

Teaching Spanish Refusals

by

Derek Snider

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2014 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Barbara Lafford, Co-Chair
Carmen Garcia Fernandez, Co-Chair
Alvaro Cerron-Palomino

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2014

ABSTRACT

A number of studies have been carried out on Spanish pragmatics and the speech act of refusals (Félix-Brasdefer 2006; García 1992). Many studies have also been conducted on the teaching of pragmatics and speech acts in the classroom (García 1996; Koike 1989). However, to date, not many studies have been conducted analyzing the acquisition of Spanish refusals in the classroom. To the author's knowledge, no study has investigated the acquisition of Spanish refusals at the various different levels in a university. Therefore, this study will analyze whether there is a significant effect of the level of Spanish instruction of intermediate and advanced university L2 learners on their ability to carry out appropriate refusals. Through discourse completion tests, data from students at the Spanish 202 and 314 levels will be analyzed to see how closely they compare to native Spanish speakers in their refusals. The results will be compared with previous studies on refusals in order to create a teaching plan for acquiring this speech act.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	2
Teaching Pragmatics	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Spanish (L1) Refusals	6
The Acquisition of Spanish Refusals	12
Teaching Spanish Refusals	13
Justification	15
METHODOLOGY	16
Subjects	16
Instruments	17
Procedures	18
Data Analysis	19
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	20
Sample Head Act Refusal Strategies	20
Sample Supporting Move Refusal Strategies	24
Free-Response Results and Findings	26
Situation 1	28
Intermediate Participants' Results	30
Head Acts	30

	Page
Supporting Moves	30
Advanced Students' Results	31
Head Acts.....	31
Supporting Moves.....	31
Compared Results	31
Situation 2	32
Intermediate Students' Results	34
Head Acts.....	34
Supporting Moves.....	34
Advanced Students' Results	35
Head Acts.....	35
Supporting Moves.....	35
Compared Results	35
Situation 3	36
Intermediate Students' Results	38
Head Acts.....	38
Supporting Moves.....	38
Advanced Students' Results	39
Head Acts.....	39
Supporting Moves.....	39
Compared Results	39
Situation 4	40

	Page
Intermediate Students' Results	42
Head Acts.....	42
Supporting Moves.....	43
Advanced Students' Results	43
Head Acts.....	43
Supporting Moves.....	43
Compared Results	44
Situation 5	44
Intermediate Students' Results	46
Head Acts.....	46
Supporting Moves.....	47
Advanced Students' Results	47
Head Acts.....	47
Supporting Moves.....	47
Compared Results	47
Situation 6	48
Intermediate Students' Results	50
Head Acts.....	50
Supporting Moves.....	51
Advanced Students' Results	51
Head Acts.....	51
Supporting Moves.....	51

	Page
Compared Results	51
Invitation vs. Insistence Compared.....	52
Advanced Students' Results	54
Head Acts.....	54
Supporting Moves.....	55
Intermediate Students' Results	57
Head Acts.....	57
Supporting Moves.....	57
Compared Results	58
Combined Situations Results	60
Multiple Choice Results.....	64
Analysis of Participants' Reasoning.....	67
Free-response Reasoning	67
Multiple Choice Reasoning.....	75
CONCLUSIONS.....	81
PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS	84
Evaluation	86
Model Dialogue	90
Evaluation of the Situation.....	91
Role-play Activities	94
Feedback and Discussion	96
FINAL CONCLUSIONS.....	97

	Page
Summary of Results	97
Limitations	98
INSTRUMENTS.....	100
REFERENCES	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 1.....	28
2. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 2.....	33
3. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 3.....	37
4. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 4.....	41
5. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 5.....	45
6. Strategies Used When Refusing an Invitation: Situation 6.....	49
7. Advanced Strategies with and without an Insistence.....	52
8. Intermediate Strategies with and without an Insistence.....	55
9. Combined Strategies from All Situations	60

Introduction

The study of pragmatics, i.e., the appropriate use of language (<http://carla.umn.edu>), has been a topic of great interest over the past two decades. Many studies have recently been done on Spanish pragmatics and the differing ways native Spanish speakers communicate, e.g., the speech acts they perform and the different strategies associated with them (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; García 1992; García 1997; Márquez Reiter, 2005; Placencia 2008). The realization of the speech act of refusals has been analyzed in various Spanish speaking countries and as a consequence the need to develop foreign/second language learners' pragmatic competence has arisen. However, very little information on pragmatics has been incorporated into Spanish textbooks, and as a consequence learners of Spanish as a foreign/second language (L2) have little formal exposure to L2 pragmatic information. Some previous studies have analyzed the acquisition of pragmatics in the classroom using various speech acts as their basis, but little has been published on teaching the speech act of refusals in the classroom. In addition, to the author's knowledge, no cross-sectional study has been done evaluating the acquisition of refusals throughout the different university levels of Spanish.

This investigation will provide a cross sectional study of the effects of the level of Spanish of university L2 learners on their ability to carry out appropriate refusals. It will also analyze and compare their ability to carry out appropriate refusals when there is an insistence to the invitation and when there is no insistence. Results will indicate whether students progress in their pragmatic ability as they advance in Spanish proficiency. The results will then be compared with similar studies to help form a teaching plan for Spanish refusals in the classroom. Because this is a cross-sectional study, longitudinal

studies will need to be conducted to verify the results that will be gained from this current investigation of “apparent time.” Longitudinal studies on individuals in real time will provide more key information on the acquisition of this speech act, but that research design is not feasible for a master’s thesis project. In addition, because of the pragmatic variation that exists in the diversity of Spanish spoken in different parts of the globe, more studies will need to be conducted implementing different refusal strategies that correspond to specific various Spanish-speaking areas cultures.

Theoretical Framework

This study uses Spencer Oatey’s (2000, 2005) rapport management model for analysis of refusing an invitation. This model analyses the connection and negotiation of a relationship between people. Within these relationships, the participants have the opportunity to better (rapport-enhancement), maintain (rapport-maintenance), neglect (rapport-neglect), or challenge (rapport-challenge) a given relationship.

In each interaction, there are behavioral expectations that are to be met. Each community and individual has their own expectations of beliefs of what should occur. These expectations are associated with each individual’s beliefs and experiences. Spencer-Oatey distinguishes three separate behavioral expectations. There is *prescribed behavior*, *proscribed behavior*, and *permitted behavior*. Prescribed behavior is socially obligatory. Proscribed behavior is socially and legally prohibited. Permitted behavior is socially desired.

Also, there are two interaction principles that are related to behavioral expectations. They are the *equity principle* and the *association principle*. The equity principle states that people are to be treated fairly and not imposed upon. Within the

equity principle there are three components: the *cost-benefit* component (to not take advantage of others), the *fairness-reciprocity* component (the cost and benefit of something should be equal), and the *autonomy-control* component (people should not be controlled or imposed upon). The association principle states that people have the right to associate themselves with others and to be able to maintain this relationship. This principle also is divided into three components: involvement (people should be able to participate with or partake in activities with others), *empathy* (people should be able to share their feelings, worries, and interests with others) and *respect* (people should treat others with respect).

Spencer-Oatey also acknowledges that there are two distinct types of face at stake during interaction between people. *Respectability face* refers to the prestige and honor that a person has in a community. This face is a reflection of age, gender, social status, and reputation. *Identity face* has to do with the daily interactions that occur every day and the ability to better or harm this identity. Identity face also deals with the idea of being tied to certain social groups. Each person may have his/her own identity or respectability face respected or violated during each interaction that occurs.

In summary, each community has behavioral expectations which are associated with each individual's beliefs and experiences. The two interaction principles are the equity principle, which states that people should not be imposed upon, and the association principle, which states that people should be able to maintain a relationship with others. As people interact, their respectability face and identity face may be respected or violated.

This author also uses Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) model to classify the strategies used to refuse an invitation as head acts and supporting moves. Head acts are defined as the minimal unit that can realize a speech act or the core of a speech act. Supporting moves modify the impact of the given head act.

The following section gives a model of how to teach pragmatics in the classroom.

Teaching Pragmatics

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) outline a procedure to teach pragmatics in the classroom. The following is their five step process:

1. Diagnostic Evaluation
2. Model Dialogue
3. Evaluation of the situation
4. Role-play
5. Feedback and discussion

Following this model, the first step when teaching pragmatics in the classroom is to have a diagnostic evaluation of the particular speech act that is going to be performed. In this first step, the teacher guides the students in a discussion regarding the different contexts in which a particular speech act can or will be used. For example, students may discuss how they might express gratitude, complain, request or refuse a request in their native tongue. They would be asked to brain storm the different possibilities of the phrases they would use and the grammatical forms associated with each. It would also be important to include an analysis of how different phrases would be appropriate in different contexts or situations. The teacher would then illustrate the way a particular

speech act is performed in the target language and explain the grammatical structures necessary for the performance of the given speech act teaching grammar in context.

The second step is to provide students with a model dialogue or example of native speakers performing a given speech act. This model dialogue will further help the students connect the proper strategies and grammar in a real-world situation. The third step is the evaluation, or the evaluation of the situation presented in the model dialogue. This involves utilizing a pre and post-activity. In this pre-activity, the students are asked to think of what they could say in different situations involving the given speech act. They are then given specific information about the particular situation and asked to think of what they expect to be said by the participants. Then, a post-listening activity is given where the students are asked about the relationship between the participants involved, the strategy used to perform the given speech act, and the perception of how the given speech act was received.

The fourth stage is role-play. The students will be given a certain situation and asked to dramatize it utilizing the guidelines that were discussed in class. This is the opportunity for the students to start to internalize and put into practice the various strategies that will help them to be more pragmatically competent in the target language.

After role-play, the fifth stage is where the students will be asked to give feedback and discuss what they noticed from the role-play and their overall takeaways of the particular speech act. Here they will be able to express their questions or concerns with performing this speech act. In this step, the teacher is able to bring out different situations and contexts that could arise that have not been touched on at this point such as performing the speech act with participants with power differences or using strategies

that convey a different message to the interlocutor. Then, the teacher is able to give an overall review of what has transpired and how it can be applied in daily life.

Review of Literature

Spanish (L1) Refusals

García (1992) conducted a study to analyze refusing an invitation by Peruvian speakers. In order to analyze her results, she used Brown and Levinson's (1987) and Blum-Kulka, et al.'s (1989) theoretical frameworks. Brown and Levinson's model emphasizes the idea that people have the need to be liked and the need to not be imposed upon. This study used 20 Peruvian Spanish speakers from Lima, Peru, ten male and 10 female. The social class and education of the participants were not controlled.

The participants involved dramatized an open role-play where a friend invited the participants to an event that the participants could not attend. All participants improvised the conversations. García found that the first stage of the interaction involved the host of the event mitigating the invitation and downplaying the event. In response to this invitation, the participants used mitigated refusals, indefinite replies, expressions of sorrow, nonverbal refusals, and a variety of reasons and/or explanations. These strategies would be classified as deference strategies (i.e. strategies that expressed respect towards the interlocutor and thus respected their need not to be imposed upon). The participants also used positive opinion, well wishing, making future plans, promising to comply, and providing a token agreement to go to the party. These strategies were classified as solidarity strategies (i.e. strategies that expressed friendliness towards the interlocutor and thus satisfied their need to be liked and approved of). The second stage of these

interactions began when the friend insisted that the participants attend the event. The participants responded by accepting to attend or accepting to try to attend the event.

It is also indicated that in the second stage of the conversations, where the friend requested an effort to comply, eight out of the 12 participants accepted the invitation. In total, of the 20 participants, 13 conditionally accepted the request to the event. This is very interesting given the fact that they were told to refuse the invitation. García (1992) states:

In social terms, this does not mean that the person making the invitation should expect 13 people to come to her party. The second stage of the interaction should probably be interpreted as a mere routine interchange. In this socio-culture setting, it is evidently expected that the person who makes the invitation will insist, and that the one responding will accept. If this is the case, not insisting would be considered rude and would make the person receiving the invitation think she was not sincere in her invitation. In the same way, not accepting it would be considered an offense, a snub. In fact, the participants were asked to report their impressions of the interaction. All of them replied that everything had gone as expected and there was nothing in the interaction which bothered them. This leaves the author to conclude that the insistence was a cultural expectation (p. 234).

This particular study gives great insight into understanding Spanish refusals. Although this study is very helpful in this category, as García (1996) mentions, it is important to note that the results cannot be generalized to all Peruvian speakers and especially to all Spanish speakers. There are far too few participants, and many more

similar studies will have to be conducted regarding Spanish refusals in different contexts and by different groups of Spanish speakers. Also, more instruments could have been used in this study to better triangulate the results such as multiple-choice DCT.

Félix-Brasdefer (2006) conducted a study called “Linguistic Politeness in Mexico: Refusal Strategies among Male Speakers of Mexican Spanish. This is a very valuable study because not many studies have been conducted on Mexican pragmatics. In this investigation, the author indicates that the Brown and Levinson (1987) model is limited in its definition of politeness and image. For this reason he decided to use Scollon and Scollon’s (2001) politeness systems that analyzes involvement and independence. Scollon and Scollon (2001) define involvement as the need and right to be considered a normal and contributing member of society. There is an emphasis on common ground. On the other hand, independence is defined as emphasizing individuality. The author states that this model fits the Mexican notion of self in that it includes their collective membership as a group with their family and friends. He used 20 male University students from Tlaxcala, Mexico in order to study Spanish refusals. He conducted four different role-play situations in order to analyze the different strategies that accompany power and distance during an interaction. After the role-play situations were concluded, the participants listened to their own answers in order to comment on their perceptions of the encounter.

The results indicate that the participants used indirect strategies to negotiate the situation. It was also indicated that the participants preferred involvement rather than independence. Félix-Brasdefer (2006) comments specifically about the situation where the participants do not encounter a difference in distance or power as he states:

In the Birthday situation, various in-group identity markers and indirect strategies (e.g., reason/explanation, mitigated refusal, promise to comply, set condition for future acceptance) often modified a direct refusal, as shown in the interaction in (1): refusing a friend's invitation to attend a birthday party (p. 2168).

He says that in-group identity markers such as *hermano* (brother), *carnal* (bro), and *güey* (dude) show involvement with the interlocutor and camaraderie. Here, these identity markers put the participants on common ground. The participants also used pauses such as “este” to soften the refusal. In order to end the interaction, the participants often used such strategies as promises to comply and regret and apologies. Félix-Brasdefer (2006) explains the reason behind the promises to comply as he states:

The purpose of these indirect strategies is to promote negotiation of the refusal and to smooth the conversational interaction. By using promises to comply, the refuser chooses not to make any commitment to accept the invitation, although he may try to comply. In particular, the use of this face-saving strategy was often employed among these participants to strategically end the interaction politely, freeing the speaker from a direct response and leaving the possibility of an acceptance open to the interlocutor (p. 2171).

He also states that the participants felt the need to justify or give reasons for their refusals.

Félix-Brasdefer (2006) also indicates that a direct refusal was often accompanied by diminutives to express involvement with an interlocutor, and this increased levels of politeness in solidarity between equal-status friends. In the end, the participants of this study showed their desire to be involved more than their desire to independence.

In this investigation, Félix-Brasdefer only studied University students from Tlaxcala, Mexico. This is a very specific group of students, and the results cannot be generalized to all Mexicans. Taking this into account, it is important to note that the author of this current investigation is also studying university students. Therefore, the results from Félix-Brasdefer's study can more easily be compared with this current study. In terms of Félix-Brasdefer's study, some of the participants knew the interlocutors with which they had the interaction. This familiarity between the participants could have affected the results. To finalize, more research will have to be conducted regarding refusals and different Spanish speaking populations in order to better understand this speech act.

García (2007) conducted a study on how Argentines refuse an invitation. She based her findings according to Brown and Levinson's model (1978) and Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989). Her subjects consisted of 11 male and 11 female Argentines that were an average age of 23 years old. Their social background and education level varied. García conducted a role play where the interlocutor invited her friends individually to a special event. The subjects participated in a situation with low social distance and no power difference. The participants were told before the role play that they could not attend. The dialogue during the interactions was not scripted. García points out that during these interchanges between the participants, there were two distinct stages which include the response to the invitation and the response to the insistence.

García explains that refusing an invitation can be a face threatening act in that the invitee is threatening the inviter's positive face, or his desire to be liked or accepted. Therefore the Argentinean participants thought it was necessary to show respect or

deference to the invitee in the first invitation phase. She also indicates that 68% of the strategies used in the first invitation phase were deferential strategies such as expressing sorrow and apologies, disappointment, and negative ability to attend.

In the second stage, or the reaction to the insistence, the types of strategies used changed and only 44% were deference strategies whereas 56% were solidarity strategies such as expressing willingness to comply or suggesting an alternative. García indicates that by the inviter insisting and demonstrating solidarity, it is common to respond to the invitation with more solidarity. “Argentinean participants, just like Peruvian participants (García 1992), emphasized their friendly bonds by expressing willingness to comply, offering alternative/suggestion, offering to try, accepting alternative/suggestion...” (García, 2007, p. 560).

She also found that 30% of the participants accepted the invitation, 20% accepted the alternative that was given by the inviter, and 32% of the head acts showed a willingness to comply or expressed offers. García (1997) states, “That is, 82% of the strategies used were not refusals but rather acceptances or plans for another gathering” (p. 560). She is also quick to point out that this acceptance is not interpreted to mean that the invitee will attend the event and that both the invitee and the inviter expect the insistence to be accepted. In conclusion, the participants preferred to threaten their own needs rather than threaten the interlocutor’s needs.

Although this article is a great contribution to Spanish refusals, some caveats do need to be addressed. This study only tested the situation that involves low power and minimal social difference between the subjects. General assumptions cannot be made for all power situations such as a boss and an employee or two subjects with a larger social

difference such as two strangers sitting next to each other on a train. Also, the subjects had varying social classes and educational levels. Therefore, it is difficult to indicate if these variables could have affected the results. More studies will have to be conducted in order to generalize the results that were found such as comparing different social classes and power differences. Taking this information into consideration, it is important to note that the author of this current study is also studying refusals with low social difference and no power difference between the participants.

The Acquisition of Spanish Refusals

Few studies have been conducted on the acquisition of Spanish pragmatics and none have been carried out on the acquisition of refusals.

Koike (1989) investigated the pragmatic competence of beginning Spanish learners in a university setting. Specifically, Koike analyzed whether learners apply pragmatic knowledge from their native language to their second language focusing on the performance of speech acts in Spanish by native speakers of English. She conducted two separate experiments in this study. The first analyzed the pragmatic abilities of forty second-semester students of Spanish. The instructor read aloud three separate messages that included different requests. Students filled out a questionnaire in which they were required to identify the different requests and explain the elements that helped them to be identified. In the second experiment, data from twenty-seven first-semester Spanish students were analyzed in a production task. They were given two separate situations where they were asked to write how they would respond by making a request. Koike used a Chi Square analysis that showed that students are much more polite than impolite. She defines polite as being less explicit, such as making a suggestion or even giving a

hint, and polite as more explicit, or using a command. The results of these experiments indicated that learners can identify speech acts easily, but the production of these speech acts might not represent either L1 or L2 pragmatic structures. A limitation of this investigation is that only written responses were used in the experiments. Oral responses, such as role plays, would have produced more natural discourse and given a broader picture of the issue. Also, there was only one task used to analyze pragmatic production. Many different tasks need to be analyzed and compared so that their results can be triangulated. In addition, this study only looked at the acquisition of requests. Although this study did not analyze refusals, the information gained can be related to this current study when analyzing pragmatic transfer.

Teaching Spanish Refusals

As mentioned above, García (1996) proposed a teaching procedure for developing pragmatic competence in the realization of declining an invitation in Spanish by non-native speakers. She indicated that it is necessary to develop students' sociolinguistic competence in the classroom, and in order to accomplish this, these students must choose the correct frame of participation, the appropriate rules of politeness, and the specific speech act that is needed. García also indicated that declining an invitation is a face-threatening act because it can affect the listeners' desire to be liked and approved of. Therefore, she pointed out that deferential politeness strategies are generally used by Spanish speakers to avoid possibly offending the listener. Based on García's (1992) study on Peruvians, García (1996) points out a certain pattern used when inviting and declining an invitation: "invitation-refusal; insistence-(token) acceptance" (p. 271). In the invitation-refusal stage the pattern shows the person making the invitation down-

toning it, that is diminishing its importance and/or downplaying the occasion's elaborateness, and the person declining an invitation, mitigating the response using one or more of the following: mitigated refusal, expression of sorrow, indefinite reply, reason or excuse, expressing willingness to comply, promising future acceptance, along with other strategies (Garcia 1996, p. 271).

In order to incorporate these results into the classroom, García (1996) followed Olshtain and Cohen's (1991) and Di Pietro's (1987) teaching approach for presenting speech acts. García concluded that it is important that students develop awareness to sociocultural rules of language while learning a foreign tongue. García described the general foundations for declining/refusing an invitation in the Spanish speaking world, and also showed how to implement these strategies into the classroom curriculum using Olshtain and Cohen's (1991) five-step process. By the same token, she pointed out that not all Spanish-speaking cultures implement the same pragmatic strategies. Also, in her article she did not include any L2 studies of refusing an invitation. Therefore, it is necessary to implement a study on L2 students of Spanish and their ability to use different strategies when refusing an invitation.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) conducted an investigation to study the effectiveness of a given method on teaching pragmatics in the classroom. More specifically, he studied the use and instruction of mitigation in a Spanish classroom by non-native speakers. Félix-Brasdefer studied the effects of explicit instruction of lexical and syntactic mitigators in the classroom when performing refusals in Spanish. Mitigating involves softening, a statement that is potentially undesirable or face threatening. A few examples of mitigators include modal adverbs such as *maybe*, modal adjectives such as *possible*,

expressions of uncertainty such as *I'm not sure*, and tag question such as *is that correct?*. This author compared L1 and L2 usage of Spanish mitigation while giving refusals. A limitation of this study is that he only used Mexican refusals as the basis of his analysis. As different Spanish speaking countries and cultures have various ways of performing this same speech act, more studies should be conducted including data from different Spanish-speaking regions to form the native-speaker baseline for refusals instead of only including Mexican refusal strategies as the target strategies.

Félix-Brasdefer (2008) pointed out that previous studies had shown that L2 speakers of Spanish use much less mitigation when not instructed to do so than native speakers of Spanish. Also, even advanced learners of Spanish that have spent different amounts of time in the target culture have shown a lack in variety of syntactic mitigators.

In order to gauge L2 learners' abilities to use mitigation, Félix-Brasdefer studied two fifth-semester university groups. Both the control group and the experimental group contained sixteen students each. The control group was taught by a Chilean instructor, whereas the experimental group was taught by a Mexican instructor. The experimental group received explicit instruction on refusals and mitigation in Spanish whereas the control group did not. All participated in four role-play situations that were observed.

The results indicated that the experimental group incorporated more mitigation strategies than the control group. The experimental group was also able to retain these mitigating strategies in a delayed-posttest one month after instruction. Therefore, Félix-Brasdefer indicated the need to explicitly teach pragmatic strategies in the classroom.

Justification

As stated previously, a number of L1-based studies have been carried out on Spanish refusals. In addition, more and more studies have come to light analyzing the teaching of Spanish pragmatics in the classroom, but not much has been done on the acquisition of Spanish refusals in the classroom. To this author's knowledge, no study has been done comparing different levels of Spanish university students and their ability to carry out appropriate refusals. Hence, this research will explore the acquisition of pragmatics throughout the different course levels in a university setting so as to be able to create a more adequate teaching plan for acquiring Spanish pragmatic ability. This author will investigate the following research question:

Is there a significant effect of the level of Spanish of university L2 learners on their ability to carry out pragmatically appropriate refusals?

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects selected for this research will be university students who are studying Spanish 202 (intermediate Spanish), and 314 (advanced Spanish). Two classes from each course level were chosen. Data from twenty students from each course level for this cross-sectional study was compared (N=40). The age for these students was 18 years or older. The variable of gender was not controlled for in this study. Although there were different instructors used with various backgrounds, the results were not affected given that all the students had had different instructors in previous courses, and the instructors that participated in this study had been trained to follow a given procedure in the classroom.

The variable of experience with the L2 was controlled. Students that have one or more parents that speak Spanish or that have spoken Spanish in the home were eliminated from the study. Also, students that spent three weeks or more in a Spanish speaking country were eliminated from the study because this study is focused on the learning aspect that happens in the classroom setting opposed to that which is learned from native interactions. Also, intermediate students received some pragmatic instruction on refusals included from their current textbook whereas the advanced students' did not receive pragmatic instruction. More specifics regarding the textbooks will be discussed in a later section.

Instruments

To gather the appropriate information in this study, a discourse completion task was used.

The first part of the DCT includes six free-response questions. The students were given the particular situation and were asked to write out their best way of responding to the situations. These particular questions allow for the investigator to study the students qualitatively and quantitatively. For these particular questions, the students were also required to answer why they answered the way they did.

Ex. Un amigo le invita a usted a su casa para almorzar. Usted le dice que no es posible. Él insiste.

Usted le dice: _____

Why? _____

The second part of the discourse completion task is a ten question multiple choice test that investigates the pragmatic competence of refusals by Spanish language learners.

These multiple choice questions reflect situations between native Spanish speakers where the students had to choose the answer to the request with the response they consider most appropriate. Upon selecting their answer, students had to justify their choice. In this manner, this discourse not only detects if students know the appropriate way to respond in a particular situation but also the reasoning behind it. By including the *why* section to this multiple choice test, the answers the students give become much more valid.

Ex. Su amigo le invita a un baile esta noche pero usted tiene mucha tarea.

Usted le dice:

- a. Los bailes no son para mí. ¡Olvídate!
- b. Sí, voy a hacer todo lo posible para ir al baile.
- c. No quiero ir.
- d. Si tengo tiempo voy, si no, no.

Why? _____

There will also be several distractors added to the DCT. This type of task is very practical and replicable for future studies because discourse completion tasks allow the investigator to collect large amounts from many participants in a short period of time.

There is no physical interlocutor, and therefore, the participants can take the DCT at the same time. Also, there is no need to transcribe the responses from a recording.

Procedures

The sixteen question DCT was given to each student during normal class hours in their normally assigned classroom. The free-response section of the DCT was handed out first and had to be completed before they were given the multiple choice section. The author of this study did not want to give the students any ideas from the multiple choice

section that could be used to fill in the free-response section. In this manner, this study was able to analyze if the students can come up with their own appropriate responses and then, if they could choose the best answer from a list of possibilities. The students were given approximately 45 minutes to complete the task. This provided them enough time to think and describe the reasoning for their answers. The students were analyzed on their ability to choose/write out the most correct answer.

In this study, the author decided on an analytic deductive research method by carefully choosing beforehand the instruments to be used and the research question to be studied. The independent variable is the level of Spanish of the students. The dependent variables include the pragmatic (conceptual) competence (as measured by the multiple choice test and explanations of choices) and pragmatic production ability of the students (as measured by the open DCT). The author also chose to conduct a one-shot design or a research design that does not involve a pre or post-test; rather, it involves a cross-sectional look at several groups in one point in apparent time. Within this design, the two different levels of Spanish were compared and contrasted to analyze the effects of proficiency level on pragmatic ability. The one-shot design was time-effective in that the investigator was able to analyze the results of students at different points in apparent time without having to test the same students over a long period as they progressed from each level. Also, pragmatic competence is not learned over a few short treatments, and therefore, given the time restraints, this author believes that it is more advantageous to measure what students are learning as they progress through the different levels of Spanish than to measure their ability to retain a few quick lessons.

Data Analysis

As stated previously, the results found in the DCT were scored and analyzed by this author. The results from the free-response section were coded using Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management model which was categorized by *respecting the association principle* and the *face sensitivities*. After the different speech acts had been coded, they underwent difference of proportions tests to see if the respecting or threatening of the different principles is significant. The results from each section will be compared with each other and how closely they compare with a native Spanish Speaker.

Results and Discussion

The following provides examples of the different strategies that were used in the free-response section of the DCT to refuse the different types of invitation. Bold font indicates the particular strategies being used. The participants were labeled as PA and PI, which signifies advanced participant and intermediate participant. The responses from the students were not adjusted to correct their grammar, accents, or spelling, etc.

Sample Head Act Refusal Strategies

1. Offering alternative. Many participants offered an alternative to the invitation made by the interlocutor. This often included doing the same activity on a different date or time.

Sample 1: Offering alternative

PA73 No quiero ir al cine ahora pero **¿quieres ir conmigo la proxima semana**
cuando la película nueva está en el cine?

Translation

PA73 I don't want to go the theatre today but **do you want to come with me next week** when the new movie is in the theatre?

2. Expressing willingness to comply. Some participants accepted the invitation from the interlocutor.

Sample 2: Expressing willingness to comply

PI9 **Vale.** Pero la próxima vez vayamos dónde quiero ir.

Translation

PI9 **Okay,** but next time let's go where I want to go.

3. Suggesting others comply. Two participants suggested that the interlocutor or a third party should attend the event.

Sample 3: Suggesting others comply

PA73 Tú sabes que no me gusta la música que te gusta. Quiero descansar en mi casa pero **tu debes invitar Becky** porque yo sé que ella quiere ir a un concierto contigo.

Translation

PA73 You know that I don't like the music you like. I want to rest in my house but **you should invite Becky** because I know that she wants to go to a concert with you.

4. Apologizing. It was common for the participants to refuse the situation by expressing their sorrow for not being able to comply.

Sample 4: Apologizing

PA71 **Lo siento** pero mi madre me dijo que tenga que limpiar mi cuarto antes de poder a pasar un rato con amigos.

Translation

PA71 **I'm sorry** but my mom told me that I have to clean my room before being able spend time with friends.

5. Grounder. Participants often avoided using a direct refusal by providing a reason or explanation.

Sample 5: Grounder

PA59 Amiga, **no tengo suficiente dinero para pagar para un boleto de avión a Nueva York.**

Translation

PA59 Friend, **I don't have enough money to pay for a plane ticket to New York.**

6. Requesting information. One participant responded to the invitation by asking for the time of the activity.

Sample 6: Requesting information

PI20 **¿a qué hora está el concierto?**

Translation

PI20 **What time is the concert?**

7. Consulting with a third party. One participant responded by saying they would need to consult their parents.

Sample 7: Consulting with a third party

PI13 No me gusta mucho Nueva York. Pero su insiten. **Necesito hablan con mis padres y luego de dicho sus respuestas.**

Translation

PI13 I don't like New York very much. But if you insist. **I need to talk to my parents and I'll tell you their answer later.**

8. Negative ability. It was common for the participants to refuse the invitation by stating that they were unable to comply.

Sample 8: Negative ability

PI13 **No puedo ir a su partido** porque esta muy temprano y practico voleibol en la hora misma.

Translation

PI13 **I can't go to your game** because it's very early and I practice volleyball at the same time.

9. Direct refusal. Many participants directly stated that they would not comply with the invitation.

Sample 9: Direct refusal

PI25 **No**, pero gracias. Quiero mirar una película nueva llame Ender's Game, pero no está en el cine hasta que la próxima semana.

Translation

PI25 **No**, but thanks. I want to watch a new movie called Ender's Game, but it isn't the theatre until next week.

10. Indirect refusal. A few participants indicated that they didn't believe that they would comply with the invitation.

Sample 10: Indirect refusal

PA58 Gracias, me gusta fútbol pero hoy, **yo pienso que dorma.**

Translation

PA58 Thanks, I like soccer but today, **I think I will sleep.**

Sample Supporting Move Refusal Strategies

1. Desire without complying. Some participants softened their refusal by stating their desire to comply with the invitation.

Sample 1: Desire without complying

PA54 **Me encantaría estudiar con ustedes,** pero no puedo estudiar con otros.
Necesito estar en un cuarto silencio. Sin embargo, debemos ir al
restaurante despues el exámen.

Translation

PA54 **I would love to study with you,** but I can't study with others. I need to
be in a quiet room. Nevertheless, we should go to the restaurant after the
exam.

2. Gratitude. Some participants expressed that they were grateful for being invited.

Sample 2: Gratitude

PI25 **Gracias** pero no puedo estudiar bien con otras personas, es un distracción
para mí, lo siento.

Translation

PI25 **Thanks** but I can't study well with other people, it's a distraction to me,
sorry.

3. Apologizing. Some participants softened their refusal by saying that they were sorry.

Sample 3: Apologizing

PA71 Estoy muy enferma entonces, no pienso que puedo ir al concierto contigo.
¡Lo siento!

Translation

PA71 I am very sick so, I don't think I can go the concert with you. **I'm sorry!**

4. Well wishing. A few participants expressed their desire for the interlocutor to have a nice time at the activity.

Sample 4: Well wishing

PA73 No puedo ir porque el partido es muy temprano pero **espero que tu tengas un tiempo bueno.**

Translation

PA73 I can't go because the game is very early but **I hope you have a good time.**

5. Positive opinion. Some participants expressed their enthusiasm or support for the activity.

Sample 5: Positive opinion

PI17 Sí estará muy divertido, **no puedo espera!**

Translation

PI17 Yes it will be very fun, **I can't wait!**

6. Grounder. Many participants supported their decision by giving reasons or explanations.

Sample 6: Grounder

PI20 Me encanta ir pero no puedo ir por que **mi clase de español terminé al las diez y el partido empieza a las seis.**

Translation

PI20 I would love to go but I can't go because **my Spanish class ends at ten and the game starts at six.**

7. Requesting information. A few students asked for more details to aid their response.

Sample 7: Requesting information

PA73 **¿Por qué tenemos que ir a Nueva York?** Yo quiero ir a Los Angeles, es más divertido que Nueva York.

Translation

PA73 **Why do we have to go to New York?** I want to go to Los Angeles, It's more fun than New York.

8. Making conditions for acceptance. In some instances, participants stated some conditions for accepting the invitation.

Sample 8: Making conditions for acceptance

PA72 Yo voy **si alguien paga para mí.**

Translation

PA72 I'll go **if someone pays for me.**

9. Negative ability. Some participants supported their initial refusal by expressing that they were unable to comply.

Sample 9: Negative ability

PI37 No gracias. **No puedo ir.**

Tranlsation

PI37 No thanks. **I can't go.**

Free-Response Results and Findings

As stated previously, the participants answered six free-response questions for the first part of the DCT. In three of the situations, they were asked to respond to an invitation. In the other three instances, they were asked to respond to the insistence of an invitation. Although the six situations were similar involving interactions with friends, the outcomes or tendencies of the participants were different in each situation and therefore, it will be necessary to analyze them separately and then together as a whole.

The strategies the participants used, as shown above, were divided into head acts and supporting moves. Head Act strategies will be discussed first. Utilizing Spencer-Oatey's (2005) model of the association principle, the strategies of offering alternative, expressing willingness to comply, and suggesting others comply have been classified as respecting the involvement component because they show the participants' desire to interact and be part of the social group. Apologizing has been grouped in the empathy component because this strategy was used to show the concern of the participants for the interlocutor when they were not going to comply with the given invitation. Using a grounder, requesting information, and consulting with a third party were grouped in the respect component as the participants used these strategies to soften the potential harm a direct refusal could cause the interlocutor. The strategies of negative ability, direct refusal, and indirect refusal were classified as undermining the involvement component

because in these cases, the participants clearly rejected the opportunity to be involved with and associate with others.

Regarding supporting moves, desire without complying was classified under the involvement component because the participants illustrated their desire to associate with the interlocutor. Gratitude, apologizing, well wishing, and positive opinion were categorized under the empathy component because of the participants' concern and wellbeing of the interlocutor. The strategies of a grounder, requesting information, and making conditions for acceptance were classified under the respect component because of the participants' desire to be respectful to the interlocutor when mitigating the response. Concerning the supporting moves, only negative ability undermined the association principle, and more specifically the involvement component, for the inability to show a desire to associate with others.

Situation 1. The first situation on the DCT involves responding to an insistence to eat lunch at a friend's house:

1. Un amigo lo(a) invita a usted a su casa para almorzar. Usted le dice que no le es posible. Él insiste.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

1. A friend invites you to his house to eat lunch. You tell him that it is not possible. He insists.

You tell him:

Why?

Table 1 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the first situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 1

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:

Situation 1

	INTER		ADV	
	N	%	n	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	3	13	6	24
b. Expressing willingness to comply	3	13		
c. Suggesting others comply				
Subtotal	6	26	6	24
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	5	20	11	44
Subtotal	5	20	11	44
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	3	13		
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	3	13	0	0
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	14	59	17	68
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	8	33	5	20
b. Direct refusal	2	8	3	12
c. Indirect refusal				
Subtotal	10	41	8	32
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	10	41	8	32
Total # of Head Acts	24	56	25	51
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association				

Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	1	5	2	8
Subtotal	1	5	2	8
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	1	5	1	4
b. Apologizing	2	10	2	8
c. Well wishing				
d. Positive opinion				
Subtotal	3	16	3	13
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	12	63	11	46
b. Request Information				
c. Making conditions for acceptance				
Subtotal	12	63	11	46
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	16	84	16	67

D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	3	16	8	33
Subtotal	3	16	8	33
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	3	16	8	33
Total # of Supporting Moves	19	44	24	49
Total # of Strategies	43		49	

Intermediate participants' results.

Head acts. The intermediate students responded to the first question of the DCT with 59% (14) of their head act strategies respecting the association component and 41% (10) undermining this same component. In regard to the strategies respecting the association principle, 26% (6) respected the involvement component, 20% (5) respected the empathy component, and 13% (3) respected the respect component. Ten strategies (24%) undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. As for the supporting moves, 84% (16) respected the association principle and 16% (3) undermined the association principle. One strategy (5%) respected the involvement component, three strategies (16%) respected the empathy component, and twelve strategies (63%) respected the respect component. Three strategies (16%) undermined the involvement component.

Of the total strategies used, 56% (24) were head acts and 44% (19) were supporting moves. Also, 70% (30) of the total strategies used respected the association principle and 30% (13) undermined it.

Advanced students' results.

Head acts. For the advanced students regarding head acts, 68% (17) of the strategies respected the association principle and 32% (8) undermined the association principle. Of the strategies that respected the association principle, 24% (6) respected the involvement component, 44% (11) respected the empathy component and 0% (0) respected the respect component. Twelve strategies (32%) undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. Concerning the supporting moves, 67% (16) of the strategies respected the association principle and 33% (8) undermined it. Two strategies (8%) respected the involvement component, 3 strategies (13%) respected the empathy component, and 11 strategies (46%) respected the respect component, while 8 strategies (33%) undermined the involvement component.

Of the total strategies used, 51% (25) were head acts and 49% (24) were supporting moves. Also, 67% (33) of the total number of strategies respected the association principle and 33% (16) undermined it.

Compared results. There are some key results that the author would like to point out when comparing these two levels on this first DCT question involving a friend's insistence to eat lunch at his house. First, the intermediate level students expressed willingness to comply in 13% of their head acts whereas the advanced level students did not express a willingness to comply in any of their strategies. As stated earlier, García (1992) has found that it is very common to accept an invitation after an insistence whether the invitee plans on attending or not. Also, the advanced students apologized in 44% of their head acts while the intermediate students only apologized in 20% of their head acts.

In terms of head acts that undermined the association principle, the intermediate students used eight strategies of negative ability and two strategies of direct refusals, whereas the advanced students used five negative ability strategies and 3 direct refusal strategies. In total, the intermediate students undermined the association principle in 41% of their head acts and the advanced students undermined it in 32% of their strategies. In contrast, of the supporting moves that undermined the association principle, the intermediate students only used negative ability strategies 3 times and the advanced students used 8 negative ability strategies. In terms of supporting moves that undermined the association principle, the intermediate students used these strategies 16% of the time whereas the advanced students used these strategies 33% of the time.

Situation 2. The second situation asks for a response for an invitation to go to a movie with a friend.

2. Usted quiere ir al cine la próxima semana porque no deseas hacerlo hoy. Su amigo le invita a ir al cine hoy.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

2. You want to go to the movies next week because you don't want to do it today. Your friend invites you to the movies today.

You tell him/her:

Why?

Table 2 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the second situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 2

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:
Situation 2

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	n	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	14	45	10	38
b. Expressing willingness to comply			3	12
c. Suggesting others comply				
Subtotal	14	45	13	50
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	1	3	1	4
Subtotal	1	3	1	4
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	3	10	6	23
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	3	10	6	23
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the	18	58	20	27

Association Principle

B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	6	19	2	8
b. Direct refusal	7	23	4	15
c. Indirect refusal				
Subtotal	13	42	6	23
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	13	42	6	23
Total # of Head Acts	31	72	26	63

C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	1	8	1	7
Subtotal	1	8	1	7
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	3	25	1	7
b. Apologizing	1	8		
c. Well wishing				
d. Positive opinion				
Subtotal	4	33	1	7
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	5	42	12	80
b. Request Information			1	6
c. Making conditions for acceptance				
Subtotal	5	42	13	86
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	10	83	15	100

D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	2	17		
Subtotal	2	17		
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	2	17	0	0
Total # of Supporting Moves	12	28	15	37
Total # of Strategies	43		41	

Intermediate Students' results.

Head acts. In this situation, the intermediate students used 58% (18) of their head act strategies respecting the association principle and 42% (13) of their head act strategies undermining the association principle. Of those that respected this principle, 45% (14) respected the involvement component, 3% (1) respected the empathy component, and 10% (3) respected the respect component, while 42% (13) undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. Of the supporting moves, 58% (18) respected the association principle whereas 42% (13) of the strategies undermined it. Of those respecting the association, 45% (14) were for involvement, 3% (1) were for empathy and 10% (3) were for respect, while 17% (2) were undermining the involvement component.

As a whole, 72% (31) of the strategies were head acts and 28% (12) were supporting moves. Of total number of strategies, 65% (28) respected the association principle and 35% (15) undermined the association principle.

Advanced students' results.

Head Acts. In the second situation, the advanced students used 77% (20) of their head acts respected the association principle and 23% (6) undermined it. When considering the strategies used to respect the association principle, 38% (10) respected the involvement component, 4% (1) respected the empathy component, and 23% (6) respected the respect component. There were 6 strategies (23%) that undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. The advanced students used 100% (15) of their strategies to respect the association principle. Of those strategies, 7% (1) respected the involvement

component, 7% (1) respected the empathy component, and 86% (13) respected the respect component.

In total, 63% (26) of the strategies were head acts and 37% (15) were supporting moves. Of these strategies, 85% (35) respected the association principle and 15% (6) undermined it.

Compared results. In this second situation, where a friend replies to an invitation to go to a movie, we see the intermediate and advanced students using many more strategies of offering an alternative. The intermediate students used more head acts offering alternatives with 45%, whereas the advanced students used 38% of their head acts offering alternatives. In contrast, the advanced students used 12% of their head acts expressing willingness to comply, and the intermediate students did not use any of these strategies, which is a flip from the first situation.

Concerning the head acts that undermined the association principle, the intermediate students used negative ability for 19% of their strategies and direct refusals for 23% (a total of 42%), while the advanced students only used 8% negative ability and 15% direct refusal (a total of 23%). Also, of the supporting moves used, the intermediate students used 17% to undermine the association principle and the advanced students did not use any. In this situation of an invitation to a movie, the intermediate students were much more likely than the advanced students to undermine the association principle.

Situation 3. The third situation asks for a response to some friends' continuing insistence on studying together for finals.

3. Unos amigos se van a reunir para estudiar para los exámenes finales. Usted sabe que no va a ir porque no puede estudiar bien con otras personas. Ellos siguen insistiendo que usted vaya.

Usted les dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

3. Some friends are going to get together to study for finals. You know that you are not going to go because you don't study well with others. They continue insisting that you go.

You tell them:

Why?

Table 3 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the third situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 3

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:
Situation 3

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	N	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative			1	4
b. Expressing willingness to comply	1	5	1	4
c. Suggesting others comply			1	4
Subtotal	1	5	3	12
2. Empathy component				

a. Apologizing	5	23	4	17
Subtotal	5	23	4	17
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	6	27	10	42
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	6	27	10	42
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	12	55	17	71

B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	1	4	1	4
b. Direct refusal	9	41	6	25
c. Indirect refusal				
Subtotal	10	45	7	29
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	10	45	7	29
Total # of Head Acts	22	52	24	51

C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	1	5	2	9
Subtotal	1	5	2	9
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	2	10	1	4
b. Apologizing	1	5	2	9
c. Well wishing	1	5	1	4
d. Positive opinion			1	4
Subtotal	4	20	5	21
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	14	70	15	65
b. Request Information				
c. Making conditions for acceptance	1	5		
Subtotal	15	75	15	65
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	20	100	22	95

D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability			1	5
Subtotal			1	5
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	0	0	1	5

Association Principle				
Total # of Supporting Moves	20	48	23	49
Total # of Strategies	42		47	

Intermediate students' results.

Head acts. During this third situation, the advanced students used 55% (12) of their head act strategies respecting the association principle and 45% (10) of their head act strategies undermining it. Of those that respected the association principle, 5% (1) were for the involvement component, 23% (5) were for the empathy component, and 27% (6) were for the respect component while 45% (10) of the head acts undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. As for the supporting moves, 100% (20) of the strategies respected the association principle which included 5% (1) that respected the involvement component, 20% (4) that respected the empathy component and 75% (15) that respected the respect component.

Of the total strategies used, 52% (22) were head acts and 48% (20) were supporting moves, and 76% (32) of these strategies respected the association principle while 24% (10) undermined the association principle.

Advanced students' results.

Head acts. For the advanced students' usage of head acts in the third situation, 71% (17) respected the association principle and 29% (7) undermined it. The involvement component was respected in 12% (3) of the strategies, the empathy component in 17% (4) of the strategies, and the respect component in 42% (10) of the strategies. The involvement component was undermined in 29% (7) of the strategies.

Supporting moves. With the supporting moves, 95% (22) respected the association principle and 5% (1) undermined it. The involvement component was respected in 9% (2) of the strategies, the empathy component in 21% (5), and the respect component in 65% (15). The involvement component was undermined in 5% (1) of the strategies.

In total, 51% (24) were head acts and 49% (23) were supporting moves, and 83% (39) of all the strategies respected the association principle where as 17% (8) undermined it.

Compared results. The third situation involves a few friends' continuing insistence to study together for finals. This situation achieved different results from the previous two situations. First, no intermediate students offered an alternative to this situation and only one expressed willingness to comply. Only 1 advanced student offered an alternative, and one expressed willingness to comply. This is very interesting given the fact that the friends continued insisting. The intermediate students used 23% of their head acts apologizing and 27% using grounders, and the advanced students used 17% of their strategies apologizing and 42% as grounders.

In terms of strategies that undermined the association principle, the intermediate students had 41% of their strategies as direct refusals and the advanced students had 6% of their strategies as direct refusals. In total, the intermediate students undermined the association principle in 45% of the strategies and advanced students in 29% of their strategies. Considering supporting moves, 70% of intermediate students' strategies were grounders and 65% for the advanced students. In this situation with multiple people continuing to insist, both the intermediate and advanced students used grounders, or

excuses and reasons for not wanting to attend rather than accepting the invitation or offering an alternative. A token acceptance would have been more likely after the continuing insistence. Garcia (1992) says, “In the same way, not accepting it would be considered an offense, a snub” (p. 234). This situation with the continuing insistence clearly illustrates that neither the intermediate nor the advanced students understand the Spanish pragmatic norms of refusing an invitation.

Situation 4. The fourth situation requires a response to an invitation to attend a soccer game with a friend.

4. Un amigo lo(a) invita a su partido de fútbol. Usted no quiere ir porque el partido empieza muy temprano.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

4. A friend invites you to a football game. You don't want to go because the game starts very early.

You tell him/her:

Why?

Table 4 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the fourth situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 4

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:
Situation 4

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	N	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	2	10	3	14
b. Expressing willingness to comply	1	5	2	9
c. Suggesting others comply				
Subtotal	3	15	5	23
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	2	9	3	13
Subtotal	2	9	3	13
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	2	9	7	32
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	2	9	7	32
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	7	33	15	68
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	5	24	2	9
b. Direct refusal	9	43	2	9
c. Indirect refusal			3	13
Subtotal	14	67	7	32
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	14	67	7	32
Total # of Head Acts	21	47	22	48
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	1	4	1	4
Subtotal	1	4	1	4
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	2	8	4	17
b. Apologizing	2	8	1	4
c. Well wishing			1	4
d. Positive opinion				
Subtotal	4	16	6	25
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	16	67	14	58

b. Request Information			1	4
c. Making conditions for acceptance			1	4
Subtotal	16	67	16	66
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	21	87	23	95
D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	3	13	1	5
Subtotal	3	13	1	5
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	3	13	1	5
Total # of Supporting Moves	24	53	24	52
Total # of Strategies	45		46	

Intermediate students' results.

Head acts. Of the head acts performed by the intermediate students in the fourth situation, 33% (7) respected the association principle and 67% (14) undermined this principle. Of the strategies that respected it, 15% (3) were involvement strategies, 9% (2) were empathy strategies, and 9% (2) were respect strategies. The involvement component was undermined in 67% (14) of the strategies.

Supporting moves. The supporting moves respected the association principle in 87% (21) of the strategies and undermined it in 13% (3) of the strategies, and of those that respected the association principle, 4% (1) were grouped in the involvement component, 16% (4) were grouped in the empathy component and 67% (16) were grouped in the respect component, while 13% (3) undermined the involvement component.

Considering the total number of strategies used, 47% (21) were head acts and 53% (24) were supporting moves. Of this total amount, 62% (38) respected the association principle and 38% (17) undermined it.

Advanced students' results

Head acts. The advanced students used 68% (15) of their head act strategies to respect the association principle and 32% (7) to undermine it. Of the strategies that respected the association principle, 23% (5) were for the involvement component, 13% (3) were for the empathy component, and 32% (7) were for the respect component, whereas 32% (7) undermined this principle.

Supporting moves. Considering the supporting moves, 95% (23) respected the association principle and 5% (1) undermined it. The involvement component was respected in 4% (1) of the strategies, the empathy component in 25% (6) of the strategies, and the respect component in 66% (16) of the strategies, while the involvement component was undermined in 5% (1) of the strategies.

The head acts equaled 48% (22) of the strategies, and the supporting moves equaled 52% (24) of the strategies used. Of the total number of strategies used, 83% (38) respected the association principle and 17% (8) undermined it.

Compared results. In the fourth situation involving a friend's invitation to a soccer game, there were not many head acts used that respected the involvement component for the intermediate and the advanced students. For example, only 10% of the intermediate students' head acts offer an alternative and 5% express willingness to comply. For the advanced students 14% offer an alternative and 9% express willingness to comply.

In terms of undermining the involvement component of the association principle, 24% of the intermediate students' head acts express negative ability and 43% express a direct refusal. On the other hand, only 9% of the advanced students' head acts express negative ability and 9% express direct refusal. When considering supporting moves, each level used a high percentage of grounders, or 67% for the intermediate students and 58% for the advanced students.

Situation 5. In the fifth situation, students are asked to respond to a friend's invitation to attend a concert.

5. Su amigo va a dar un concierto y quiere que usted vaya. Usted quiere descansar en su casa en vez de ir.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

5. Your friend is going to give a concert and wants you to go. You want to rest in your house instead of going.

You tell him/her:

Why?

Table 5 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the fifth situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 5

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:
Situation 5

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	N	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	1	5	1	5
b. Expressing willingness to comply	4	21	2	9
c. Suggesting others comply			1	5
Subtotal	5	26	4	19
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	3	16	3	14
Subtotal	3	16	3	14
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	6	32	9	43
b. Requesting Information	1	5		
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	7	37	9	43
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	15	79	16	76
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	3	16	1	5
b. Direct refusal	1	5	3	14
c. Indirect refusal			1	5
Subtotal	4	21	5	24
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	4	21	5	24
Total # of Head Acts	19	54	21	50
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	3	19	1	5
Subtotal	3	19	1	5
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude				
b. Apologizing	1	6	3	14
c. Well wishing				
d. Positive opinion	1	6	3	14
Subtotal	2	12	6	28
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	9	56	13	62

b. Request Information	1	6		
c. Making conditions for acceptance				
Subtotal	10	62	13	62
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	15	93	20	95
D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	1	7	1	5
Subtotal	1	7	1	5
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	1	7	1	5
Total # of Supporting Moves	16	46	21	50
Total # of Strategies	35		42	

Intermediate students' results.

Head acts. In the fifth situation, the intermediate students used 79% (15) of their head acts to respect the association principle and 21% (4) to undermine it. They respected the association principle by respecting the involvement component 26% (5) of the time, the empathy component 16% (3) of the time, and the respect component 37% (7) of the time, while undermining the involvement component 21% (4) of the time.

Supporting moves. Of the supporting moves, 93% (15) respected the association principle and 7% (1) undermined it, and of those that respected it, 19% (3) were involvement strategies, 12% (2) were empathy strategies, and 62% (10) were respect strategies. There was one strategy (7%) that undermined the involvement component.

Of the total strategies used, 54% (19) were head acts and 46% (16) were supporting moves, which included 86% (30) that respected the association principle and 14% (5) that undermined it.

Advanced students' results

Head Acts. The advanced students used 76% (16) of their head acts to respect the association principle and 24% (5) to undermine it. The strategies that respected the association principle included 19% (4) from the involvement component, 14% (3) from the empathy component, and 43% (9) from the respect component. In contrast, 24% (5) of the head acts undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. The supporting move strategies included 95% (20) that respected the association principle and 5% (1) that undermined it. Of the strategies that respected this principle, there were 5% (1) in favor of the involvement component, 28% (6) in favor of the empathy component, and 62% (13) in favor of the respect component in contrast with one strategy (5%) that undermined the principle.

Considering all the strategies, 50% (21) were head acts and 50% (21) were supporting moves, and of the total strategies, 86% (36) respected the association principle and 14% (6) undermined it.

Compared results. In this fifth situation of a friend's invitation to his concert, 21% of the intermediate students' head acts expressed willingness to comply, whereas only 9% of the advanced students expressed willingness to comply. Both used a high percentage of grounders as head acts, or 32% for the intermediate students and 43% for the advanced students. Both groups used a similar percentage of strategies that undermined the association principle at 21% for the intermediate students and 24% for the advanced students. This situation produced some of the lowest numbers for strategies that undermined the association principle which could be due to the fact that a friend is giving a concert which could be considered more personal or meaningful than going

together to watch a soccer game or going to a movie. Therefore, the author believes that this context had a definite effect on the on the results for both the intermediate and the advanced students.

Considering the supporting moves, 19% of the intermediate students' strategies expressed a desire without complying, or in other words, explained that they wished they could attend, whereas 5% of the advanced students expressed this desire. On the other hand, 14% of the advanced students' strategies expressed positive opinion and only 6% for the intermediate students. Each group only had one student undermine the association principle by using a negative ability as a supporting move. Both respected the association principle with 86% of the total strategies and undermined it in 14% of the total strategies used.

Situation 6. The participants responded to an insistence to visit New York with some friends.

6. Para las vacaciones, unos amigos lo(a) invitan a usted a ir a Nueva York. Usted no quiere ir a Nueva York, pero sus amigos insisten.

Usted les dice:

¿Por qué?

Translation

6. For vacation, some friends invite you to go to New York. You don't want to go to New York, but your friends insist.

You tell them:

Why?

Table 6 shows the intermediate and advanced students' strategies for refusing an invitation in the sixth situation of the free-response section. The responses are categorized as head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 6

Strategies used when refusing an invitation:
Situation 6

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	N	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	2	10	1	4
b. Expressing willingness to comply	5	25	3	14
c. Suggesting others comply				
Subtotal	7	35	4	18
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing			1	4
Subtotal			1	4
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	6	30	11	50
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party	1	5		
Subtotal	7	35	11	50
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	14	70	16	72
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability			1	5
b. Direct refusal	6	30	5	23
c. Indirect refusal				
Subtotal	6	30	6	28
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	6	30	6	28
Total # of Head Acts	20	56	22	54
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association				

Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying			1	5
Subtotal			1	5
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	1	6		
b. Apologizing	2	13	2	11
c. Well wishing			1	5
d. Positive opinion	1	6		
Subtotal	4	25	3	16
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	10	62	13	68
b. Request Information	1	6	1	5
c. Making conditions for acceptance	1	6	1	5
Subtotal	12	75	15	79
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	16	100	19	100

D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability				
Subtotal				
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	0		0	
Total # of Supporting Moves	16	44	19	46
Total # of Strategies	36		41	

Intermediate students' results.

Head acts. In the sixth situation, the intermediate students used 70% (14) of their head acts to respect the association principle and 30% (6) of their head acts to undermine it. In terms of respecting this principle, 35% (7) were involvement strategies, and 35% (7) were respect strategies while 30% (6) of the strategies undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. Concerning the supporting moves, 100% (16) of the strategies respected the association principle, which included 25% (4) of the strategies respecting the empathy component and 75% (12) respecting the respect component.

Of the total strategies used, 56% (20) were head acts and 44% (16) were supporting moves, and 83% (30) of these strategies respected the association principle while 17% (6) undermined it.

Advanced students' results.

Head acts. The advanced students utilized 72% (16) of their head acts to respect the association principle and 28% (6) to undermine it, which included 18% (4) that respected the involvement component, 4% (1) that respected the empathy component, 50% (11) that respected the respect component, and 28% (6) that undermined the involvement component.

Supporting moves. As for the supporting moves, 100% (19) respected the association principle, including 5% (1) for the involvement component, 16% (3) for the empathy component, and 79% (15) for the respect component.

Considering all the strategies used, 54% (22) were head acts and 46% (19) supporting moves, whereas 85% (35) respected the association principle and 15% (6) undermined it.

Compared results.

The sixth situation involves a few friends' insistence to visit New York. Here, the intermediate students express willingness to comply in 25% of their head acts and the advanced students in only 14% of their head acts. Although the situation indicated that there was an insistence to the invitation, only 18% of the advanced students' head acts

respected the involvement component, and in contrast, 35% respected it from the intermediate students. The advanced students used grounders for 50% of their head acts, and the intermediate students used grounders for 30% of their head acts.

Both groups used six strategies that undermined the association principle, which include 30% direct refusals for the intermediate students and 23% for the advanced students. Both groups also used many grounders for supporting moves, or 62% for the intermediate students and 68% for the advanced students. Neither group undermined the association principle using supporting moves.

Invitation vs. insistence compared. When studying invitations, it is also very important and necessary to study what effect the insistence has on the response. The free-response section of the DCT was purposefully constructed to have three situations with invitations and three situations with an insistence to the invitation. The following will analyze the combined results of the invitation and the insistence. It is important to note that the word *increase* in this section denotes that there are more particular strategies used in the situations with an insistence than the situations without an insistence, and the word *decrease* denotes that there are less particular strategies used in the situations with an insistence than without an insistence.

Table 7 compares the advanced students' results of the three situations without an insistence with the three strategies that include an insistence (No Insist.= No insistence and W/ Insist.= with an insistence). These strategies are broken down into head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 7

Advanced strategies with and without an insistence

	No Insist.		W/ Insist.	
	n	%	n	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	8	11	14	20
b. Expressing willingness to comply	4	6	7	10
c. Suggesting others comply	1	1	1	2
Subtotal	13	18	22	32
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	16	22	7	10
Subtotal	16	22	7	10
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	21	30	22	32
b. Requesting Information				
c. Consulting with a third party				
Subtotal	21	30	22	32
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	50	70	51	74
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	7	10	5	7
b. Direct refusal	14	20	9	13
c. Indirect refusal			4	6
Subtotal	21	30	18	26
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	21	30	18	26
Total # of Head Acts	71	52	69	53
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	5	7	3	5
Subtotal	5	7	3	5
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	2	3	5	8
b. Apologizing	6	9	3	5
c. Well wishing	2	3	1	2
d. Positive opinion	1	2	4	7
Subtotal	11	17	13	22
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	39	89	39	65

b. Request Information	1	1	2	3
c. Making conditions for acceptance	1	2	1	2
Subtotal	41	62	42	70
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	57	86	58	97
D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	9	14	2	3
Subtotal	9	14	2	3
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	9	14	2	3
Total # of Supporting Moves	66	48	60	47
Total # of Strategies	137		129	

Advanced students' results.

Head acts. When considering the advanced students' responses, 70% (50) of the head acts respected the association principle in the non-insistence situations and 74% (51) with the insistence situations, whereas 30% (21) undermined it in the non-insistence situations and 26% (18) undermined it in the insistence situations. Considering the different components of the association principle, 18% (13) respected the involvement component, 22% (16) respected the empathy component, and 30% (21) respected the respect component in the situations without an insistence, whereas 32% (22) respected the involvement component, 10% (7) the empathy component, and 32% (22) the respect component in the insistence situations.

Looking more closely, the advanced students offered an alternative 11% (8) of the time where there was no insistence and 20% (14) of the time when there was an insistence. They also expressed willingness to comply 6% (4) of the time with no insistence and 10% (7) of the time when an insistence was given. They also apologized

less when insisted upon, 10% (7) in comparison to 22% (16). They also used almost the exact same number of grounders, 30% (21) without an insistence and 32% (22) with an insistence. The advanced students responded with a direct refusal with 10% (7) of the strategies with no insistence and 7% (5) of the strategies with an insistence. They used direct refusals 20% (14) of the time with no insistence and 13% (9) of the time with an insistence. They also only used indirect refusals when insisted on with 6% (4) of their strategies.

Supporting moves. The advanced students used supporting moves to respect the association principle in 86% (57) of the strategies in situations without an insistence and 97% (58) in situations with an insistence. In contrast, there were 14% (9) of the strategies that undermined the association principle without an insistence and 3% (2) with an insistence, and more specifically, they undermined the involvement component.

Table 8 compares the intermediate students' results of the three situations without an insistence with the three strategies that include an insistence (No Insist.= No insistence and W/ Insist.= with an insistence). These strategies are broken down into head acts and supporting moves that either respect or undermine the association principle.

Table 8

Intermediate strategies with and without an insistence

	No Insist.		W/ Insist.	
	n	%	n	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	5	7	17	24
b. Expressing willingness to comply	9	14	5	7

c. Suggesting others comply				
Subtotal	14	21	22	31
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	10	15	6	8
Subtotal	10	15	6	8
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	15	23	11	16
b. Requesting Information			1	1
c. Consulting with a third party	1	2		
Subtotal	16	25	12	17
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	40	61	40	56

B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	9	13	14	20
b. Direct refusal	17	26	17	24
c. Indirect refusal				
Subtotal	26	39	31	44
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	26	39	31	44
Total # of Head Acts	66	55	71	58

C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle

1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	2	4	5	9
Subtotal	2	4	5	9
2. Empathy component				
a. Gratitude	4	7	5	9
b. Apologizing	5	9	4	8
c. Well wishing	1	2		
d. Positive opinion	1	2	1	2
Subtotal	11	20	10	19
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	36	65	30	58
b. Request Information	1	2	1	2
c. Making conditions for acceptance	2	4		
Subtotal	39	71	31	60
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	52	95	46	88

D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle

1. Involvement component

a. Negative ability	3	5	6	12
Subtotal	3	5	6	12
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	3	5	6	12
Total # of Supporting Moves	55	45	52	42
Total # of Strategies	121		123	

Intermediate students' results.

Head Acts. The intermediate students used 61% (40) of their head acts to respect the association principle in the situations without insistences and 56% (40) in the insistence situations. In contrast, they undermined the association principle with 39% (26) of their head acts in situations without insistences and 44% (31) in insistence situations. Within the association principle, they respected the involvement component in 21% (14) of the strategies, the empathy component in 15% (10) of the strategies, and the respect component in 25% (16) of the strategies with the absence of an insistence. In comparison with the insistence situations, they respected the involvement component in 31% (22) of the strategies, the empathy component in 8% (6) of the strategies, and the respect component in 17% (12) of the strategies.

Looking at these results more closely, the intermediate students offered an alternative in 7% (5) of their head acts during the non-insistence situations and 24% (17) of their strategies during the insistence strategies. They expressed willingness to comply 14% (9) of the time without an insistence and 7% (5) of the time with an insistence. They apologized in 15% (10) of the strategies without an insistence and 8% (6) of the time with an insistence. Also, 23% (15) of the strategies were grounders without an insistence and only 16% (11) with an insistence. The intermediate students also used negative ability 13% (9) of the time with non-insistence situations and 20% (14) with

insistence situations. Direct refusals were 26% (17) without an insistence and 24% (17) with an insistence.

Supporting moves.

The intermediate students respected the association principle with 95% (52) of the supporting moves in non-insistence situations and in 88% (46) of the strategies in insistence situations. In contrast, they undermined the association principle in 5% (3) of their strategies without an insistence and 12% (6) with an insistence. The strategies that undermined the association principle were negative ability strategies.

Compared results. Comparing the intermediate and the advanced students, it shows that both offered alternatives more often with the insistence situations from 7% (5) to 24% (17) for the intermediate students (an increase of 17% which is significant where $p=.009$ and $z=2.61$), and from 11% (8) to 20% (14) for the advanced students (an increase of 9% which is not significant). Although both groups increased the number of strategies when an insistence took place, the intermediate students used more of these strategies overall during the insistence situation and also increased their output of these strategies by a high percentage when insisted on.

Considering expressing willingness to comply, only the advanced students increased the number of these strategies used when insisted on from 6% (4) to 10% (7) (an increase of 4% which is not significant), whereas the intermediate students dropped from 14% (9) to 7% (5) (a decrease of 7% which is not significant). Although the advanced students did not have a drastic increase in the number of strategies used to express willingness to comply, they still increased their number when insisted upon which is what the situation calls for when a friend insists. The common response is to

accept the invitation. The advanced students still only accepted the invitation in only 10% of the strategies. On the other hand, the intermediate students did not comply with the pragmatic norms that occur during a friend's insistence by decreasing the number of these strategies used when being insisted upon. Out of 71 head acts, the intermediate students only expressed their willingness to comply in 5 strategies, but the advanced students only used these strategies in 7 out of 69 head acts. When combining offering an alternative and expressing willingness to comply, the intermediate increased these strategies 14% from to 22% when being insisted upon (a difference of 8% which is not significant), and the advanced students increased these strategies from 12% to 21% when being insisted upon (an increase of 9% which is not significant).

The intermediate students used head acts to apologize less often after being insisted on by 7%, and the advanced students apologized less often by 12% after the insistence. The negative ability head acts increased by 7% in the insistence situation for the intermediate students and decreased by 3% by the advanced students. The intermediate students also used 17 direct refusal strategies in both the insistence and non-insistence situations, but the advanced students decreased their direct refusals by 7% after the insistence. Direct refusals and negative ability strategies are not the first choice when being insisted on, and their responses reflect that the advanced students comprehended this to some degree whereas the intermediate did not understand this given that they used these strategies equally or more often after the insistence. Also, looking at the supporting moves, the advanced students decreased their percentage of negative ability use from 14% to 3% (a decrease of 11%) in the insistence situations, and the intermediate students

increased their negative ability strategies from 5% to 12% (an increase of 7%) with the insistence situations.

Overall, the intermediate students used exactly 40 head act strategies that respected the association principle in the insistence situations, whereas the advanced students used 51 for the insistence situations and 50 for the non-insistence situations. The intermediate students also used 71 head act strategies that undermined the association principle in the insistence situations and 66 for the non-insistence situations, and in comparison, the advanced students used 69 head acts in the insistent situations and 71 in the non-instance situations. As for the supporting moves, there were 46 strategies that respected the association principle in the insistence situations and 52 strategies in the non-insistence situations for intermediate students in comparison with 58 in insistence situations and 57 in non-insistence situations for the advanced students. Finally, the intermediate students used 6 supporting moves that undermined the association principle in insistence situations and 3 in non-insistence situations, and the advanced students used 2 in insistence situations and 9 in non-insistence situations. Besides the supporting moves that undermined the association principle, which were very minimal, the insistence and non-insistence situations did not seem to have a great effect on the total number of strategies used that respected and undermined the association principle. The intermediate and advanced students still respected and undermined the association principle to the same degree regardless of the presence or absence of an insistence.

Combined situations results. Table 9 shows the combined results of all six free-response situations for the intermediate and advanced students. These results are broken

down into head acts and supporting moves that respect and undermine the association principle.

Table 9

Combined strategies from all situations

	INTER		ADV	
	n	%	n	%
A. Head Acts Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Offering alternative	22	16	22	16
b. Expressing willingness to comply	14	10	11	8
c. Suggesting others comply			2	1
Subtotal	36	26	35	25
2. Empathy component				
a. Apologizing	16	12	23	16
Subtotal	16	12	23	16
3. Respect				
a. Grounder	26	18	43	31
b. Requesting Information	1	1		
c. Consulting with a third party	1	1		
Subtotal	28	20	43	31
Total # of Head Act strategies respecting the Association Principle	80	58	101	72
B. Head Acts Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	23	17	12	9
b. Direct refusal	34	25	23	16
c. Indirect refusal			4	3
Subtotal	57	42	39	28
Total # of Head Acts undermining the Association Principle	57	42	39	28
Total # of Head Acts	137	56	140	53
C. Supporting Moves Respecting the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Desire without complying	7	7	8	6
Subtotal	7	7	8	6
2. Empathy component				

a. Gratitude	9	8	7	6
b. Apologizing	9	9	9	7
c. Well wishing	1	1	3	2
d. Positive opinion	2	2	5	4
Subtotal	21	20	24	19
3. Respect component				
a. Grounder	66	61	78	62
b. Requesting Information	2	2	3	2
c. Making conditions for acceptance	2	2	2	2
Subtotal	70	65	83	66
Total # of Supporting Moves respecting the Association Principle	98	92	115	91
D. Supporting Moves Undermining the Association Principle				
1. Involvement component				
a. Negative ability	9	8	11	9
Subtotal	9	8	11	9
Total # of Supporting Moves undermining the Association Principle	9	8	11	9
Total # of Supporting Moves	107	44	126	47
Total # of Strategies	244		266	

As stated previously, it is necessary to compare and analyze all of the situations as a whole comparing the advanced and intermediate students. When considering head acts, the intermediate students respected the association principle in 58% (80) of the strategies and undermined it in 42% (57) of the strategies, whereas the advanced students respected the association principle in 72% (101) of the strategies and undermined it in 28% (39) of the strategies. Therefore, the advanced students respected the association principle in 14% more strategies than did the intermediate students, which is a significant difference ($p=.02$ and $z=2.4$). The intermediate students respected the involvement component in 26% (36) of the strategies, the empathy component in 12% (16) of the strategies, and the respect component in 20% (28) of the strategies. The advanced students respected the involvement component in 25% (35) of the strategies, the empathy component in 16%

(23) of the strategies, and the respect component in 31% (43) of the strategies. The involvement component is the most important component when replying to an invitation, and the two groups did not show a significant difference in these strategies.

When considering the supporting moves, the intermediate students respected the association principle in 92% (98) of the strategies and undermined the association principle in 8% (9) of the strategies. The advanced students respected the association principle in 91% (115) of the strategies and undermined it in 9% (11) of the strategies. The intermediate students respected the involvement component in 7% (7) of the strategies, the empathy component in 20% (21) of the strategies, and the respect component in 65% (70) of the strategies. The advanced students respected the involvement component in 6% (8) of the strategies, the empathy component in 19% (24) of the strategies, and the respect component in 66% (83) of the strategies.

Taking a closer look at the head acts used to respect the association principle, both the intermediate and advanced students offered an alternative in 16% (22) of the strategies. When considering willingness to comply, the intermediate students used this strategy 10% (14) of the time, and the advanced students used this strategy 8% (11) of the time. The difference between intermediate and advanced students' usage of these two strategies is not significant.

These two strategies of the involvement component are very important in many Spanish-speaking cultures. These strategies show the interlocutor that he or she is important and even more important than the needs of the hearer of the invitation. This follows Félix-Brasdefer's (2006) findings that Mexicans prefer involvement to independence. Therefore, it is very common for the receiver of the invitation to put the

need of the interlocutor to be liked before their personal need to not be imposed upon. Once again, according to García (1992, 2008) this is routine in many Spanish speaking cultures, and for this reason it might be very common for Spanish speakers, at least of some countries, to agree to the invitation or to make future plans even though they were clearly supposed to refuse the invitation. This being said, it is also very common for the receiver of the invitation to never follow through with what he or she accepted after the insistence, and the interlocutor expects this outcome to take place.

Taking this into consideration, it is interesting to note that the intermediate and advanced students offered an alternative in the exact same number of instances and also that the intermediate students expressed willingness to comply in 14 strategies compared to 11 strategies from the advanced students.

The advanced students apologized more than the intermediate students, 16% (23) to 12% (16). The advanced students also used more grounders as head acts, 31% (43) to 20% (28), but the difference between the two groups is not significant. The intermediate students used negative ability for 17% (23) of their head acts, whereas the advanced students only used 9% (12) of their head acts, which illustrates a significant difference ($p=.04$ and $z=2.06$). The intermediate students used a direct refusal 25% (34) of the time and the advanced students only used a direct refusal 16% (23) of the time, which is not significant.

When considering the supporting moves, the intermediate students expressed a desire without complying in 7% (7) of the strategies and the advanced students in 6% (8) of the strategies. Both used many grounders as supporting moves with 61% (66) for the intermediate students and 62% (78) for the advanced students. Also, negative ability was

used as a supporting move in 8% (9) of the intermediate strategies and 9% (11) of the advanced strategies. In general, most of the strategies used by the intermediate and advanced students did not show a significant difference in the free-response section of the DCT.

Multiple Choice Results

In the multiple choice section, the students were asked to pick the best possible answer for every given situation. Although there could have been multiple answers for each question, they were asked to pick the best possibility. The students needed to use their Spanish pragmatic knowledge to decipher what would work best with each situation, or what wouldn't work in each situation and therefore, come up with the correct answer. Where the free-response section of the DCT had more opportunity for variety in the responses, the multiple choice section was purposefully more focused to see if the students could differentiate between the possible choices.

When comparing the intermediate students to the advanced students in the multiple choice section of the DCT, neither group scored very high. The intermediate students averaged a total score of 19.5% correct and the advanced students averaged a total score of 18.5% correct, which is not significantly different. Furthermore, they did select very similar answers in this section.

When the strategy of expressing willingness to comply was the best choice, only 17.5% of the advanced students selected it, and only 25% of the intermediate students selected it, and these responses are not significantly different. Although the intermediate students did not excel in selecting this strategy, they still outperformed the advanced students by 7.5%.

As previously stated, it is routine for Spanish speakers to insist when making an invitation and therefore, it is even more vital that the receiver of the invitation demonstrate a desire to show involvement with the inviter. Consequently, it is common to accept the invitation or create an alternative when an insistence arises. When the multiple choice section included an insistence to the invitation, the advanced students only selected the alternative strategy or the strategy to express willingness to comply 15% of the time, whereas the intermediate students made the correct selection 23% of the time, which does not demonstrate a significant difference between the two groups. With these percentages, neither group demonstrated a great knowledge of the behavioral expectations of many Spanish speaking cultures. In these cultures, involvement is more important than not being imposed upon, and therefore, the insistence is a key indicator in the multiple choice section for selecting the correct answer. As a result, the students should have had even more reason to select the strategy of expressing willingness to comply or the strategy of offering an alternative. When only considering where the correct choices were expressing willingness to comply strategies, the intermediate students increased in selecting the correct answer when there was an insistence from 15% correct to 35% correct, which is a significant increase ($p=.04$ and $z=2.07$), whereas the advanced students decreased from 20% correct to 15% correct, which is not significant decrease. The intermediate students also selected this correct strategy 20% more than did the advanced students when there was an insistence. This difference is significant ($p=.038$ and $z=2.07$).

Another interesting tendency that occurred was that both groups selected the direct refusal strategy very often when available in the multiple choice answers. A direct

refusal was only listed in three of the questions, and of those questions, the intermediate students selected it 68% of the time, and the advanced students selected it 72% of the time. Even though direct refusals can occur in Spanish speaking cultures, they are not as common as many of the other strategies and can be considered rude. For example, the following is a direct refusal that was a common selection for the students:

No, no, no. De ninguna manera.

Translation

No, no, no. There is no way.

This example does not seem to show involvement or interest in the inviter's needs or wants.

Other strategies that were not selected by the students were the desire without complying that was followed by an exaggerated grounder. These answers were only chosen 5% of the time by the intermediate students and 6% of the time by the advanced students. In these strategies, the receiver of the invitation expresses their want to comply. Then the receiver of the invitation expresses a great excuse for not being able to comply. Though the excuse may not be true, the receiver of the invitation shows to the inviter how much their invitation means to them, and that in normal circumstances, they would attend. By merely saying, "I can't go," the inviter can be offended that the receiver has no desire to comply or is making no effort to comply. In the multiple choice section of the DCT, there was little significant difference between the intermediate and advanced students. In summary, the significant differences between the two groups in the multiple choice section exist when there is an imposition and the correct response is expressing willingness to comply.

Analysis of Participants' Reasoning

Free-response reasoning. When looking at the answers given by the students, it is also very useful and insightful to look into the reasons why the students answered the way they did. As stated previously, every question on the free-response and multiple choice sections asked for the students to explain why they answered the way they did. A correct answer with incorrect reasoning can lead to future pragmatic failures. Here are some examples of the answers the advanced and intermediate students gave which include the reasoning for their answers. This first group of examples will come from the free-response section of the DCT. The following examples are from situation 3 which includes the insistence from some friends to study together for finals.

Situation 3: Intermediate Example 1

PI 13 No puedo estudiar bien en grupos grandes. Necesito estudiar en mi casa.
 Lo siento.

Translation

PI 13 I can't study well in big groups. I need to study at home. Sorry.
Reasoning I told the truth of why I don't want to study with them.

In this example, the intermediate student gives an explanation of why he/she cannot comply with the invitation and follows this by saying he/she is sorry. For this student, the reasoning for this strategy is to tell the truth. For this student, the truth is what matters in this situation.

Situation 3: Advanced Example 1

PA 67 Ya sé que no puedo estudiar cuando estoy con amigos. ¡Ustedes son tan
 chistosos, no puedo pensar en mis estudios!

Translation

PA 67 I already know that I can't study well with Friends. You guys are so funny I can't concentrate on my studies!

Reasoning It's best to be honest in this situation.

In this example, the advanced student gives two reasons why he/she cannot comply with the invitation. The student's reasoning for this strategy is to be honest. In these first two examples, both the intermediate student and the advanced student say what they feel is the truth. The reasoning of being honest or telling the truth was a very common response from both the intermediate and advanced students.

Situation 6 involves some friends' insistence to vacation together in New York.

Situation 6: Intermediate Example 1

PI 24 Yo no voy a Nueva York. No tengo mucho dinero.

Translation

PI 24 I'm not going to New York. I don't have a lot of money.

Reasoning I want my friend to leave me alone.

In this example, the intermediate student uses a direct refusal and then gives an explanation for this refusal. The reasoning behind this strategy is that the student wanted his/her friend to stop insisting. It is clear, by the student's annoyance to the situation, that he/she did not understand the Spanish pragmatic norms of insisting when giving an invitation and consequently responded in an unideal manner.

Situation 6: Intermediate Example 2

PI 17 Sí, estará muy divertido, no puedo esperar!

Translation Yes, it will be very fun, I can't wait!

Reasoning I told them how excited I was, even though I wasn't really.

In this situation, the intermediate student accepts the invitation and complements the acceptance by explaining that he/she is excited. The student later explains that even though they said they were excited for the trip, they really were not. Here, the student accepts an invitation even though they would rather not. This shows that the intermediate student is putting the inviter's wants to be liked and to be involved before their own wants to not be imposed upon. Whether the student follows through with acceptance does not matter. He/she used strategies that would be appropriate in the given situation.

Situation 6: Advanced Example 1

PA 54 Mis padres dicen que necesito estar aquí durante las vacaciones. Creen que no pasemos tiempo juntos.

Translation

PA 54 My parents say I need to be here during my vacation. I don't believe we will hang out together.

Reasoning I don't want to hurt my friend's feelings.

Here, the advanced student blames not being able to go on the trip to New York on the parents. The reasoning for this is that the student does not want to undermine the inviter's desire to be liked and approved of. For this reason, the student makes up an excuse that is greater and more convincing than just saying they do not have the desire to go. In this case, the student is negotiating the inviter's desire to be liked and their own desire to not be imposed upon.

Situation 6: Advanced Example 2

PA 79 No quiero ir a nueva york, y no saldré para Nueva York con ustedes.

Translation

PA 79 I don't want to go to New York, I won't leave to New York with you.

Reasoning In this situation it's a good idea to be firm about your decision not to go on a trip.

In this example, the advanced student directly and clearly refuses the insistence and reasons that one should stand their ground when denying an invitation to a trip. Once again, this student is only worried about being imposed upon and does not understand the relationship between inviter and invitee in the Spanish speaking world.

Situation 6: Advanced Example 3

PA 78 Nosotros debemos ir a Cuba porque no me gusta Nueva York y Cuba es más interesante.

Translation

PA 78 We should go to Cuba because I don't like New York and Cuba is more interesting.

Reasoning I still wanted to go on a vacation with friends, just not to New York.

In this example, the advanced student uses an alternative suggestion and explains their opinion on New York and Cuba. The reasoning behind this is a desire to be involved with the friends but in a different setting. In the Spanish speaking world, an alternative suggestion shows a desire to be involved with the inviter and is a common and acceptable strategy.

The following are some examples from question 1 which involves a friend's invitation and insistence to eat lunch together.

Question 1: Intermediate Example 1

PI 4 No puedo almorzar a su casa hoy porque y tengo otros planes con mi familia.

Translation

PI 4 I can't eat lunch at your house today because, and I have other plans with my family.

Reasoning My friend was being pushy, so I needed to explain why I couldn't go to his house for lunch.

Here, the intermediate student gives a negative ability for not being able to comply followed by a vague excuse. This student explains that they thought the inviter was pushy when inviting/insisting. The reasoning hints towards the fact that the student did not like or agree with the insistence or find it appropriate. This student might not recognize the different pragmatic norms that exist between cultures and therefore, deem the inviter pushy or rude.

Situation 1: Intermediate Example 2

PI 38 No, lo siento, necesito el tiempo para hacer mi tarea.

Translation No, sorry, I need time to do my homework.

Reasoning Because saying that I have important things to do will stop him from asking again.

In this example, the intermediate student follows the refusal by an apology and an excuse to support the refusal. The reasoning behind this strategy implies that the student is annoyed and this response will get the inviter to stop inviting.

Situation 1: Intermediate Example 3

PI 25 O.k., pero solo por dos horas porque tengo mucho tarea.

Translation Okay, but only for two hours because I have a lot of homework.

Reasoning In many Spanish-speaking cultures, when someone insists upon hosting you or providing a service to you, it is rude to decline

In this situation, the intermediate student agrees to the insistence but includes his own specifications for the acceptance and later explains why. This student reasons that it is rude to decline an invitation in Spanish-speaking cultures. This is one of only two instances where the student indicates the need to use Spanish pragmatic rules when responding to an invitation. It is very possible that he would have responded differently using his own cultural pragmatic norms, but he purposefully curtailed his response to meet the cultural expectations of the given situation.

Situation 1: Intermediate Example 4

PI 20 Quiero ir a su casa para almorzar y si tú insistes yo voy ir!

Translation

PI 20 I want to go to your house to eat lunch, and if you insist, I will go.

Reasoning In Spanish it is proper to decline an invitation at first and wait for them to insist.

In this example, the intermediate student indicates the desire to accept the invitation and the future acceptance upon an insistence. She explains in her reasoning that one first declines an invitation and awaits the insistence. Along with PI 25, these are the only two instances where the students identified in their reasoning the Spanish pragmatic pattern that takes place during an invitation. They both accepted or indicated

that they would accept the invitation, but even more importantly, they understood the routine and therefore, would be able to duplicate or implement this routine in future encounters and not just produce the correct responses when their own pragmatic norms and the Spanish pragmatic norms align. Another interesting detail is that the advanced students never indicated that they curtailing their responses to meet the Spanish norms. It was only indicated by two intermediate students.

Situation 1: Advanced Example 1

PA 63 Lo siento, pero no puedo.

Translation

PA 63 Sorry, but I can't.

Reasoning Want to be polite and tell them I can't

Here, the advanced student uses an apology and a negative ability to refuse the invitation and explains that this is an attempt to be polite. This strategy of using an apology and only giving a negative ability strategy could offend a Spanish speaker. This is because there is no attempt to be involved with the inviter and the excuse is very vague and could show that the student has little interest with the inviter. A stronger excuse could be more appropriate in this situation so as to not make the inviter feel unimportant.

Situation 1: Advanced Example 2

PA 54 Lo siento, pero tengo una cita. ¿podemos almorzar en su casa mañana?

Translation

Sorry, but I have another engagement. Can we have lunch in your house tomorrow?

Reasoning To be polite, I make another offer.

This advanced student apologizes, explains why they will not be able to accept the invitation and makes an alternative suggestion. They give the reason that they are trying to be polite. In the Spanish culture, the strategy of making an alternative shows involvement and friendliness with the inviter.

Multiple Choice Reasoning. It is also necessary and useful to analyze the reasoning behind the answers in the multiple choice section because the students are having to choose between only four possibilities instead of giving a unique response they would prefer. The following will include the most common selections on a few questions along with their justifications for the answers.

Question 2 Example:

Sus amigos dan una fiesta este sábado. Ellos lo(a) habían invitado a usted pero usted tiene una cita con su novio/a. Usted les había dicho que no iba a poder asistir, pero ellos lo(a) llaman a usted e insisten. Usted les dice:

- a. Lo siento pero tengo otros planes, y no puedo ir.
- b. ¿Qué tal si paso por tu casa otro día?
- c. Tengo una cita con mi novio/a este sábado.
- d. Ya les dije que no podía ir. No me llamen más, por favor.

Translation

Your friends are throwing a party this Saturday. Your friends had invited you but you have a date with your girlfriend/boyfriend. You had told them that you wouldn't be able to attend, but they call you and insist. You tell them:

- a. Sorry but I have other plans, and I can't go.
- b. What if I go to your house another day?

- c. I have a date with my girlfriend/boyfriend this Saturday.
- d. I already told you that I couldn't come. Don't call me anymore please.

In this example of some friends' insistence to attend a birthday party, none of the intermediate students chose the best answer (b), *What if I go to your house another day?*, and only 15% of the advanced students chose this answer. The answer that received the most selection was (a), *Sorry but I have other plans, and I can't go*, which was selected by 70% of the intermediate students and 55% of the advanced students. In this case, the students preferred an apology and a very vague grounder as opposed to creating an alternative suggestion like in answer (b). Here are some reasons for why the students chose answer (a).

Intermediate examples:

- PI 4 This is still polite, but they'll understand why you can't go.
- PI 38 It is a vague excuse that requires no explanation.
- PI 31 I'm being polite and saying sorry while giving an explanation of why I can't go.

Advanced examples:

- PA 74 It is the polite response.
- PA 71 It is the most polite and accurate response.
- PA 58 Don't like canceling plans.

In these examples, PI 4, and PI 31 of the intermediate students and PA 74 and PA 71 indicate that they are being polite by choosing (a). In other words, they feel it will appease both parties the best. Although they all attempted to be polite, the strategy they

chose does not align itself well with the Spanish pragmatic norms and the inviter could have been offended by their responses. PI 38 understands that this is a vague excuse and prefers this strategy in this situation. PA 58 does not want to change any prior arrangements, and this reasoning shows that they are much more worried about being imposed upon than satisfying the inviter's wants to be liked and involved with others.

Question 7 Example:

La familia de su amigo viene de Canadá. Él quiere que usted vaya a su casa para conocerlos. Usted no puede ir y ya le ha dicho a su amigo que no puede ir, pero él insiste. Usted le dice:

- a. Tengo un examen al día siguiente.
- b. No quiero conocer a tus padres.
- c. Voy a tratar de pasar por tu casa entonces.
- d. Tú sabes que no me gustan las reuniones familiares.

Translation

Your friend's family is visiting from Canada. He wants you to go to his house to meet them. You cannot go, and you have already told him that you cannot go, but he insists.

You tell him:

- a. I have an exam the next day.
- b. I don't want to meet your parents.
- c. I will try to pass by your house then.
- d. You know that I don't like family reunions.

In this situation of a friend's insistence to meet his/her family, 50% of the intermediate students chose the correct answer (c), *Voy a tartar de pasar por tu casa*

entonces., and 30% of the advanced students chose this answer. Also, 35% of the intermediate chose answer (a), *Tengo un examen al día siguiente.*, and 50% of the advanced students chose this same answer. The students that chose answer (a) utilized a grounder or excuse to reject the invitation. Although a grounder can be utilized to reject an invitation, the safest response was to express willingness to comply/try to comply. The following gives the reasoning behind the students' answers of (a) and (c) for question 7.

Intermediate students selecting (a):

PI 24 I don't want to be rude

PI 38 It's an excuse that the friend will accept

Intermediate students selecting *c*, (correct response):

PI 10 He insists so I try to be polite.

PI 34 I won't go but I won't upset my friend by lying.

Advanced student selecting *a*:

PA 71 A reason why you cannot go without being rude.

Advanced student selecting *c* (correct response):

PA 67 It makes my friend feel better, but doesn't make any promises.

In question 7, PI 24 and PA 71 both select (a), or a specific grounder, so that they do not seem rude to the inviter. The least rude or best response was *c*, to try to comply. Taking that into consideration, this specific grounder was not the worst response that could have been given. PI 38 indicates that selecting *c* will be acceptable to their friend, but they might not be considering Spanish pragmatics when making this assumption. PI 10 explains that when a friend insists, the polite response would be to express that you

will try to comply. This thinking can be deemed as polite in the Spanish speaking world. PI 34 selects answer (c), to try to comply, and indicates that they really are not planning on going. This line of thinking is very common in Spanish culture and would be acceptable. PA 67 also selects this answer without feeling obligated to go.

Question 15 Example:

Hay un baile y muchos de sus amigos van a estar ahí. Un amigo le pide a usted que vaya. A usted no le gusta bailar. Usted le dijo a su amigo que no puede ir pero su amigo insiste que vaya. Usted le dice:

- a. Bueno, sí iré (pero usted no va a asistir).
- b. Tú sabes que no me gusta bailar, ¿por qué me invitas?
- c. No puedo ir, lo siento.
- d. Tengo que limpiar la casa, y no voy a tener tiempo.

Translation

15. There is a dance, and a lot of your friends are going to be there. A friend asks you to go. You do not like to dance. You told your friend that you can't go, but your friend insists that you go. You tell him/her:

- a. Okay, yeah I'll go (but you are not going to go).
- b. You know that I don't like to dance. Why are you inviting me?
- c. I can't go. Sorry.
- d. I have to clean the house, and I'm not going to have time.

In this example of a friend's insistence to attend a dance together, 20% of the intermediate students select the best response (a), *Okay, yeah I'll go (but you are not going to go)*, and none of the advanced students chose this option. Answer (c), *I can't*

go, sorry, was the answer with the most selections, which included 40% for the intermediate students and 60% for the advanced students. These students opted for choosing a negative ability, followed by an apology, which is very vague, instead of selecting the token acceptance. Once again, in these exchanges between Spanish speakers, expressing willingness to comply does not necessarily mean you will comply. The following lists some of the reasons for choosing answer (c), and the reasoning behind choosing the best response, answer (a).

Intermediate students answer *c*:

PI 7 The others were rude. (This student is referring to the other possible answers.)

PI 21 If I really didn't want to go, I would be honest, explain, and apologize.

Intermediate student answer *a* (correct response):

PI 1 My friends are persistent so I might tell them I'll go just so they stop asking, and then not go and "accidentally" fall asleep.

Advanced students answer *c*:

PA 74 No point in telling someone you will go when you want.

PA 71 You don't want to lie and offend your friend. Honest and to the point.

The reasoning from PI 7 once again provides an example of a student choosing a less desirable response to an insistence, in this case a negative ability, in an attempt to show politeness or not be rude. PI 21 and PA 71 indicate that they chose answer (c) in an attempt to be honest. In both the multiple choice and free-response sections, honesty was one of the key reasons for the answers that were given. In many cases, being honest does not meet the expectations of the Spanish speaker and is not always the most appropriate

way to reject an invitation. PA 74 answers with (c) and points out that they do not believe you should tell someone you will comply if you will not. The token acceptance is not part of this student's pragmatic norms when it comes to invitations. PI 1 responds with answer (a), or expressing they will comply, and indicates in their reasoning that they wanted the inviter to stop inviting and that they would not go in the end. Although (a) is the correct answer, and planning on not actually going would be acceptable, being annoyed with the inviter's insistence indicates that this student might not understand the pragmatic routine involved with invitations either.

The reasoning behind the responses in the free-response section and the multiple choice section give meaningful insight when trying to understand the pragmatic goals that the students are trying to accomplish. The students' reasoning suggests that in many instances, they were not familiar with or did not attempt to curtail their responses to respond more similarly to a Spanish speaker. As mentioned earlier, only on two occasions did a student indicate that they purposefully tried to align their answers with the Spanish routine of invitations. Instead, the reasoning behind many of the answers was to not be rude or to be honest. Although the students at times had come up with appropriate answers, they rarely indicated knowledge of the appropriate Spanish pragmatic norms. As stated previously, when this is the case, they are prone to fail when their personal norms are not in accordance with the Spanish norms.

Conclusions

This cross sectional study of advanced and intermediate L2 learners of Spanish provides valuable insight into understanding how the level affects the ability to carry out appropriate refusals. Through the use of free-response questions, multiple choice

questions, and an analysis of the reasoning behind the students' answers, the author was able to triangulate his findings to better understand the results. When considering the free-response section, the advanced students demonstrated a greater preference towards respecting the association principle than did the intermediate students. When undermining the association principle, the intermediate students showed a greater preference towards using negative ability strategies than did the advanced students. Taking this into consideration, only the intermediate students demonstrated a significant increase in their use of offering an alternative when being insisted on. Also, only the intermediate students increased their willingness to comply strategies by 4% after an insistence, whereas the advanced students decreased their usage of these strategies by 7%, but these differences are not significant. In comparison, García's (1992) investigation shows that Peruvians increased their willingness to comply strategies after being insisted on by 75%. This is the routine, and these results indicate that the students in the investigation did not match the Spanish speaking Peruvians' norms. Furthermore, combining the total number of head acts used to express willingness to comply and the head acts used to offer an alternative, there was not a significant difference in their usage between the two groups (26% for intermediate students and 24% for advanced students). In contrast, 82% of the Argentinians' strategies in Garcia's (2008) study expressed willingness to comply or offered an alternative. Once again, the intermediate and advanced students fell well short of intended target.

The multiple choice section of the DCT, illustrated very few differences between the intermediate and advanced students. In total, the intermediate students answered 19.5% of the questions correctly, and the advanced students answer 18.5% of the

questions correctly. One of the few differences was when the correct response was expressing willingness to comply. In this situation, the intermediate students increased their correct responses by 20%, which is significant, and the advanced students decreased their correct responses by 5%, which is not significant. Another key point is that both groups had a preference for selecting a direct refusal when it was one of the possible selections. Given the data collected from the multiple choice section, neither group demonstrated command of how to refuse an invitation in Spanish.

The reasoning the students provided in the free-response and the multiple choice sections of the DCT is also an indicator of poor understanding of the intended goal when refusing an invitation. For example, only two of the students, which were intermediate students, indicated that they curtailed their answers to meet the needs of the Spanish norms. Many of the reasons given from several students indicated that they were trying to tell the truth or be honest, which is evidence that they were not concerned with providing the correct involvement strategy. Other common reasons for responding incorrectly included the students' desire to be polite or not be rude. In other words, they did not know what was polite or to be expected in the Spanish culture. When considering the free-response section, the multiple choice section, and the explanation sections of this investigation, it is clear that the intermediate and advanced students do not have a great understanding of Spanish refusals and the routine associated them. Furthermore, the results indicate that the advanced students have not progressed in their performance of Spanish refusals when being compared with the intermediate students. Therefore, it is very possible that students do not progress in their pragmatic ability as they advance in Spanish proficiency. Consequently, this author believes that it is necessary to explicitly

teach Spanish pragmatics in the classroom, including the speech act of refusing an invitation. The following section will illustrate the author's plan for the implementation of learning Spanish pragmatics.

Pedagogical Implications

In order for the students to correctly learn how to use Spanish pragmatics in the classroom, the teacher has to have a good understanding of what needs to be accomplished. If the teacher lacks knowledge in this area, it is impossible to expect the students to gain a correct understanding. For this reason, teachers need to be properly trained in Spanish pragmatics and in the teaching of Spanish pragmatics. They need to learn what is expected when executing a particular speech act so that they can be an example to the students. In order to aid the teacher in this field, textbooks should include explicit pragmatic instruction. Then, the students and the teacher will have a base they can rely on during instruction.

When considering the results that were obtained in this study, it is interesting to note that the textbooks used for the advanced students, *Composicion* and *Conversaciones creadoras*, does not contain any specific pragmatic instruction. In contrast, the textbook used for the intermediate students in this study, *Interacciones*, does contain some specific pragmatic instruction. In *Interacciones*, the students are first given a model dialogue that can be listened to and read which illustrates an example of the specific speech act. Next, they are given an explanation and the general rules concerning the targeted speech act. Then, the students are able to look at new phrases or chunks that can be used to perform the given speech act. Finally, they are provided with a few activities where they are able to practice this particular speech act. The following provides an example of the material

contained in *Interacciones* to teach extending, accepting, and declining an invitation. This section will include the explanation, and some examples of the phrases used to perform this particular speech act.

Explanation:

When extending an invitation in the Spanish-speaking world, the person making an invitation will usually insist until the invitee accepts. Not insisting might give the invitee the impression that his/her presence is not important. By the same token, in some Spanish-speaking countries, it is not unusual to accept an invitation to an informal gathering and then not attend without notifying the host/hostess ahead of time. In this type of gatherings, it is also acceptable to attend accompanied by a close friend or relative even if you have not told your host/hostess (p. 84).

Examples of phrases used:

Con mucho gusto. ¿A qué hora?	I'd be glad to. At what time?
Me encantaría, pero...	I'd love to, but...
Qué lástima, pero...	What a shame (pity), but...
En otra ocasión será.	Some other time.
¡Qué pena que no pueda(s) venir!	What a shame that you can't come!
Lo (La) / Te voy a echar de menos	I am going to miss you. (p. 85)

Although *Interacciones* contains valuable information regarding speech act performance, not all Spanish textbooks contain specific information pertaining to pragmatics, which is evident in the advanced students' textbook. Also, *Interacciones* is just scratching the surface of the possibilities of teaching the Spanish language with the

implantation of pragmatic instruction. For these reasons, this author believes that the following plan will help all teachers with their instruction in Spanish pragmatics.

The following will demonstrate the manner in which Olshtain and Cohen's (1991) model can be used in the classroom for teaching speech act performance to intermediate or advanced students.

Evaluation

As stated previously, the first step when teaching students a speech act is to have a diagnostic evaluation, which is a discussion to get the students to think more carefully on how they interact in different situations they encounter. Many people prejudge and reject what they do not understand, and this can definitely be said for pragmatic differences that exist between cultures. By understanding the differences that exist in the Spanish speaking world, the students will be able to understand and adapt more easily when given the opportunity and pragmatic failures will not be so prevalent. They will be able to communicate and interact more effectively. During this diagnostic evaluation, Olshtain and Cohen (1991) say that the teacher elevates the students' consciousness concerning the different pragmatic norms. When starting this process, it is very helpful to start with what the students already know, and therefore, it can be very useful to begin discussing how the students carry out the particular speech act in their native language. This will open up their eyes to their own norms so that they can then compare them to the norms of the target language.

Garcia (1996) says a good way to gauge the students' understanding is to use a multiple choice test. In these tests, there are usually many possible answers, but it is the

student's responsibility to choose the best answer. Therefore, they are looking for the best pragmatic answer given the situation and not just a possible choice.

The following is an example of this type of test:

A: Hola, José ¿cómo te va?

B: Excelente Ramón, gracias, ¿y tú?

A: Muy bien, bueno, sabes que, yo voy a tener un asado que va a ser tan delicioso y quiero que vengas y te diviertas con nosotros.

B: ¿Cuándo va a ser?

A: Mira, será este viernes a las siete de la noche.

B: Que lástima, sabes que, yo tengo trabajo este viernes y no voy a poder asistir.

A: No me digas. Bueno, yo entiendo, pero sería buenísimo si pudieras tratar de venir.

Tanslation

A: Hey, Jose How's it going?

B: Excellent Ramon, thanks, and you?

A: Very good, well, you know what, I'm going to have a barbecue that will be so delicious, and I want you to come and have fun with us.

B: When is it going to be?

A: Look, it will be this Friday at seven.

B: That's too bad, you know what, I have work this Friday and I won't be able to attend.

A: You don't say. Well, I understand, but it would be great if you could try to come.

Possible Answers:

(a) Lo siento, no puedo.

(b) No puedo faltar al trabajo otra vez.

(c) No, ya te dije que no.

(d) Bueno, voy a tratar de hacer todo lo posible para asistir.

Translation

(a) I'm sorry, I can't.

(b) I can't miss work again.

(c) No, I already told you know.

(d) Okay, I will try to do everything possible to attend.

With this situation, all of the answers are possible responses to the invitation, and therefore, the students need to understand which would be the best answer given the situation. For example, answer (a) uses an apology and negative ability for responding and this would be far too vague given the insistence. Answer (b) gives a grounder (b), which would be possible, but given the fact that the friend insisted, responding to an insistence with an excuse is not ideal. In answer (c) there is a direct response and an indication that the hearer is annoyed and shows that they do not understand the pragmatic routine of invitations and would therefore, be incorrect. The best answer would be (d), which indicates that the hearer understands the Spanish pragmatic norms of accepting an invitation or trying to comply after being insisted upon. This is not to say that the other responses do not occur in the Spanish culture, rather, that they are less common or less accepted in many instances. The students will have a better understanding of their pragmatic tendencies and how they will need to adjust them to better fit the target culture.

After evaluating some of these multiple choice situations, it is necessary to practice with more situations to strengthen their understanding of what has just been

discussed. The following is a similar example that would follow to see if the students are grasping the correct concepts:

A: Alberto, acabo de saber que a ti te gusta jugar al golf.

B: Claro que sí, me encanta jugar al golf.

A: Yo voy a jugar mañana. ¿Quieres venir conmigo? Será a las seis de la mañana.

B: Me parece bien, pero no tengo mucho tiempo, y no va ser posible.

A: Si no tienes mucho tiempo, podemos jugar por dos horas no más, ¿qué te parece?

Translation

A: Alberto, I just found out that you like to play golf.

B: Of course, I love to play golf.

A: I'm going to play tomorrow. Do you want to come with me? It would be at six in the morning.

B: Sounds good to me, but I don't have a lot of time, and it won't be possible.

A: If you don't have a lot of time, we can play for only two hours. What do you think?

Possible answers:

(a) Sería bueno, pero no creo que sea posible.

(b) ¿Qué tal si jugamos otro día? Voy a llamar te.

(c) No duermo mucho, y necesito descansar.

(d) No, esta vez no.

Translation

(a) It would be good, but I don't think it's possible.

(b) What if we played another day? I'll call you.

(c) I don't sleep a lot, and I need to rest.

(d) No, this time no.

Here, the students are tested to see if they understood the previous examples and can therefore prove it with the correct answers to the follow-up questions such as this example. In this example, answer (a) mitigates the refusal and then uses a negative ability. Answer (c) uses a specific excuse (grounder). Answer (d) uses a direct refusal and then softens the refusal with a mitigator. All of these responses are possibilities, and could be very commonly used by the students taking the test when speaking in their L1, but hopefully they have understood the differences associated with their pragmatic norms and the Spanish pragmatic norms. If so, they would be able to identify (b) as the best response to the insistence given that the hearer makes an alternative suggestion which shows involvement with the inviter.

Model Dialogue

The model dialogue would be the next step and can be a simulated or authentic dialogue. The teacher can have the students listen to or read together. The following is an authentic dialogue from Félix-Brasdefer (2006) on refusals. This example begins after a friend was invited to a birthday party:

A: Pero no manches, no puedo ir, gu'ey.

B: por que'?

A: es que tengo, voy a ir con una - una rorra.

B: dile que no vas a ir, inventa un pretexto.

A: voy a tratarle, pero, pero no, no creo que vaya yo eh? hijo, disculpa, pero sí, ya sabes, felicidades=

B: =sale, si puedes, te espero eh?

A: sí, voy a tratar de ir, pero - pues la verdad no te aseguro nada porque sí, sí tengo que ir a ese negocio

B: sale, nos vemos

A: sale.

Translation

A: come on, I can't go, dude.

B: why?

A: look, the thing is that I have to go out with a - a chick.

B: tell her you're not going, make something up.

A: I'm gonna try, but, but no, I don't think I'll be able to go, ok? darn, I'm sorry, but yeah, you know, happy birthday=

B: =okay, if you can, I'll be expecting you, ok?

A: yeah, I'm gonna try to go, but - well the truth is I can't promise anything because I really have to take care of that business

B: okay, see you

A: alright. (p. 2170)

Evaluation of the Situation

During the evaluation of the situation, the teacher is key to asking the right questions to get the students involved and thinking about the given situation. The teacher should point out that the context will change how the situation unfolds and what is to be expected. For example, a boss inviting a coworker to lunch will be different from a parent inviting a child to lunch. The class will therefore brainstorm as the teacher asks

general questions during the pre-activity for phrases that they might need in different contexts. The pre activity also involves more specific questions related to the specific model dialogue before it has been listened to. After the students brainstorm, they will listen to the model dialogue, which is then followed by the post activity. This post activity includes questions related to the specific speech act and context given. By giving the pre and post activities along with the model dialogue, the students will have a better foundation when listening to or giving a specific speech act, and in this case, when involved in an invitation.

Here are some examples of questions the teacher can ask during the evaluation of the situation:

General:

- a. What are some phrases that you could use to refuse an invitation from a friend?
- b. How would they most likely respond to those phrases?
- c. Would you use different phrases if the invitation came from your boss or your parent?

Specific:

- a. You are going to listen to an interaction between two friends, David and Robert. David is throwing a birthday party at his house and invites Jaime to come. Robert has a date with his girlfriend. Before we listen, write down how you think Robert will respond to David.
 - b. How will David react when he hears Robert's response?
 - c. How will this interaction finish?

After Listening

- a. How did Robert respond to David's invitation?
- b. How did David receive the invitation from Robert?
- c. Was there an insistence?
- d. How did Robert respond to the insistence? Did it change Robert's response?
- e. Do you think Robert will go to the party?
- f. How will David feel if Robert does not make it to the party?
- g. How was their relationship impacted by this interaction? Did it help or hurt their relationship?
- h. Is this what you expected would happen, or how were their responses different from what you expected?

After the post activity questions, the teacher will instruct the students on how to respond to an invitation in Spanish. The teacher will instruct the most common way of refusing an invitation in the Spanish speaking world, and where possible, can also include the differences that exist between the different Spanish speaking cultures. Here, the teacher would instruct the students of the general norms that occur when giving and receiving an invitation which include the routine of invitation, refusal, insistence, and finally, token acceptance. They will also be taught what is expected by both parties when producing these responses.

Here, it would also be very helpful to include any grammar and/or lexical items that would be useful with this particular speech act. For example, Félix-Brasdefer (2008) indicates that Mexicans use mitigation when refusing an invitation and García (1992, 2007) that Peruvians and Argentineans use deferential politeness strategies in the first

stage of an invitation. Therefore, knowledge of how to use the conditional tense would be very useful to these students when trying to say things such as *Me encantaría ir pero (I would love to go but)*, or *¿Sería posible hacerlo otro día? (Would it be possible to do it another time?)*. In this sense, the grammar is put into context and becomes more meaningful. The need to separate grammar/lexicon from culture becomes unnecessary, and therefore, the students are taught meaningful lessons centered around pragmatics.

Role-play Activities

The role-play is the chance for the students to utilize their understanding by communicating in a certain context provided by the teacher. The ultimate goal is for the students to communicate more appropriately and effectively in Spanish, and therefore, the role-play provides great experience. In order to accomplish this task, the teacher will assign certain specific roles to the students that will help them with giving and responding to an invitation. The following gives some examples of role-plays in different contexts including power and social distance, as labeled in Félix-Brasdefer (2006):

- a. Interaction between two friends at the grocery store (no power difference, no social distance)

A: Usted está en el supermercado, y ve a su amigo. Usted lo invita a ir a un restaurante para ver el partido de fútbol más tarde.

B: Usted está haciendo compras cuando un amigo lo/la invita a un restaurante para ver el partido de fútbol. Usted no puede ir. Usted responde.

Translation

A: You are at the grocery store and you see a friend. You are going to go to a restaurant to watch the soccer game later. You invite your friend to the restaurant.

- B: You are shopping when a friend invites you to a restaurant to watch the football game. You cannot go. You respond.
- b. Interaction between two acquaintances at school. (No power difference, high social distance).

A: En una clase de ciencia, hay un proyecto que necesita hacer esta semana. Puede-trabajar solo o con un compañero. Usted no conoce a nadie en la clase, pero decide que sería más fácil trabajar con otra persona. Usted lo invita a otro estudiante en la clase para que sea su compañero en el proyecto.

B: Hay un proyecto que tiene que hacer esta semana en la clase de ciencia. Puede trabajar solo o con un compañero. A usted no le gusta trabajar con otros estudiantes. Un estudiante lo/la invita a ser su compañero. Usted responde.

Translation

A: In a science class, there is a project that you need to do this week. You can work by yourself or with a partner. You do not know anyone in the class, but you decide that it would be easier to work together with another person. You invite a student in the class to be your partner for the project.

B: There is a project that you have to do this week in your science class. You can work by yourself or with a partner. You do not like to work with other students. A student invites you to be his/her partner. You respond.

- c. Interaction between a boss and an employee at work. (high power difference, high social distance).

A: Usted es el jefe de un negocio, y quiere conocer a un empleado nuevo. Usted lo invita a almorzar hoy.

B: Usted es un empleado nuevo. Hoy, tiene planes para ir a almorzar con su hijo.
Su jefe lo/la invita a almorzar hoy. Usted responde.

Translation

A: You are the boss of a business, and you want to get to know a new employee.
You invite him/her to eat lunch today.

B: You are a new employee. Today, you have plans to eat lunch with your son.
Your boss invites you to eat lunch today. You respond.

Di Pietro (1987) says that the students should use their newly learned knowledge in real-life situations and that three phases of the interaction should be included which are the development and practice of the situation, the actual execution of the situation, and the evaluation of the situation. These practices of real-life situations will aid the students pragmatically, but they will also help the students to feel much more confident utilizing a foreign language in front of others. Taking this into consideration, Di Pietro also suggests that the students perform the role-play in front of all their peers. In this way, the rest of the students will be able hear different strategies for executing the same situation and the teacher will also be able to give valuable feedback to all the students at once.

Feedback and Discussion

Olstain and Cohen (1991) indicate that the feedback and discussion section is where the students will reflect on and compare the pragmatic differences between the students' native language and the target language, and this in turn, will help them internalize the knowledge they have gained. Taking this into consideration, Garcia (1996) points out that there are pragmatic differences between every culture and region in the world.

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) say:

What we are after is the development of an awareness of sociocultural and sociolinguistic differences that might exist between one's first language and the target language. Such awareness will often help explain to both teachers and learners why sometimes there is unintended pragmatic failure and breakdown in communication. If we are aware of it, it might be easier to find the appropriate remedy (p. 164).

Therefore, teachers must realize that Spanish pragmatics is not an exact science that can be generalized to fit the norms of every Spanish region and culture, but teachers can teach tendencies and similarities that occur between certain cultural groups.

Common general strategies are what should be sought after and implemented. As stated previously, more and more studies will need to be conducted in order to find the pragmatic commonalities and differences between Spanish speaking groups. These commonalities should be understood because it is impossible to study and implement every possible strategy that is used in the different regions and cultures. In the end, the most important thing is that the students gain the ability to recognize pragmatic differences that exist in their own culture and the target culture. In this way, they will be able to understand and adapt to any pragmatic situation they might be confronted with. They will have an open mind to the cultural norms associated with different groups and be able to incorporate these norms into their own language if they choose to do so. From explicit instruction in the classroom, the students learn to recognize, understand, and apply new pragmatic strategies that they encounter.

Final Conclusions

Summary of Results

In conclusion, this investigation provided a cross sectional study of the effects of the level of Spanish of university L2 learners on their ability to carry out appropriate refusals. The results indicate that the advanced students in this study have not progressed in their pragmatic ability as they advance in Spanish proficiency, and therefore, it is probable that students will not progress in their pragmatic ability unless they are explicitly taught the necessary pragmatic skills as they advance in Spanish proficiency. For this reason, the author of this study has created a teaching plan based on Olshtain and Cohen's (1991) and García's (2006) models to teach speech act performance in the classroom. This author's plan is specifically set up for teaching Spanish refusals, but the principles are the same for other specific speech acts, and therefore, it can be adapted and modified to meet each teacher's personal needs and goals. This model involves implementing a diagnostic evaluation, demonstrating a model dialogue, having an evaluation of the situation, practicing role-play situations, and having feedback and discussion. There are far too many differences between all the Spanish speaking cultures to memorize every pragmatic strategy possible, and therefore, it is necessary to teach the students the commonalities and major differences that exist between them. In the end, the major goal is to create a pragmatic awareness in the students so that they will be able to recognize and adapt accordingly to the various situations that they will encounter and consequently, become overall better language learners.

Limitations

Taking these findings into consideration, a few caveats do need to be set in place. First, more studies have to be conducted utilizing a greater sample number in order to better generalize the results. Also, this author exclusively studied refusals between friends, and therefore, more studies investigating differences in power and social status will need to be conducted. Furthermore, this study utilized a discourse completion, whereas the studies conducted by García (1992, 1998) and Félix-Brasdefer (2006) utilized role-plays to obtain their results, and for this reason, it would be beneficial to compare these results with new investigations involving role-plays. Finally, more investigations need to be done on refusals by native Spanish speakers in order to be able to clarify the target goal of refusing an invitation in Spanish.

Instruments

Part 1

Instructions: How would you respond to the given situations in Spanish? Write out a response that would be appropriate given the situation. Then, briefly explain why you responded the way you did. You may explain in English or Spanish.

1. Un amigo lo(a) invita a usted a su casa para almorzar. Usted le dice que no le es posible. Él insiste.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

2. Su amigo necesita conseguir un trabajo pero no sabe dónde buscar. Usted habla con él sobre esto.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

3. Usted quiere ir al cine la próxima semana porque no desea hacerlo hoy. Su amigo le invita a ir al cine hoy.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

4. Unos amigos se van a reunir para estudiar para los exámenes finales. Usted sabe que no va a ir porque no puede estudiar bien con otras personas. Ellos siguen insistiendo que usted vaya.

Usted les dice:

¿Por qué? _____

5. Su amigo va tener un bebé y Ud. quiere felicitarlo(a).

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

6. Un amigo lo(a) invita a su partido de fútbol. Usted no quiere ir porque el partido empieza muy temprano.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

7. Su amigo va a dar un concierto y quiere que usted vaya. Usted quiere descansar en su casa en vez de ir.

Usted le dice:

¿Por qué? _____

8. Para las vacaciones, unos amigos lo(a) invitan a usted a ir a Nueva York. Usted no quiere ir a Nueva York, pero sus amigos insisten.

Usted les dice:

¿Por qué? _____

Part 2

Instructions: How would you respond to the given situations in Spanish? Choose the answer that would be the most appropriate given each situation. There may be more than one possible answer, so please choose the best answer. Then, briefly explain why. You may explain in English or Spanish.

1. Su amigo va a tener un bebé y usted no lo sabía. Usted le dice:

a. ¡Felicitaciones! ¡Cuánto me alegro!

b. Me gustaría tener un bebé.

c. ¿Por qué no me dijiste a mí antes?

d. Tu bebé va a ser gordo.

¿Por qué? _____

2. Sus amigos dan una fiesta este sábado. Ellos lo(a) habían invitado a usted pero usted tiene una cita con su novio/a. Usted les había dicho que no iba a poder asistir, pero ellos lo(a) llaman a usted e insisten. Usted les dice:

- a. Lo siento pero tengo otros planes, y no puedo ir.
- b. ¿Qué tal si paso por tu casa otro día?
- c. Tengo una cita con mi novio/a este sábado.
- d. Ya les dije que no podía ir. No me llamen más, por favor.

¿Por qué? _____

3. Un amigo quiere ir con usted a un partido de béisbol, pero a usted no le gusta el béisbol. Usted le dice:

- a. Estoy muy cansado/a. No puedo ir.
- b. Ya tengo otros planes muy importantes.
- c. No me gusta el béisbol, y tú lo sabes.
- d. Quisiera ir, pero mi familia viene de Nueva York para visitarme.

¿Por qué? _____

4. El perro de su amigo se murió. Usted le dice:

- a. ¡Qué pena! ¿Cómo puedo ayudarte?
- b. Todos los perros se mueren.
- c. Lo siento.
- d. El perro tenía 20 años. Todos sabían que iba a ocurrir.

¿Por qué? _____

5. Su amigo lo(a) invita a usted a un baile esta noche pero usted tiene mucha tarea. Usted le dice:

- a. Los bailes no son para mí. ¡Olvídate!
- b. Sí, voy a hacer todo lo posible para ir al baile.
- c. No quiero ir.
- d. Si tengo tiempo voy, si no, no.

¿Por qué? _____

6. Su amigo no fue a su fiesta. Usted se encuentra con su amigo. Usted le dice:

- a. ¡Nunca más te voy a invitar!
- b. Ya no somos amigos.
- c. Puedes ir la próxima vez.
- d. Gracias por no venir.

¿Por qué? _____

7. La familia de su amigo viene de Canadá. Él quiere que usted vaya a su casa para conocerlos. Usted no puede ir y ya le ha dicho a su amigo que no puede ir, pero él insiste. Usted le dice:

- a. Tengo un examen al día siguiente.
- b. No quiero conocer a tus padres.
- c. Voy a tratar de pasar por tu casa entonces.

d. Tú sabes que no me gustan las reuniones familiares.

¿Por qué? _____

8. Su amigo quiere vivir con usted durante el semestre. Usted piensa que no va a poder estudiar bien si vive con otra persona. Usted le dice:

a. No, no, no. De ninguna manera. No estudio bien si vivo con amigos.

b. No me gusta vivir en apartamentos.

c. Ya tengo otro amigo que necesita un compañero de cuarto.

d. Me gustaría, pero mi mamá está muy enferma y la estoy cuidando. No puedo dejarla y vivir en otro lugar.

¿Por qué? _____

9. Su amigo quiere ir a un restaurante italiano pero usted no quiere ir. Usted le dice:

a. No, no me gusta ese restaurante.

b. A esa hora yo voy a levantar pesas.

c. Sabes que yo iría pero justo a esa hora tengo mi clase de español.

d. No voy a poder ir.

¿Por qué? _____

10. Hay una película de guerra que su amigo quiere ver. A usted no le gusta la violencia. Usted le dice:

a. Me encantaría ir al cine contigo, pero mi hermano está en el hospital y voy a visitarlo.

b. ¿De guerra? Uhm... voy a pensarlo.

c. Estoy muy ocupado/a ese día. No tengo tiempo para ir al cine.

d. No tengo suficiente dinero ni ganas de ir al cine.

¿Por qué? _____

11. Usted necesita ayuda con su tarea de matemáticas porque no entiende muy bien.

Usted le pide ayuda a su amigo. Usted le dice:

a. Si fuera posible, ¿podrías ayudarme?

b. Ayúdame con las matemáticas.

c. Tú puedes ayudarme con las matemáticas ahora.

d. Si no me ayudas con las matemáticas, no voy a ser tu amigo/a.

¿Por qué? _____

12. Su amigo desea ir al museo de arte con usted el sábado. Usted va a ir a la playa.

Usted le dice:

a. Me encantaría ir pero me siento muy, muy enfermo. No puedo salir de la cama.

b. No voy a poder ir.

c. Lo siento, pero ¿a un museo de arte? ¡Ni loco/a!

d. No, porque me voy a la playa con otros amigos.

¿Por qué? _____

13. Hay un examen difícil que su amigo va a tomar mañana. Él le pide ayuda. Usted tiene que estudiar para sus exámenes y no tiene tiempo. Usted le dice:

a. ¿Otra vez quieres que te ayude? ¡No es justo!

- b. Tengo muchos exámenes. No tengo tiempo.
- c. ¿Qué tal si no nos preocupamos tanto por los exámenes?
- d. Tengo muchos exámenes pero voy a pasar a tu casa cuando termine. (En realidad, usted no va a ir a su casa)

¿Por qué? _____

14. Su amigo le da a usted \$20 por su cumpleaños. Usted le dice:

- a. Tú eres el mejor amigo que tengo.
- b. Muchas gracias.
- c. No le dice nada.
- d. Usted no acepta el dinero.

¿Por qué? _____

15. Hay un baile y muchos de sus amigos van a estar ahí. Un amigo le pide a usted que vaya. A usted no le gusta bailar. Usted le dijo a su amigo que no puede ir pero su amigo insiste que vaya. Usted le dice:

- a. Bueno, sí iré (pero usted no va a asistir).
- b. Tú sabes que no me gusta bailar, ¿por qué me invitas?
- c. No puedo ir, lo siento.
- d. Tengo que limpiar la casa, y no voy a tener tiempo.

¿Por qué? _____

References

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey.
- Brown, J. L., Hiller, R. (2006). *Conversaciones Creadas*. (3rd ed.) Houghton Mifflin College Division.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Carla: Pragmatics and speech acts. Retrieved from <http://carla.umn.edu/speechacts/index.html>
- DiPietro, R. J. (1987). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dvorak, T., Valdes, G., Hannum, T. P. (2007). *Composicion*. (5th ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(12), 2158-2187.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). Teaching pragmatics in the classroom: Instruction of mitigation in Spanish as a foreign language. *Hispania*, 91(2), 479-494.
- García, C. (1992). Refusing an invitation: A case study of Peruvian style. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 5(1-2), 207-243.
- García, C. (1996). Teaching speech act performance: Declining an invitation. *Hispania*, 79(2), 267-277.
- García, C. (2007). “Ché, mirá, vos sabés que no voy a poder”: How Argentineans refuse an invitation. *Hispania*, 90(3), 551-564.
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 279-289.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce Murcia (Ed). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 164-165. New York: Newbury House.
- Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication*, second ed. Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Rapport management: a framework for analysis. In: Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally Speaking. Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. Continuum, London, 11-46.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 95-119.

Spinelli, E., and García C. (2012). *Interacciones*. (7th ed.). Heinle & Heinle Pub.