 'statement of alternatives'.

In terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were a little different: for NKs, 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'negative willingness'; for NEs, 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'No'.

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 4 are as follows:

- NK

“저, 사장님, 저도 참석하고 싶은데요. 죄송합니다만 주말에 대전에 계신 할아버님댁을 방문해야 해서요. 몸이 편찮으시거든요. 다음 번에는 꼭 참석하겠습니다.” (*Jeo, sajangnim, jeodo chamseokhago sipeundaeyo. Joesonghamnidanman jumale daejeone gyesin harabeonimdaegeul bangmunhaeya haeseoyo. momi pyeonchaneusigeodeunnyo. daeum beoneneun kkok chamseokhagyesseumnida.*)

Well, boss, I'd like to go. I'm sorry but I have to visit my grandpa in Daejeon this weekend. He is sick. Next time I will.

- NE

“Sorry, I would but I've already made other plans.”

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies, Korean native speakers used all the three clusters more frequently than English native speakers..

2) Refusing an Equal Status Person's Invitation (Situation 5)

In refusing one of your classmates' invitation to his or her birthday party, the top three reasons in frequency for NKs were 'having a previous engagement', 'having something to do', and 'having an important thing to take care of', which were almost the same as those for NEs. Actually, the most frequently used reason for NEs was 'having another plan', followed by 'too busy', and then 'having a previous engagement'.

However, aside from the above reasons, NKs also gave many reasons specifically related to family: 'a family event', 'a party for celebrating the 100th day after one of his or her relatives' son's birth', 'going to grandpa's tomb with his or her father', etc. On the other hand, NEs gave the only one reason related to family, 'family get-together'. However, that reason was not concrete in its content. Therefore, it can be said that NKs' reasons arose not only from personal matters but also from the society around themselves, while NEs' chiefly arose from personal matters.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, NKs used more 'negative willingness' without any 'No', whereas NEs used 'negative willingness' less frequently with relatively many 'No's. This means that NEs refused a little more directly than NKs.

NKs and NEs also differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs 'elaborated on the reason', used 'set conditions', and 'promised future acceptance' much more frequently than NEs. They also used 'statement of address'(chiefly the interlocutor's name plus '-ya', '창수야'(Changsuya!, My dear Changsu!) a lot, while NEs did not at all. They 'stated their positive opinion' more frequently

than NEs but expressed 'gratitude' less frequently. NEs used 'statement of solidarity' even more frequently than NKs. Both NKs and NEs hardly used 'statement of alternatives'.

In terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were the same: 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'negative willingness'.

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 5 are as follows:

- NK

“친구야 진짜 미안해. 그날에 조카 돌잔치가 있어서, 가고는 싶지만 갈 수가 없네. 파티가 토요일이라면 갈 수도 있을 텐데.” (*Chingguya jinjja mianhae. Geunale joka doljanchiga isseoseo. Gagoneun sipjiman gal ssuga eomne. Patiga toyeoiliramyeon gal ssudo isseul tende.*)

Buddy, I'm really sorry. That day one of my nieces' first birthday party will be held. I'd like to go but I can't. If yours were this Saturday, I could go.

- NE

“I wish I had known sooner. Sorry but I can't. I made other plans. Say hi to everyone for me.”

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies, like in the first case of invitation, Korean native speakers used all the three clusters more frequently than English native speakers.

3) Refusing a Lower Status Person's Invitation (Situation 6)

In refusing one of your juniors' invitation to go to the movies, the

top three reasons in frequency for NKs were 'wanting to take a rest because the exams are over', 'having a previous engagement', and 'being exhausted', which were almost the same as those for NEs. Actually, the most frequently used reason for NEs was 'having a prior plan', followed by 'not feeling well', and then 'being exhausted due to the exam'. The remaining reasons given by NKs were not very different from those by NEs.

With respect to the use of direct strategies, there was a lot of difference between NKs and NEs. NKs never used 'No' but NEs used it relatively frequently. NKs used 'negative willingness' ('I can't') less frequently than NEs. Therefore, NKs can be said to have refused less directly than NEs.

NKs and NEs differed in terms of the use of indirect strategies and adjuncts to refusals. NKs 'elaborated on the reason' and used 'statement of address' more frequently than NEs. They also used 'wish', and 'set conditions', while these semantic formulas were not found in NE data. They rarely used 'statement of positive opinion' and 'gratitude', whereas NEs did a lot. NKs also used 'statement of solidarity' much less frequently than NEs. Both NKs and NEs used 'promise of future acceptance' frequently.

On the other hand, NEs 'stated their positive opinion' and express 'gratitude' much more frequently than NKs. This means that they expressed their ideas straightforward and with clarity. In Korean culture, giving a positive opinion and thankfulness to the interlocutor especially when refusing is rare because such speech acts are considered to presuppose acceptance. NEs also used 'asking a question' ('Where is

the movie showing?') and 'statement of solidarity' much more frequently than NKs.

In terms of frequency, the top three semantic formulas used by the two language groups were a little different: for NKs, 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'elaboration on the reason'; for NEs, 'reason', 'statement of regret', and 'No'.

The typical examples of refusals used by each group in situation 6 are as follows:

- NK

“나 시험 끝나고 쉬고 싶어. 몸이 안좋거든. 오늘은 힘들 거 같애. 다음 번에는 꼭 갈게. 미안” (*Na siheom kkeunnago swigo sipeo. Momi anjokeodeun. Oneuleun himdeul geo gatae. Daeum beoneneun kkok galkkae. Mian.*)

My exams are over so I want to take a rest. I'm not feeling well today. I'm afraid I can't. Next time, I promise I will. Sorry.

- NE

“I would, but I'm a little tired from midterms. Thanks, though!”

With respect to the use of three clusters of refusal strategies, unlike in the first two cases of invitation, Korean native speakers used more indirect strategies but fewer direct strategies and adjuncts to refusals than English native speakers.

[TABLE 2]

Frequency of Refusal Strategies Used

When Refusing Invitations from Higher, Equal, and Lower Status Persons

Refusal Strategies	Frequency of Refusal Strategies (% of each group that used a given refusal strategy)					
	Higher Status		Equal Status		Lower Status	
	NK *n = (183) 61×3	NE n = (42) 14×3	NK	NE	NK	NE
Direct strategies (subtotal)	50	36	49	41	14	52
Performative	0	5	0	0	0	0
'No'	1	21	0	12	0	31
Negative willingness/ability	49	10	48	29	14	21
Elaboration on the negative willingness	0	0	1	0	0	0
Indirect strategies (subtotal)	198	138	233	157	233	155
Statement of regret	72	36	75	60	75	38
Wish	0	2	8	10	8	0
Excuse, reason, explanation	89	79	87	71	87	79
Elaboration on the reason	11	5	21	2	21	14
Statement of alternative 1	1	0	2	0	2	0
Elaboration on the alternative 1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Statement of alternative 2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Set conditions	3	5	11	0	11	0
Elaboration on the set conditions	0	0	1	0	1	0
Promise of future acceptance	19	10	14	5	14	12
Statement of principle	0	0	1	0	1	0
Threat of negative consequences	0	0	1	0	1	0
Criticism on the request	0	0	2	0	2	0
Elaboration on the criticism	0	0	0	0	0	0
Request for help	1	0	1	0	1	0

Letting interlocutor off the hook	0	0	1	0	1	0
Repetition of part of request	0	0	0	5	0	0
Postponement	0	0	0	2	0	0
Asking for permission to accept later	0	0	4	2	4	0
Promise of future compensation	1	0	0	0	0	0
Elaboration on future compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asking a question	1	1	1	0	1	10
Statement of advice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seeking approval	0	0	0	0	0	0
Postponing some other time	0	0	1	0	1	1
Elaboration on the postponing	0	0	1	0	1	0
Adjuncts to refusals (subtotal)	38	16	69	58	24	65
Expression of embarrassment	0	0	1	5	1	5
Expression of surprise	0	0	0	2	0	0
Statement of solidarity	7	0	2	21	2	7
Statement of address	7	0	16	0	16	7
Statement of positive opinion	14	2	31	21	5	10
Pause fillers	7	7	16	2	0	0
Gratitude	3	7	3	7	0	36
TOTAL	286	190	351	256	271	272

* n = total number of subjects in each group

** The number given under each refusal strategy means % of that one used by one member of each group. That number is always less than 100. It is because each of the refusal strategies used per capita is counted only once even though used more than twice

[TABLE 2-1]

Percentage of Key Refusal Strategies Used

When Refusing Invitations from Higher, Equal, and Lower Status Persons

Refusal Strategies	Percentage of Key Refusal Strategies (% of a given one out of the total refusal strategies used by each group)					
	Higher Status		Equal Status			
	NK	NE	NK	NE	NK	NE
Direct strategies	17 (50)	18 (36)	14 (49)	16 (41)	5 (14)	19 (52)
Performatives	- (0)	3 (5)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
'No'	- (1)	11(21)	- (0)	5(12)	- (0)	11(31)
Negative willingness/ability	17(49)	5(10)	14(48)	11(29)	5(14)	8(21)
Indirect strategies	70 (198)	74 (138)	66 (233)	62 (157)	87 (233)	57 (155)
Statement of regret	25(72)	19(36)	21(75)	23(60)	28(75)	14(38)
Wish	- (0)	1 (2)	2 (8)	4(10)	3 (8)	- (0)
Excuse, reason, explanation	31(89)	42(79)	25(87)	28(71)	32(87)	29(79)
Elaboration on the reason	4(11)	3 (5)	6(21)	1 (2)	8(21)	5(14)
Set conditions	1 (3)	3 (5)	3(11)	- (0)	4(11)	- (0)
Promise of future acceptance	7(19)	5(10)	4(14)	2 (5)	5(14)	4(12)
Asking a question	- (1)	- (1)	- (1)	- (0)	- (1)	4(10)
Adjuncts to refusals	13 (38)	8 (16)	20 (69)	22 (58)	8 (24)	24 (65)
Statement of solidarity	2 (7)	- (0)	1 (2)	8(21)	1 (2)	3 (7)
Statement of address	2 (7)	- (0)	5(16)	- (0)	6(16)	3 (7)
Statement of positive opinion	5(14)	1 (2)	9(31)	8(21)	2 (5)	4(10)
Pause fillers	2 (7)	4 (7)	5(16)	1 (2)	- (0)	- (0)
Gratitude	1 (3)	4 (7)	1 (3)	3 (7)	- (0)	13(36)
TOTAL	100 (286)	100 (190)	100 (351)	100 (256)	100 (271)	100 (272)

* The number in the parenthesis is the same as that under a given refusal strategy in TABLE 1

** The number on the left of the parenthesis means % of a given one out of the total refusal strategies used by each group.

IV. Conclusion

The findings from this study are summarized as follows: Korean native speakers (NKs) were less direct in their refusals. Considering the use of individual refusal strategies, they used fewer 'No's. They expressed 'regretfulness' over 'thankfulness', especially in a refusal to invitation. They also used more 'pause fillers' and 'statement of address'. In addition, with respect to three clusters of refusal strategies - direct strategy, indirect strategy, and adjunct to refusal, Korean native speakers used indirect strategy more frequently than English native speakers. On the whole, Korean native speakers used more refusal strategies than English native speakers. On the other hand, English native speakers (NEs) were more direct in their refusals. The other results for English native speakers were opposite to those for Korean native speakers. In light of the reasons for refusals, NKs' arose not only from personal matters but also from the society around themselves, while NEs' chiefly arose from personal matters.

The limitations of this study are summarized into three: Firstly, the focus of this study is on a speech act, refusal at the utterance level, not at the discourse level. In this respect, this study has a limitation because it doesn't intend to analyze the speech act of refusals in terms of discourse sequences. This study was done by the DCT requiring only one-time response. However, in reality, conversation occurs in such a discourse situation, not in a single turn exchange. Secondly, the data elicited from the DCT as a method for this study may yield different

results from naturally occurring data. Thirdly, it is difficult to say that the subjects sampled as native English speakers and native Korean speakers respectively represent their own group. Actually, native Korean speakers chiefly consist of 18 to 24 year-old college students and native English speakers mainly middle-aged teachers at secondary schools and professors at Soongsil university in Seoul. Therefore, the findings of this study can not be generalized to Korean native speakers and English native speakers as an entire group.

The pedagogical implications of this study for teaching pragmatics in an EFL context were discussed as follows: Previous studies on interlanguage pragmatics especially employing Korean EFL learners as their subjects have mostly emphasized as their conclusion that Korean EFL learners, if possible, should express their ideas appropriately, i.e. in accordance with English-speaking countries' sociocultural rules. The reason is that so-called pragmatic errors by dint of lack of knowledge about English-speaking countries' sociocultural rules are likely to cause breakdown in communication with native English speakers.

It is a sure thing that such an argument is a straight fact. However, one of the recent studies on interlanguage pragmatics (Ahn, 2010) suggested a new point of view about pragmatic errors. It sees them, chiefly caused by pragmatic transfer, as inevitable phenomena, not to depreciate them as Korean learners of English's simple errors because of their ignorance. Actually, it shows as a source of its argument that even high-proficient Korean speakers of English can successfully realize their refusals with their own formulas, that is, without exactly copying target-like strategies for refusals.

I, researcher of this study also agree with this point of view. Language is the principal means whereby we conduct our social lives. When it is used in contexts of communication, it is bound up with culture in multiple and complex ways (Kramsch, 1998). Therefore, it would be overemphasized to follow the sociocultural rules of the target language alone, losing Korean learners' national identity. Each national identity, whether it is native Koreans' or native English speakers', should mutually be esteemed. Difference in the sociocultural rules between Western and Oriental countries, especially difference in politeness concept between them, was also discussed in Mao's (1994) and Yu's (2002, 2003), which are strong evidence that it would be too much to insist the sociocultural rules of the target language alone when studying English.

Our world has literally become a global village and English has now become a universal language for all the people who can speak it fluently or not. English is no longer a native language exclusively for Western countries including the U.S., the U.K., etc. Therefore, for Korean EFL learners to survive in an internationalized world, learning English only with a focus on British and American sociocultural norm would be insufficient. In addition, the ability to speak of Korean society and culture in front of foreigners in English is also a must. Equipped with Korean-related sociocultural knowledge, not to mention English-related, Korean EFL learners could be a winner in a drastically competitive, turbulent world. Therefore, a class for speaking of Korean society and culture in English would be a good way to complement an English class focusing on introduction of English-related sociocultural norm

alone. Both having knowledge about Korean sociocultural norm as well as English one and expressing this knowledge in English would enable Korean EFL learners to be competent English speakers in an international world who are free to express their own thoughts appropriately when having to choose either to assimilate themselves into target language culture or to insist their own national identity.

APPENDIX I.

Discourse Completion Task Questionnaire

1. Sex: male female
2. Age: ()

Please read the following 12 situations thoroughly. After each situation you will be asked to write a response in the blank after "**You refuse by saying:**".

Try to imagine yourself in the following situations, or in a similar experience that you have had, then respond in the most natural way, as you would in a real situation.

1. You have been working at a part-time job for an extra spending money after school at the university bookstore. The bookstore is open Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. You work from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. It is Friday evening at 6:45 p.m. and your boss has just received a large amount of books three weeks late. They need to be on display by Monday morning. You are finishing an inventory when the boss approaches you and asks you to work extra hours (until 9:00 p.m.) to get the display ready, but **you refuse his/her request.**
 - (1) You have been working hard for one year and enjoyed your boss's confidence. Your boss sometimes invites you to a dinner party at his/her house and you are familiar with his/her wife/husband and children. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (2) You have been working for one year. You get along with your boss but have never had a personal talk with him/her. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (3) You have been working at the university bookstore only for one week but you have had one-year working experience at another bookstore. You know your boss only by name. **You refuse by saying:**
2. You are taking a course in 20th-century American literature this semester. You haven't missed this class once this semester and consider yourself a diligent student. Among your classmates, you have a reputation for taking very good notes. The professor has just announced that the midterm exam is next week. One of your classmates who has frequently missed the class asks you for your notes. When the class ends, he/she approaches you for your notes, but **you refuse his/her request.**
 - (1) Up to now, the classmate has been taking several classes with you and is also a member of the same guitar club as you. Last summer vacation, you and he together went to the beach and shared a pleasant memory. **You refuse by saying:**

- (2) The classmate has taken class a few times with you and is also a member of the same guitar club as you. However, you are not familiar with him. **You refuse by saying:**
- (3) The classmate is taking class with you for the first time this semester. You know him only by sight. **You refuse by saying:**
3. You are a senior member of Student Council. While planning an upcoming event, you are approached by a freshman.
Freshman: "I'm responsible for making a flyer for an upcoming event. Would it be possible to get your help?" **You refuse his/her request.**
- (1) The freshman is a brother/sister of your boy/girlfriend. You have visited your boy/girlfriend's house several times and know him/her very well.
You refuse by saying:
- (2) You have worked with the freshman once or twice to prepare for the previous events. However, you haven't had an opportunity to have a personal talk with him/her face to face. **You refuse by saying:**
- (3) It is only one week since the freshman joined Student Council. You have never met him/her before but he/she knows you by sight. **You refuse by saying:**
4. You have been working at a restaurant near your school as a part-time job. The boss calls you into the office.
Boss: "I'm giving a little party this weekend for all the employees. Will you be able to come?" **You refuse his/her invitation.**
- (1) The boss is your father's/mother's friend. Your father/mother and he/she went to the same elementary school. They frequently meet at the class reunion. He/She has visited your house several times and knows you very well. **You refuse by saying:**
- (2) You have been working there for about one year. Your boss seems kind to you but indifferent to your personal life. **You refuse by saying:**
- (3) It is only one week since you worked there. Your boss knows you only by name. **You refuse by saying:**
5. You are walking across campus when you run into one of your classmates. He/She invites you to his/her 21st birthday party at his/her house next Friday night at 8:00 p.m. He/She says, "Our mutual friends will be there, too." You know that this would be a good opportunity to see everyone you haven't met for a long time. Unfortunately, you cannot make it. **You have to refuse his/her invitation.**

- (1) You and he/she know each other very well because he/she has lived in your neighborhood since you were a child and now goes to the same church. Recently, you have had a lot of cheerful time with him/her there. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (2) Up to now, you and he/she have been in the same class a few times but have never studied for the exam together. You have never spent time talking seriously with him/her. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (3) You and he/she are in the same class for the first time this semester. You know him/her only by sight but he/she wants to make friends with you. **You refuse by saying:**
6. You are a senior living in the dormitory. The mid-term exam was over yesterday so you have nothing particular to do today. This evening a freshman invites you to go to the movies with him/her but you don't want to.
- Freshman: "A group of us are going to see a movie tonight. Would you like to join us?" **You refuse his/her invitation.**
- (1) The freshman is a brother/sister of your girl/boyfriend. You have visited your girl/boyfriend's house several times so you know him/her very well. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (2) The freshman is your roommate. He/She is cooperative enough to clean the room without your help and never to bring his/her friends. You have a good feeling towards him/her, but, if so, have never had a personal talk with him/her. **You refuse by saying:**
 - (3) The freshman is living in the dormitory but not a roommate. You know him/her only by sight. **You refuse by saying:**

Appendix III.

1. 당신은 대학 서점에서 용돈을 벌기 위해 방과후 아르바이트를 하고 있습니다. 서점은 월요일부터 금요일까지 오전 9시부터 오후 7시까지 문을 엽니다. 당신은 평소에 월요일부터 금요일까지 오후 3시부터 오후 7시까지 근무합니다. 금요일 저녁 6시 45분에 서점 주인은 3주간 밀려있던 많은 양의 책을 막 받았습니다. 그 책들은 월요일 아침까지 진열되어 있어야 합니다. 당신이 이제 막 일을 끝마칠 즈음 서점 주인은 당신에게 다가와 책 진열을 위해 밤 9시까지 야근을 할 것을 부탁드립니다만 **당신은 거절합니다.**
 - (1) 당신은 그 서점에 1년간 근무해오고 있으며 주인의 신임을 얻고 있습니다. 서점 주인은 이따금씩 당신을 집에 초대해 저녁 식사를 함께 하였고 주인의 식구들과도 친합니

다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (2) 당신은 그 서점에 1년간 근무해오고 있으며 주인과 별 문제없이 잘 지냅니다. 그러나 서점 주인에게 개인적인 속애기를 털어놓은 적은 없습니다.

(당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (3) 당신은 그 서점에 근무한 지 1주일밖에 안되지만 학교 밖의 다른 서점에서 1년간 근무한 경험이 있습니다. 당신은 현 대학서점의 주인을 이름만 알 뿐입니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

2. 당신은 이번 학기에 20세기 미국 문학을 수강하고 있습니다. 당신은 이번 학기에 그 수업에 한 번도 결석하지 않았으며 스스로를 근면한 학생으로 생각하고 있습니다. 같은 반 학생들간에 당신은 노트 필기를 아주 잘하는 것으로 정평이나 있습니다. 어느 날 담당교수는 다음 주에 중간고사가 있을 것이라고 공표합니다. 수업을 자주 빼먹던 한 학생이 당신의 노트를 빌려달라고 요청합니다. 수업이 끝난 후 그 학생은 당신에게 다가와 부탁을 하지만 **당신은 거절합니다.**

- (1) 지금까지 그 학생은 당신과 여러 번 같이 동일한 과목들을 들었고 또 당신과 같은 기타반의 일원입니다. 작년 여름방학동안 당신과 그 학생은 함께 씨클M.T.로 바닷가에 놀러 가서 즐거운 추억을 나누었습니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (2) 그 학생은 당신과 몇 번 같이 동일한 과목을 들었고 또 당신과 같은 기타반의 일원입니다. 그러나 당신은 그 학생과 친한 사이는 아닙니다.

(당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (3) 그 학생은 이번 학기에 최초로 당신과 함께 동일한 수업을 듣고 있으며 단지 얼굴만 아는 사이일 뿐입니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

3. 당신은 대학 학생회의 선배입니다. 다가올 행사를 계획하고 있을 때 한 1학년 생이 당신에게 다가옵니다.

1학년생: “이번 행사에 전단지 제작을 맡고 있는데 도와주실 수 있으세요?”

그러나 **당신은 거절합니다.**

- (1) 그 1학년생은 당신의 이성 친구의 동생입니다. 당신은 당신의 이성 친구의 집을 여러 번 방문하였고 따라서 그 1학년생과는 잘 아는 사이입니다.

(당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (2) 당신은 그 1학년생과 한두 번 지난번 행사 준비를 같이 한 적이 있습니다. 그러나 그 1학년생과 직접 진지하게 개인적인 얘기를 나눌 기회는 없었습니다.

(당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (3) 그 1학년생은 불과 1주일 전에 학생회에 가입하였습니다. 당신은 그 전에 그 1학년생과 만난 적도 없고 단지 얼굴만 알 뿐입니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

4. 당신은 학교 근처의 레스토랑에서 아르바이트를 하고 있습니다. 어느 날 주인은 당신을 사무실로 불러들입니다.

레스토랑 주인: “이번 주말에 모든 종업원들과 함께 조출한 파티를 열 건데 올 수 있겠나?” 그러나 **당신은 거절합니다.**

- (1) 그 주인은 당신 아버님/어머님의 친구입니다. 당신 아버님/어머님과 그 주인은 초등학교 동창생이고 자주 동창회에서 만납니다. 그 주인은 당신 집을 여러 번 방문하였고 그래서 당신을 잘 압니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)
- (2) 당신은 약 1년간 그 레스토랑에서 근무하였습니다. 그 주인은 당신에게 걸음으로는 친절하게 대하지만 당신의 개인 생활에는 무관심한 것처럼 보입니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)
- (3) 당신은 그 레스토랑에서 근무한지 1주일밖에 안됩니다. 레스토랑 주인은 단지 당신의 이름만 알 뿐입니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)

5. 당신이 대학 캠퍼스를 걷고 있을 때 우연히 같은 반 학생 중 하나와 마주치게 됩니다. 그 학생은 다음 주 금요일 밤 8시에 자신의 집에서 21번째 생일 파티를 열 것이라며 당신을 초대합니다. 그 학생은 “너와 내가 함께 알고 있는 친구들도 올 거야.” 라며 덧붙입니다. 당신은 이번 기회가 오랫동안 만나지 못했던 모두를 함께 볼 수 있는 좋은 기회라는 것을 압니다만 운 없게도 당신은 갈 수가 없습니다. 그래서 **당신은 거절합니다.**

- (1) 당신과 그 학생은 어렸을 때부터 같은 동네에 살고 있고 지금은 같은 교회를 다니기 때문에 아주 잘 아는 사이입니다. 최근에 당신은 그 학생과 교회에서 즐거운 시간을 함께 자주 보냈습니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)
- (2) 지금까지 당신과 그 학생은 몇 번 같이 수업을 들은 적은 있지만 함께 시험공부를 한 적은 없습니다. 또한 당신은 그 학생과 한 번도 진지하게 속 얘기를 나눈 적도 없습니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)
- (3) 당신과 그 학생은 이번 학기에 최초로 같이 수업을 듣고 있습니다. 당신은 그 학생과 얼굴만 아는 사이지만 그 학생은 당신과 친구하기를 원합니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)

6. 당신은 대학 기숙사에서 생활하는 4학년생입니다. 중간고사가 어제 끝나서 당신은 오늘 특별히 할 일이 없습니다. 오늘 저녁 1학년생이 당신에게 같이 영화를 보자고 합니다만 당신은 가고 싶지 않습니다. 그래서 **당신은 거절합니다.**

- (1) 그 1학년생은 당신의 이성 친구의 동생입니다. 당신은 이성 친구의 집을 여러번 방문하여서 그 1학년생과는 잘 아는 사이입니다. (**당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.**)
- (2) 그 1학년생은 당신과 함께 기숙사 방을 쓰는 룸메이트입니다. 그 1학년생은 당신의 도움 없이 방을 청소하고 절대로 자신의 친구들을 방에 데려오지 않을 만큼 협조적입니다. 당신은 그 학생에 대해 호감을 가지고는 있지만 한 번도 개인적인 속 얘기를 나

뉘 본 적은 없습니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

- (3) 그 1학년생은 같은 기숙사에서 생활하지만 룸메이트는 아닙니다. 당신은 그 학생과 단지 얼굴만 아는 사이입니다. (당신은 아래와 같이 거절합니다.)

〈References〉

- Ahn, Miran. Korean ESL refusals in face-to-face interaction. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26 (2), 2010, 123-152.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T. and Luiss-Weltz, R., Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language Issues in Second Language Research*, R. Scarcella, E. Anderson and S. D. Krashen (eds), NY: Newbury House. 1990. 55-73.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S., Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology* 8, E. N. Goody (ed), Cambridge University Press, 1978. 56-289
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S., *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987.
- Claire Kramsch, *Language and Culture*, Oxford University Press. 1998.
- Kwon, Jihyun. *Pragmatic transfer and proficiency in refusals of Korean EFL learners*. Ph D. diss., Boston University. 2003.
- Mao, L. R.. Beyond politeness theory: 'face revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21 (5): 451-486. 1994.
- Takahashi, T. and Beebe, L. M.. The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *Journal of the Japan Association of Language Teachers (JALT Journal)*, 8(2): 1987. 131-155.
- Yu, Kyongae. Culture-specific concepts of politeness: the Korean concept of *gongsonhada* is different from the American concept of polite and from the Japanese concept of *teineina*]. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*. Vol. 18, No. 2, 2002. 41-60.
- Yu, Kyongae. Characteristics of Korean politeness: imposition is not always a face threatening act]. *Discourse and Cognition*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2003. 137-163.

〈국문 초록〉

한국어와 영어에 사용된 거절 전략 비교 연구

본연구의 목적은 DCT (담화 완성 과업 설문지)를 사용하여 거절 화행에서 한국어와 영어 간 차이가 있는지를 조사하는 것이다.

연구 결과는 다음과 같이 요약된다: 한국어 모국어 화자는 그들의 거절화행에서 덜 직접적이었다. 개별 거절 전략 사용면에서, 한국어 모국어 화자는 더 적은 ‘아니요’를 사용하였고 특히 초대에 대한 거절화행에서 ‘감사함’보다 ‘미안함’을 더 많이 사용하였다. 그들은 또한 ‘대화 휴지 도구’ (pause fillers)와 ‘호칭’을 더 많이 사용하였다. 게다가, 세 개의 거절 전략군 (직접 거절전략, 간접 거절전략, 거절 부가어) 사용면에서, 한국어 모국어 화자는 영어 모국어화자보다 간접 거절전략을 더 많이 사용하였다. 전체적으로 한국어 모국어 화자는 영어 모국어 화자보다 더 많은 거절 전략을 사용하였다. 반면에, 영어 모국어 화자는 그들의 거절화행에서 더 직접적이었다. 영어 모국어 화자의 경우 다른 결과들은 한국어 모국어 화자의 결과들과 정반대였다. 거절 이유 면에서, 한국어 모국어 화자의 거절 이유는 개인적인 문제뿐만 아니라 자신을 둘러싼 사회에 기인한 반면, 영어 모국어 화자의 거절 이유는 주로 개인적 문제에 기인하였다.

화용론을 외국어로서의 영어 학습 상황에서 교수할 때 교육학적 의미 또한 논의되었다.

Key words: refusal, refusal strategy, speech act, interlanguage pragmatics