

Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic Variation: Refusing among Spanish Heritage Speakers

Vanessa Elias

Indiana University

Abstract

Few researchers have examined the pragmatic competence of Spanish heritage speakers (e.g. Pinto & Raschio, 2008; Valdés, 1981; Walters, 1979; Zentella, 1997). The present study investigates the strategies that Spanish heritage speakers use when giving a refusal, as well as how they perceive insistence. The data from the study come from nine Spanish heritage speakers that interacted with another Spanish heritage speaker. The participants and interlocutor engaged in four different role-play situations that included two refusals to an invitation and two refusals to a suggestion. Afterwards the participants completed a retrospective verbal report with the researcher (Cohen, 2012). The results from the study show that the participants preferred the use of indirect refusal strategies, such as giving a reason or explanation or an indefinite reply, which demonstrates the participant's willingness to engage with the interlocutor despite giving a refusal. The results from the retrospective verbal report reveal that heritage speakers are aware of cultural differences and in some cases are susceptible to these differences. This study demonstrates that these Spanish heritage speakers possess the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge of Spanish.

Keywords: pragmatics, speech acts, refusals, Spanish heritage speakers, perception

1. Introduction

Current population trends of the Hispanic community in the United States project that the Hispanic population will become the minority-majority by 2044 (Krogstad, 2014). As the number of Spanish speakers increases in this country, so does the number of Spanish heritage speakers. Valdés (2001) defines a heritage speaker as an individual who was raised in a non-English speaking home, who can speak and/or understand the heritage language and be bilingual to some degree in English and the heritage language. Spanish in the United States has received increased attention from researchers from various disciplines, particularly from linguists (Beaudrie & Fairclough, 2012), who have focused on Spanish heritage speaker's grammatical competence (Montrul, 2012), Spanish language maintenance (Rivera-Mills, 2012), phonetic competence (Potowski, 2008; Ronquest, 2013), and bilingual language acquisition (Silva-Corvalán, 2014). Additionally, concerns of how native a Spanish heritage speaker is have also been debated. Nevertheless, although these different topics have been investigated by a number of researchers, there still remains a limited number of studies that have focused on the pragmatic knowledge and production of Spanish heritage speakers in the United States.

There are two types of pragmatic knowledge, pragmalinguistic knowledge and sociopragmatic knowledge. Leech (1983) defines pragmalinguistic knowledge as "the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions" (p. 11). Sociopragmatic knowledge, on the other hand, is defined as the "mapping of forms, meaning, force, and context which are sometimes obligatory and sometimes not" (Rose & Kasper, 2001, p. 51). Therefore, pragmalinguistic knowledge is the understanding of which forms and strategies are used to convey an illocution. Sociopragmatic knowledge refers to the ability of knowing in which contexts the forms and strategies are appropriate. The objective of the current study is to expand the research done on pragmatics and Spanish heritage speakers by focusing on the speech act of refusals and examining this population's pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence.

This article begins with an overview of the studies that exist on the pragmatics of Spanish heritage speakers with particular attention to refusals. Next, the Method section describes the participants, tasks, and the refusal taxonomy that is utilized to analyze the data, followed by the research questions. Later, the quantitative and qualitative results are presented followed by a discussion of the results. Finally, the conclusions are given.

2. Literature review

2.1 Studies on the pragmatics of Spanish heritage speakers

Pinto (2012) notes that within the bilingual community, the limited exposure to monolingual Spanish and English interference combine to form a bicultural hybrid system that has yet to be studied. Despite a limited number of

pragmatic studies, speech acts have received the most attention (Félix-Brasdefer & Koike, 2014). Some of the speech acts include requests (Arellano, 2000; Pinto & Raschio, 2007; Valdés, 1981; Walters, 1979; Zentella, 1997), complaints (Pinto & Raschio, 2008), leave-takings (García, 1981), gratitude (Dumitrescu, 2005), compliment responses (Valdés & Pino, 1981), and advice giving and suggestions (Youmans, 2001). These studies describe Spanish heritage speaker's language in these various contexts, but do not discuss extensively the pragmatic system of this population, which would provide beneficial information about how these individual systems are affected by their exposure to two distinct cultures.

The studies on Spanish heritage speaker pragmatics are scarce in comparison to other dialects of Spanish. Requests are the most widely studied speech act in Spanish and within Spanish in the U.S. Walters (1979) studied Puerto Rican Spanish-English bilingual children and concluded that the children were more polite in Spanish than in English. Valdés (1981) investigated the use of code-switching to aggravate or mitigate a request in the spontaneous speech of Mexican-American bilingual university students, while Zentella (1997) examined Puerto Rican children in New York. Both studies found that code-switching was used to both mitigate and aggravate a request in their respective dialects. Furthermore, Arellano (2000) found that Mexican-American farm workers chose their strategy according to the authority and level of imposition of the request. Lastly, Pinto and Paschio (2007) studied three groups of speakers, heritage Spanish speakers, native English speakers and native Spanish speakers and concluded that in terms of level of directness, heritage speakers were more similar to the English speakers. In addition, in regards to the number of downgraders, the heritage speakers differed from the Spanish and English monolingual groups, falling somewhere in-between the two monolingual groups.

In addition to requests, other speech acts have been investigated as well. Valdés and Pino (1981) studied compliment responses in a corpus of spontaneous speech and found that that code-switching was a widely used compliment strategy by the bilingual speakers. Yañez (1990) also examined compliment responses in the spontaneous speech of Chicano women in family and church gatherings and determined the speakers always responded to the compliment in the language in which the compliment was given and the structure of the responses were more similar to that of monolingual English speakers. Besides compliment responses, leave-takings have also been studied. García (1981) examined in a five-minute conversation between three generations of Mexican-Americans at a family celebration and found that there was a four-step process when performing a leave-taking which included: the announcement of the intention of leaving, gathering of personal belongings and departing family members, joking and planning the next gathering and expression of terminal exchanges and closings. Additionally, Youmans (2001) explored the use of modals in the spontaneous speech of low working class Chicano women and two middle-class Anglo graduate students. The study noticed that the Anglo participants preferred negative politeness strategies while the Chicanos preferred to use positive politeness strategies.

Finally, the most recent study on the pragmatics of Spanish heritage speakers is Pinto and Raschio (2008) which studied complaints in heritage speakers, native English speakers, and native Spanish speakers. The results showed that the English and heritage speakers used more justification of speaker, which could be due to the mitigating effect of the strategy, which diminished the impact of the complaint. Moreover, the authors noted that the heritage speakers are more similar to the English speakers in their use of semantic formulas. Additionally, Pinto and Raschio (2008) noted a lack of English borrowings in the complaints, which the authors concluded could be for a variety of reasons, such as the nature of the instrument used in the study. The authors concluded that the heritage speakers in the study have their “unique intercultural style” due to the contact that they have with both English and Spanish.

As previously mentioned, studies examining Spanish heritage speaker pragmatics are scarce when compared to other dialects of Spanish. The aforementioned studies provide valuable information about how bilinguals and/or Spanish heritage speakers use code-switching as a mitigating device or discuss the sequencing of a speech act in spontaneous data, but there are several gaps that need to be filled within this small body of work. For example, a concern about studies such as Arellano (2000) or Pinto and Raschio (2007, 2008) is that they utilized written Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs), which have been identified as problematic by some researchers (e.g. Félix-Brasdefer, 2003b, 2010; Kasper, 2000). In addition, although pioneer articles in this field, many studies such as Valdés and Pino (1981) García (1981) Yañez (1990) and Youmans (2001) fail to mention if proficiency level of the participants was assessed. Furthermore, some studies like Valdés & Pino (1981) do not mention the number of responses, or focus on small amounts of data, so generalizations about this population and comparisons to other dialects of Spanish are difficult to make.

2.2 What are refusals?

Refusals are a reactive speech in which a speaker “fails to engage in an action proposed by the interlocutor” (Chen, Ye & Zhang, 1995, p. 121). They function as a response to an initial act performed by another individual and are considered commissives under Searle’s (1969) taxonomy of speech acts because they create an obligation on the part of the speaker and commit him/her to perform an action. Additionally, according to Brown and Levinson (1987) they are a face-threatening act because they act in opposition to the wants and desires of the interlocutor and subsequently damage the addressee’s positive face. In giving a refusal, the speakers can give a direct refusal such as “No” or an indirect refusal such as “I don’t have time.” Refusals are often accompanied by supporting moves, such as an explanation “I have other plans” or expressions of willingness (I really want to, but...) that help in mitigating the refusal (Félix-Brasdefer, 2008a, p.196).

The study of refusals dates back to the mid 70’s with the study of refusals to requests (Shigeta, 1974). One of the most noteworthy studies on refusals is

Beebe, Takahaski, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) which examined Japanese students studying English to assess whether the students transferred their pragmatic knowledge from Japanese into English. The major contribution of this work was its proposed classification taxonomy for refusals, which continues to be used in recent studies (Félix-Brasdefer, 2003a, 2006, 2008b). Furthermore, studies on refusals in Spanish date as early as 1992 with the study of Peruvian Spanish by García. However, despite the numerous studies on this speech act, to date no study has examined the speech act of refusals within the Spanish of heritage speakers in the United States.

2.3 Refusals in the Spanish speaking world

The speech act of refusals has been investigated in several different dialects of Spanish. Some of the earlier works on refusals in Spanish are García (1992, 1999, 2007) which investigated refusals in Peruvian Spanish, Venezuelan Spanish, and Argentinean Spanish, respectively. In all three studies, García utilized Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model and Blum Kulka, House, and Kasper's (1989) classification of strategies to analyze data collected through role plays. The results from García's studies demonstrated that Peruvians preferred to demonstrate respect when issuing the first refusal, but then preferred the use of solidarity moves in order to establish and maintain a sense of camaraderie with the interlocutor when responding to insistence. These three cultures form part of a positive politeness culture, in which the participants are not concerned with protecting their negative face and the interlocutor's negative face.

Other studies on refusals include Félix-Brasdefer (2006) which analyzed the strategies used to refuse in different situations utilizing Watts' (2003) politeness model and Scollon and Scollon's (2001) model on positive and negative face. The participants in the study, all males, performed a series of role plays in which they refused two invitations, a suggestion, and a request. The results from the study showed preference for indirect strategies when refusing and revealed that insistence is a response to a refusal that is not considered a face-threatening act. Furthermore, the results from the verbal reports demonstrated that the speakers showed a preference for involvement by providing indefinite replies or justifying their refusal in order to mitigate their response. In addition, with respect to the notion of face, the results indicated that these participants are oriented toward involvement versus independence. Lastly, the participants used formulaic expressions to convey respect to the interlocutor. The results from Félix-Brasdefer (2006) confirmed results from a previous study (Félix-Brasdefer, 2003a), in that the monolingual Spanish speakers demonstrated a preference for indirect strategies when refusing.

Félix-Brasdefer (2006) as well as the studies by García (1992, 1999) provide insight into how refusals are carried out in monolingual situations and are a starting point to better understanding how this speech act is carried out in the Spanish-speaking world. Refusals can seem a bit impolite to someone because they are behaviors that can "...conflict with how one expects them to

be, how one wants them to be and/or how one thinks they ought to be” (Culpeper, 2011, p. 23). In addition, Culpeper notes that what can be inappropriate in one context may be appropriate in another one. For these cultures, it is important to engage with people despite having to give a refusal and these interactions also aide in the mitigation of the refusal.

2.4 Insistence in Spanish

Insisting, according to Vanderveken (1990), is the act of directing in a ‘persistent way’ that increases the degree of strength of the action in question (p. 193). Hundsnurscher (1981), on the other hand, defines insisting as a reactive action that occurs after an initial action is rejected and is an indication that producer of the first action ‘is not going to abandon his goal’ (p. 349). In addition, within Brown and Levinson’s (1987) framework, insisting would be considered a face-threatening act because of its imposition of free will on a person.

Puga Larraín (1997) found that insisting is a socially appropriate and expected behavior in Spanish culture. In addition, García (1992, 1999, 2007) found that her participants preferred to demonstrate respect upon giving the first refusal, but then would use solidarity moves in the subsequent refusals in order to establish/maintain their relationship with the interlocutor. Félix-Brasdefer (2003a, 2006, 2008a, 2008b) found similar results, but in his study he found that the learners found insisting to be a rude behavior, which Félix-Brasdefer (2008a) attributed to their pragmatic systems in English. Thus, it is important to review in more depth the notion of insisting for the present study, given that the participants have been exposed to cultures that hold opposing views of insisting in refusals.

Placencia (2008, 2011) focused on insistence in the Spanish of Quito, Ecuador through an ethnographic approach to analyze participant observation notes, 15 hours of spontaneous interactions, and in-depth interviews with twelve men and ten women in order to determine their role and acceptability within this society. The results from Placencia (2008, 2011) indicate that insistence is an acceptable behavior because it demonstrates affection between the individuals and functions as a form of connection talk between the people. However, according to Placencia (2008) there appears to be a shift occurring in which the older generation is more accepting of insisting. This could be an indication of valuing interdependence within the society while the younger generation does not view insisting as an acceptable behavior, which could be a shift towards autonomy. Lastly, the data demonstrate that insistence with food offerings is an activity that is performed by the older generation.

The works discussed in the section give insight into how insisting is used and perceived in the Spanish-speaking world. The advantages of the works by Placencia (2008, 2011) are that the studies utilized naturally-occurring data in the analysis versus controlled data elicitation tasks as used in García (1992, 1999, 2007) and Félix-Brasdefer (2003a, 2006, 2008a, 2008b). Félix-Brasdefer (2007) discusses that elicited data approximate natural discourse; however, naturally-occurring data is more complex and spans over multiple

turns. The work by Placencia gives a more complete understanding of how insisting functions within the Spanish-speaking community and also tells of the on-going changes that are occurring through the generations. Although all the studies discussed in this section contribute to our understanding of insisting, Placencia (2008, 2011) gives more comprehensive insight into the behavior, which is important for the current project. Furthermore, it allows us to understand how insistence is viewed among Spanish monolinguals, so that we can examine how Spanish heritage speakers may be similar or different. Without knowing how insisting is viewed in monolingual contexts, conclusions on how Spanish heritage speakers view or use this behavior would be unattainable.

2.5 Politeness

The studies that investigated the speech of refusals in the Spanish-speaking world focused on politeness strategies and used different politeness models, such as Brown and Levinson (1987) and Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management model. Another politeness model is Scollon and Scollon's (2012) interpersonal politeness and power, which will be used in the present study. This model takes into consideration the notion of face, a three-tier face system, and a three-tier politeness system. The notion of face (e.g. Goffman 1967) is a complex concept because on one side, humans need interactions with other individuals and to show their involvement with them, but on the other hand, people like to maintain distance from others which demonstrates respect for that person's independence. Scollon and Scollon (2012) define the involvement component of face, also referred to as solidarity politeness, as a concern for someone's "right and need to be considered normal, contributing, or supporting member of society" (p. 48). Independence, also referred to as deference politeness, stresses individuality and respects a person's own autonomy and freedom.

The three tiers of the face system are power, distance, and weight of imposition. Power is defined as the vertical disparity between individuals in a hierarchical society. Distance refers to the level of closeness that exists between two people. And weight of imposition is contingent on the situation; for example, as the weight of imposition increases, so does the use of independence strategies. In addition to the face system, Scollon and Scollon's (2012) model also includes a politeness system that includes deference, solidarity, and hierarchy. The three-way split in the system is dependent on the power and distance difference between the individuals. In the deference face system there is a symmetrical power relationship, distance between the two parties. A solidarity face system has a symmetrical power relationship and a close distance relationship. Lastly, a hierarchical face system includes an asymmetrical power relationship and asymmetrical face strategies. The current study will manipulate power and distance, thus creating symmetrical and asymmetrical situations. Scollon and Scollon's model provides an instrumental means of examining these distinct situations in order to gain

better insight as to what strategies Spanish heritage speakers use when refusing.

2.6 Refusals in L2 Spanish

Refusals have also been studied in the context of Spanish a second language. Félix-Brasdefer (2008a) examined the perception of refusals to invitations through the use of retrospective verbal reports. The study utilized Cohen's (2005) classification of strategies for learning and using speech acts, which includes cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, effective strategies, and social strategies. The participants in the study included twenty males who were advanced learners of Spanish who performed two open role plays and a retrospective report with the investigator. The results of cognitive strategies revealed that the participants had many things on their minds when carrying out the role play, but they focused more on providing a reason/explanation for the refusal. As for the language of thought, there was no clear pattern. Some of participants thought in Spanish, while others did not report a language. Lastly, the questions on social strategies revealed that some of the participants are aware that Latin Americans insist more than Americans do. Furthermore, the majority of the participants did not expect insisting because for them it is considered rude or bothersome.

Prior to Félix-Brasdefer (2008a), information on the perception of speech acts was scarce; thus, the present study provides a substantial contribution to the field, particularly in understanding the cognitive processes involved in speech act production. In addition, the study offers crucial evidence for the advantages of employing retrospective verbal reports as a data collection tool. And given that this data collection tool has not been used in any study with heritage speakers, it will provide crucial insight into the mental processes of heritage speakers when performing the speech act of refusing. Finally, Félix-Brasdefer (2008a) discusses how learners perceive particular strategies when they refuse. This idea is important, because as Pinto (2012) states, Spanish heritage speakers form a bicultural hybrid system, and knowing how second language learners perceive strategies like insistence could be a valuable clue into how the participants of the current investigation will perceive it as well. The following section will discuss Cohen's (2005) taxonomy of language learner strategies and how it applies to the current investigation.

2.7 Language learning strategies

In addition to Scollon and Scollon's (2012) politeness model, this study will also use a modified version of Cohen's (2005) taxonomy of language learner strategies. The framework includes two different strategies, language-learning strategies and language use strategies. The language learning strategies include: cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. Cognitive strategies are those strategies such as identifying, distinguishing or committing material to memory. Metacognitive strategies are the strategies used for planning, checking how it is going, and then evaluating

how the interaction went. Affective strategies are for regulating attitudes and motivation while social strategies are for enhancing learning with other and seeking authentic interactions with native speakers.

In addition to language learning strategies, Cohen's (2005) taxonomy also includes language use strategies which are activated once the learner has acquired the information needed to carry out the interaction. The sub-categories for this strategy are retrieval, rehearsal, communication, and cover. Retrieval involves recalling information about language stored in memory, such as the correct verb tense to make a polite request. Rehearsal strategies are for practicing information that the learner already possesses. Communication strategies are ways of maneuvering a conversation in order to avoid problems. Lastly, cover strategies are used to avoid embarrassment, and include memorizing formulaic expressions or laughing at a joke that you did not fully understand.

The current study will focus on three of the four language learning strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies. The participants in this investigation have grown up speaking Spanish and thus their motivation for knowing Spanish is entirely different in comparison to second language learners. Thus, it is not practical to analyze all strategies because not all of them apply to heritage speakers' special language learning situation. In addition, this taxonomy will be used with Spanish heritage speakers because to date no study exists that has explored heritage speaker's perception of speech acts, especially the speech act of refusing. Lastly, knowing this information is important because it will provide a better understanding of how the pragmatic system of these speakers has been affected.

Given the limited amount of studies that have analyzed the pragmatics of Spanish heritage speakers, the present study aims to investigate the speech act of refusals in order to expand the understanding of Spanish heritage speaker pragmatics. In addition, to date no study has explored the perception of speech acts by this population. It is for these reasons that the current study seeks to explore the following questions:

1. What strategies do Spanish heritage speakers use when refusing an invitation and when refusing a suggestion?
2. What language learning strategies do Spanish heritage speakers employ when refusing an invitation and when refusing a suggestion?

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The participants for the present investigation are nine second-generation Spanish speakers of Mexican descent, five females and four males. For the purposes of this study, second-generation Spanish speakers are defined as participants who were born in the United States and both parents were born in Mexico. This definition was adopted given that they are the second generation

of Spanish speakers residing in the United States. Two of the nine participants were born in California and moved to Indiana when they were young; the remaining participants were born and raised in the Midwest of the United States. The participants are college students from a large Midwestern university. The participants interacted with an interlocutor who also fit the criteria for participating in the study. Prior to participating, the investigator asked the individuals where they were born and where their parents were born. Only those who fit the criteria were invited to participate.

All the participants except for one are advanced Spanish speakers according to the *Diplomas de Español como Lengua Extranjera* (DELE)¹ proficiency test that was administered. The other participant, according to the DELE exam, is an intermediate Spanish speaker. The interlocutor of the study is also an advanced Spanish speaker like the rest of the participants. The average age of the participants at the time of data collection is 20.3 years old. The interlocutor was a female Spanish heritage speaker who was 19 years old. Half of the participants and the interlocutor were enrolled in Spanish courses at the university level. All of them stated that they were enrolled in Spanish courses in order to improve their grammar and writing skills. In addition, all of the participants stated that they used Spanish with their families, and six of them stated that they also used Spanish with other Spanish-speaking friends.

3.2 Instrument and procedure

The data for the present study come from two different tasks. The first task consisted of seven open role plays between the participants and the interlocutor. These situations were presented in Spanish to the participants, in order to activate the participant's Spanish knowledge. Of the seven role plays, four were analyzed for the current investigation and three functioned as distractor role plays. The four situations included two refusals to an invitation and two refusals to a suggestion and were modeled after Félix-Brasdefer (2008b). The situations were based on two variables: social power, understood as the degree of familiarity, close (-distance) or distant (+distance) relationship between the participants as specified in the role play situations; and social distance, the relation between the participants in a hierarchical structure (Scollon & Scollon, 2012).

Both Kasper (2000) and Félix-Brasdefer (2003b) have attested to the validity of role-plays in pragmatic studies. Félix-Brasdefer (2003b, 2010) states when compared to written DCT's, role-plays are a more valid instrument when learning Spanish in a foreign language context. The use of role plays also allows for control of variables such as power and distance, which could be difficult to control in naturally occurring data (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010). The role play situations used in the current study can be

¹ The DELE exam is a standardized exam issued by the *Instituto Cervantes* to assess Spanish language proficiency. This test has been used to determine Spanish proficiency in Spanish heritage speakers by other researchers (Montrul, 2004, 2005, 2010).

found in Appendix A. Table 1 demonstrates the distribution of the situations according to Scollon and Scollon's (2012) politeness system.

Table 1. Distribution of situations by face system

<u>Politeness System</u>	<u>Status of participant to interlocutor</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Power</u>
Solidarity	Equal: Friend-Friend (invitation)	-	-
Solidarity	Equal: Friend-Friend (suggestion)	-	-
Hierarchical	Lower: Employee-Boss (invitation)	+	+
Hierarchical	Lower: Student-Advisor (suggestion)	+	+

During each of the role plays the participants interacted with the same interlocutor and both the participant and the interlocutor received a card with the context for the situation. However, the participant and interlocutor did not receive the same set of information. The information was written in Spanish and the participants were instructed to carry out the role play as naturally as possible. The interlocutor was told that she wanted the participant to do what was explained in the situation, but that she should end the conversation when she saw fit. All of the role plays were performed one after the other and were recorded using a digital audio recorder.

The data for the second task come from retrospective verbal reports that the investigator conducted with the participants. Retrospective verbal reports are verbal reports that are collected from the participants immediately after completing a task, in this case after completing all seven role plays (Cohen, 1998, 2004, 2012; Cohen & Olshtain, 1993 Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Hassall, 2008; Robinson, 1992; Widjaja, 1997; Woodfield, 2012). Upon completion of the role plays, the participants and the investigator met and listened to each refusal role play individually. After listening to each role play, the investigator asked the participants about their perception of the role plays, particularly, what they were paying attention to when they refused. In addition, they were asked to discuss their language of thought and to discuss what pragmatic knowledge they possess and how this affected their interaction in the role plays. This part of the study was conducted in the language in which the participant felt most comfortable, which for all the participants was English. Table 2 shows the questions that were asked and have been adapted from Félix-Brasdefer (2008a). The use of verbal reports has been attested in various pragmatic studies as an effective tool to collect information about what participants attend to when carrying out a role play (Cohen, 1998; 2004).

Table 2. Questions asked in the retrospective verbal reports

Cognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were you paying attention to when you refused in this situation? • Is the situation realistic?
Language of thought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you responded to this situation, to what extent

Pragmatic knowledge	<p>were you thinking in Spanish or in English?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you switch the language of thought at some point during your response?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was it important for you to be direct or indirect when you refused in this situation? • After you refused, did you expect any insistence from the interlocutor? How did it make you feel? • Do you consider insistence to be rude or acceptable behavior? • Have you noticed any cultural differences with respect to the notion of insistence between the Anglo culture in the United States and family's culture?

Cohen (2004) states that verbal reports allow us to analyze how an individual's perception influenced their responses. Félix-Brasdefer (2010) states that verbal reports serve to "validate the instrument, thus increasing both the content and construct validity" (p. 51). In addition, this tool is instrumental in understanding participant's sociocultural perception (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010). Additionally, Woodfield (2012) states that retrospective verbal reports are capable of revealing sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge when planning contexts (p. 232). Lastly, the use of verbal reports has been attested in both monolingual studies (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006) as well as studies with second language learners (Cohen and Olshain, 1993, Félix-Brasdefer, 2008a, Woodfield, 2012).

Once the participants completed the retrospective report, they completed a demographic questionnaire and a Spanish proficiency test. The background questionnaire is provided in Appendix B and asked participants about their experience with Spanish. The proficiency test was a DELE exam which consists of 30 multiple choice questions and 20 cloze test items. All of the participants were asked to complete both sections of the proficiency test. The information provided by both of these tasks give a better understanding of the participant's language abilities and their specific situation with Spanish.

3.3 Data analysis

Once the data were collected, the role plays and retrospective interviews were transcribed using Jefferson's conventions (1986, pp. ix-xvi) (See Appendix C). The statistical analysis for the study consisted of chi-square tests given that the data is presented in raw counts and not means. The statistical program SPSS 22 was used to run the analysis.

The role play data were analyzed using a modified version Beebe et al.'s (1990) and Félix-Brasdefer's (2008b) classification of refusals strategies. In addition, the data from the retrospective verbal reports were analyzed according to Cohen's (2005) language learning strategies. The classification of refusal strategies is included below in Table 3.

Table 3. Strategies used when giving a refusal

<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Example</u>
A. Direct strategies	
1. Flat No	No
2. Negative willingness	... no voy a poder. '...I won't be able.'
B. Indirect strategies	
1. Apology/regret	Lo siento... 'I'm sorry...'
2. Reason/explanation	En estos momentos, mi mamá también está enferma y ... 'At this moment my mother is also sick and...'
3. Statement of philosophy	Uno ya de tantas cosas se le olvida y se vuelve loca, que se le olvida ir a trabajar y luego la regañan... 'With some many things one forgets and goes crazy, you forget to go to work and then they yell at you ...'
4. Repetition	A: – Nada más por cinco minutos, no puedes ir? B – Cinco minutos no más y luegoirme, no vale la pena. 'Only for five minutes, can't you go?' ' Only five minutes and then I'll go, it's not worth it.'
5. Alternative	A la mejor podemos ir la siguiente semana. 'Maybe we can go next week.'
6. Indefinite reply	Uh no creo que vaya poder asistir. 'Uh I don't think I will be able to go.'
7. Postponement	...mejor prefería no tomarlo durante el verano '... I would prefer to not take it during the summer'
8. Request	¿A qué hora van a ir? 'What time are you going?'
9. Promise to comply	Pues voy a tratar 'Well I will try'
10. Condition of future or past acceptance	Mire, si era cómo las primeras semanas, sí 'Look if it were like the first weeks, yes'
11. Wish	Sí, ojalá 'Yes, I hope'
C. Solidarity Politeness Strategies	
1. Explicit acceptance	Estoy jugando, claro que voy a ir. 'I'm just playing, of course I will go.'
2. Solidarity	Ay, le mando saludos de mi parte. 'Oh, I send him/her my best wishes.'

D. Adjuncts to Refusals

1. Willingness	La verdad yo si quisiera ir ... 'The truth is I would like to go ...'
2. Gratitude	... muchas gracias por la invitación '... thanks a lot for the invitation'
3. Empathy	No las he visto en mucho tiempo. 'I have seen them in a long time.'
4. Agreement	<u>Sí, bueno sí</u> puedo, pero no lo creo. 'Yes, well yes I can, but I don't think so.'
5. Positive opinion	Sería buena idea 'It would be a great idea'

4. Results

4.1 Quantitative results of strategies used in refusals

4.1.1 Distribution of refusal strategies.

This section presents the results from the role-play situations. Table 4 shows the distribution of the strategies across the four refusal role-play situations for this study.

Table 4. Refusal strategies used by Spanish heritage speaker

<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Invite - Friend</u> (-D; -P) N (%)	<u>Suggest - Friend</u> (-D; -P) N (%)	<u>Invite - Boss</u> (+D; +P) N (%)	<u>Suggest - Advisor</u> (-D; -P) N (%)	<u>Total</u> N (%)
Direct strategies					
1. Flat No	2 (2.2)	5 (4.5)	0	1 (1.3)	8 (2.2)
2. Negative willingness	11 (12.1)	19 (17.1)	20 (22.7)	9 (11.5)	59 (16.0)
Indirect strategies					
1. Apology/regret	4 (4.4)	1 (0.9)	4 (4.5)	0	9 (2.4)
2. Reason/explanation	22 (24.2)	28 (25.2)	27 (30.7)	11 (14.1)	88 (23.9)
3. Statement of philosophy	2 (2.2)	0	0	0	2 (0.5)
4. Repetition	6 (6.6)	4 (3.6)	4 (4.5)	1 (1.3)	15 (4.1)
5. Alternative	9 (9.9)	4 (3.6)	2 (2.3)	3 (3.8)	18 (4.9)
6. Indefinite reply	7 (7.7)	14 (12.6)	6 (6.8)	18 (23.1)	45 (12.2)
7. Postponement	2 (2.2)	1 (0.9)	0	3 (3.8)	6 (1.6)

8. Request	7 (7.7)	12 (10.8)	0	16 (20.5)	35 (9.5)
9. Promise to comply	3 (3.3)	4 (3.6)	5 (5.7)	0	12 (3.3)
10. Condition of future or past acceptance	0	1 (0.9)	0	0	1 (0.3)
11. Wish	1 (1.1)	0	1 (1.1)	0	2 (0.5)
Solidarity Politeness					
1. Explicit acceptance	1 (1.1)	2 (1.8)	0	0	3 (0.8)
2. Solidarity	3 (3.3)	3 (2.7)	0 (1.1)	0	7 (1.9)
Adjuncts to Refusals					
1. Willingness	6 (6.6)	9 (8.1)	10 (11.4)	1 (1.3)	26 (7.1)
2. Gratitude	1 (1.1)	0	1 (1.1)	1 (1.3)	3 (0.8)
3. Empathy	1 (1.1)	0	2 (2.3)	0	3 (0.8)
4. Agreement	2 (2.2)	4 (3.6)	1 (1.1)	8 (10.3)	15 (4.1)
5. Positive opinion	1 (1.1)	0	0	0 (1.3)	
Supporting moves					
1. Preparator	0	0	4 (4.5)	5 (6.4)	9 (2.4)
Total	91 (100%)	111 (100%)	88 (100%)	78 (100%)	368 (100%)

The results from Table 4 reveals that the most used strategy by the participants in all four situations was giving a reason or explaining why they could not do something. Twenty-four percent (88/368) of the strategies were classified as a reason/explanation. The second most used strategy by the participants in all four of the role-plays was negative willingness, which was used 16% (59/368) of the time. The results from a chi-square show that these results are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 640.30$, $df=19$, $N=368$, $p<.000$), which reveals that the use of these two strategies was significantly more than the other strategies used by the participants. For example, in the refusal of a suggestion to a friend participants used more reasons and/or explanations that were similar to Participant 2's response, as in (1):

- (1) *...pero tengo que terminar de escribir umm terminar de escribir una tarea que tengo para mañana. Y luego también trabajo. '...but I have to finish writing umm finish writing a homework assignment that is due tomorrow. And then I have to work.'*

Participants also used more negative willingness strategies such as Participant's 1 strategy (2) more example below, than the other strategies:

- (2) ...*pues me encantaría salir con todos otra vez*, 'well I would love to go out with everyone again'

The total number of strategies varied across the four role play situations; however, the chi-square test revealed that these differences were not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.24$, $df=3$, $N=368$, $p=.101$). This demonstrates that there are no differences across the number of strategies used in each individual role play, despite the varying degree of distance between the interlocutor and the participant. Thus, although the (-distance, -power) situations resulted in more strategies than the (+power, +distance) situations this difference is not significant.

Despite no variation between the four role play situations, differences are observed within each situation. Within the role play of refusing a friend's invitation, the most used strategy was reason/explanation (*Tengo que estudiar y terminar la tarea*. 'I have to study and finish some homework.') (N=22; 24.2%). This result is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 99.209$, $df = 18$, $N=91$, $p<.000$). Similar results were found for both the role play situations in which the participants had to refuse a suggestion to a friend and refuse their boss's invitation to party. In the refusal to a suggestion made by a friend, the participants used reason/explanation (...*por eso tengo que ir a la clase*. '...that's why I have to go to class.') 25.2 % of the time (N=28). This result was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 114.81$, $df = 14$, $N=111$, $p<.000$). In the role play in which the participants refused an invitation to a party at their boss's house the participants used reason/explanation (e.g., *Pues yo ya le dije que me iba despedir de él antes*. 'Well I already told him that I was going to say goodbye to him beforehand.') 30.7 % of the time (N=27). Like the other role plays, this result was also statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 138.70$, $df = 13$, $N=89$, $p<.000$). The results for these three role play situations demonstrate that the participants choose reasons/explanations in comparison to the other strategies that they used. The results for the role play in which the participants refused a suggestion from an advisor had different results from the other three role plays. For this role play the participants employed an indefinite reply (e.g. *Es que no pensaba tomar clases en el verano* 'It's that I wasn't thinking of taking any classes this summer') 23.1% of the time (N=18). This was the most used strategy in this role play and a chi-square test revealed that this result is statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 138.70$, $df=13$, $N=89$, $p<.000$), which reveals that the participants used a more indirect strategy when refusing a suggestion to an advisor as opposed to another indirect strategy or a direct one.

4.1.2 Internal modifiers

Table 5 shows the distribution of internal modifiers that participants used within their refusal strategies. Syntactic internal modifiers include morphological modifications, such as the use of the conditional verb tense, negation, or tense and aspectual markers. Lexical internal modifiers include mitigating devices, such as *lo siento* (I'm sorry) or *perdón* (sorry), politeness markers hedgers, etc. (Faerch & Kasper, 1989).

Table 5. Distribution of internal modifiers across four refusal situations

<u>Role Play</u>	<u>Syntactic</u>	<u>Lexical</u>	<u>Total</u>
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Invitation – Friend (-D, -P)	6 (16.2)	14 (23.7)	20 (20.8)
Suggestion – Friend (-D, -P)	7 (18.9)	11 (18.6)	18 (18.75)
Invitation – Boss (+D, +P)	12 (32.4)	19 (32.2)	31 (32.3)
Suggestion – Advisor (+D, +P)	12 (32.4)	15 (25.4)	27(28.1)
Total	37 (100)	59 (100)	96 (100)

As can be seen in the table above, the participants chose to use more lexical internal modifiers (N= 59; 61.5%) than syntactic ones (N =37; 38.5%). The situation in which the participants had to refuse an invitation to a party from their boss had more internal modifiers (N = 31; 32.3%). In addition, the situation in which the participants had to refuse a suggestion from the advisor showed the second highest number of internal modifiers (N = 27; 28.1%). They used fewer internal modifiers in the situations in which they had to refuse to a friend. The results from a chi-square show that these differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 17.35$, $df = 6$, $N=96$, $p=.008$). This means that the participants used more lexical items than syntactic internal modifiers to mitigate their refusal, particularly when giving a refusal to their boss or advisor. They used fewer modifiers when refusing to their friends. This result is expected given the distance and power difference between a friend and a boss or an advisor and it is expected that one would attempt to mitigate more in those contexts than with a friend because there is a level of trust among friends.

4.2 Results from retrospective verbal reports

The results in this section come from the questions that were asked to the participants during the retrospective verbal report. The questions included what the participants were concerned with in the situations, the participant's language of thought, if it was important to be direct or indirect in the role plays, how they felt about insisting and if they noticed any cultural differences among Hispanic and Anglo cultures. The participants in the present study were concerned with what they were going to say to the interlocutor. In addition, they had difficulty determining their language of thought. Furthermore, they considered insisting as acceptable behavior. Lastly, they were aware of cultural differences. The sections below describe in more details the results of the retrospective verbal reports.

4.2.1 Cognition

After the role plays, retrospective verbal reports were conducted to obtain information about how the participants perceived the interactions that took

place. An analysis of the reports indicated that eight of the nine participants were primarily concerned with what they were going to say to the interlocutor.

- (3) Invitation by a friend (Participant #2):
 ‘I kept thinking about what I was going to say to her. Like what excuses was I going to tell her?’

Additionally, the participants found three of the four situations relatable. All of them stated that the first situation with the friend was very real for them because of all them had encountered a similar situation before. The same was true for the second friend role play and the advisor role play. Almost all of the participants had a real life experience to which they could relate the role play situation. The situation with the boss was least realistic for the participants because none of them had ever encountered such a situation in real life, as in (4):

- (4) Invitation by boss (Participant #2):
 ‘I don’t know, I just have never been in that situation. It was hard to know what to say.’

4.2.2 Language of thought

In addition to being questioned about what they were paying attention to, the participants were also asked to discuss their language of thought throughout the interaction. This task was difficult for four of the nine participants, despite listening to the recordings in order to help them recall what they were thinking about. For the other five participants all of them stated that they were thinking in Spanish, but had momentary switches to English, especially when they forgot how to say a word in Spanish, as shown in (5-6):

- (5) Suggestion by advisor (Participant #6):
 ‘Oh here I remember I couldn’t remember the word ‘schedule’ so I switched to thinking in English.’
- (6) Suggestion by a friend (Participant # 3):
 ‘I was thinking of the word for quiz, but I forgot. That’s when I switched to thinking in English because I couldn’t remember the word for it.’

This question has the potential for providing valuable information about the thought process of Spanish heritage speakers, but different means of exploring this population’s language of thought need to be investigated in order to elicit more information from students about this particularly task.

4.2.3 Pragmatic knowledge

The participants were also asked about their perception of insistence that occurred in the interactions, as well as whether they noted any cultural differences in how Hispanics refuse something and how Anglo culture refuses something. As for the participant's perception of insistences, there were different opinions about this depending on the situation. In the first situation, an invitation by your friend, all the participants stated that the interlocutor's insisting was acceptable behavior and all of them said that they expected the insistence. As for the situation of a suggestion by a friend, all of the participants found the insistence to be acceptable behavior, but three of the participants said that they did not anticipate it, as in (7):

- (7) Suggestion by a friend (Participant #5):
 'I wasn't expecting it because I had just told her that I need to go to class for presentation.'

Furthermore, the refusal of a boss's invitation yielded different results. A majority of the participants, six of the nine did not anticipate their boss insisting when they said that they could not go, as shown in (8):

- (8) Invitation by your boss (Participant #2):
 'I did not anticipate for her to keep asking. I thought that once I said no that would be enough.'

Additionally, the participants did not judge insisting in this situation as acceptable, as in (9):

- (9) Invitation by your boss (Participant #5):
 'Well I didn't like that she kept asking me to go. I know that José is my best friend, but I already said good-bye to him and I had other things to do.'

Lastly, the refusal to a suggestion by an advisor showed different perceptions of the insisting. All the participants stated that they perceived the insistence as acceptable behavior and anticipated it as well. Many of them stated that this was so because your advisor only wants the best for you, as the example in (10):

- (10) Suggestion by an advisor (Participant #10):
 'Well, she wanted me to graduate on time, so it was okay. I mean that's her job, to tell me what classes to take.'

When asked whether they noticed any cultural differences in how Anglo culture and Hispanic culture differ in refusing, five of the nine participants stated that Hispanics are more passionate about things, and this is the reason why they are different, as in (11):

(11) Participant #7:

‘I don’t know, when I hang out with my Latino friends, they are just more passionate about things. Like, they mess around with you when you say you can’t go. Many times when they do that I end up going out with them because I feel bad.’

The participants are aware of some cultural differences. In addition, their perception of what is acceptable and not acceptable is contextually driven; particularly, the situation and interlocutor play a major role in how the participants interpret insisting after they have refused either an invitation or a suggestion.

5. Discussion

This study analyzed the strategies used by Spanish heritage speakers when refusing an invitation given by a friend and a boss, as well as a refusal to a suggestion given by a friend and an advisor. This speech act has been investigated in several dialects of Spanish (Félix-Brasdefer, 2003a, 2006, 2008b; García, 1992, 1999, 2007); however, refusals have not been investigated in the Spanish of heritage speakers in the United States. The first research question sought to analyze the strategies that Spanish heritage speakers use when refusing an invitation and a suggestion. The results from the role plays reveal that the participants had a preference for indirect strategies when refusing in four different role play situations. These results fall in line with previous research done by Félix-Brasdefer (2003a, 2006, 2008b), in which there was a higher number of indirect strategies. The use of indirect strategies demonstrates a tendency towards involvement or solidarity politeness moves between the participant and the interlocutor. The participants want to engage in activities with the interlocutor despite having to refuse in a given situation. The participants do this by providing a reason or explanation as to why they cannot do something. Lastly, no pragmatic variation was seen in the strategies that the participants employed in the four situations.

In addition, an in-depth analysis of the internal modifiers within the strategies revealed that the participants used more internal modifiers when addressing a more distant person. This demonstrates that the participants are susceptible to pragmatic variation. The high use of internal modifiers demonstrates that they want to show respect to their superior despite having to give a refusal. Additionally, these results reveal that for these Spanish heritage speakers, they possess the necessary pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge and are able to recognize the different face systems and choose how to refuse accordingly. The participants used more lexical modifiers when addressing a more distant and powerful person, boss and advisor, in comparison to when they were addressing someone with whom they had a more personal relationship. They also used more syntactic modifiers in the situations with more social distance, thus, demonstrating pragmalinguistic knowledge in Spanish.

The second research question sought to analyze the language learning strategies that Spanish heritage speakers employ when refusing. The retrospective verbal reports provided insight into how the participants interpreted the role play situations and which language learning strategies were used. Pinto (2012) notes that heritage speakers form a bi-cultural hybrid because of their limited Spanish input. The results from the present investigation could lend support to that idea. In three of the four role play situations, the participants considered insistence as an acceptable behavior and they also came to expect it. Some of the participants, on the other hand, especially in the [-distance] situations (deference politeness), stated that after a while they were annoyed by the insistence. This annoyance could be transfer of English strategies into the Spanish pragmatic systems of the participants. Félix-Brasdefer (2003a, 2008a) found that Anglo culture perceives insistence as a rude and unacceptable behavior, while Spanish speakers perceive insistence as a required norm that demonstrates solidarity between the individuals. Given that the retrospective verbal reports revealed mixed attitudes towards insistence in some of the role plays, it is difficult to conclude whether there is a transfer of English pragmatic strategies for these speakers. What can be concluded is that the participants are aware of cultural differences in these situations and they live them on a day-to-day basis, which demonstrates their pragmatic knowledge of this speech act.

Furthermore, the participants were asked to discuss their language of thought in the planning and execution of the role play situations which was asked to gain insight into their cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Cohen, 1998). About half of the participants found this question difficult to answer in the retrospective verbal report. Of the participants that were able to answer the questions, the majority of them said that they were thinking in Spanish throughout the situations. This result is similar to Félix-Brasdefer (2008a) who through the use of retrospective verbal reports was also able to ask participants about their language of thought. In his study, Félix-Brasdefer (2008a) found that for the majority of the participants they were thinking in Spanish throughout the interactions. The finding from the current study points to how the mind of Spanish heritage speakers work, and could be because all of the participants with the exception of one are advanced Spanish speakers. Perhaps the results would be different if the participants had been intermediate or lower proficiency heritage speakers. Furthermore, this result also attests to the validity of retrospective verbal reports. This type of data collection tool is instrumental in capturing information that would otherwise be lost. Another interesting thing to note is that despite the fact that these individuals live in an English-speaking world, they are still able to maintain streams of consciousness in their heritage language. Future studies should take this into account and apply different types of verbal reports, such as think-aloud reports in order to examine more closely the language of thought of heritage speakers. The information collected through data collection tools, such as verbal reports, is important because it provides more in-depth knowledge of learners' abilities. For this study, the use of verbal reports demonstrated that Spanish heritage speakers possess the Spanish sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic

knowledge despite only receiving limited input in Spanish. There still exists the possibility of transfer of pragmatic knowledge from English, but the participants were aware of different social contexts and social norms and adjusted their strategies accordingly.

Finally, the limitations of the present investigation include the limited number of participants in the study. Future studies should seek to increase the number of participants and also investigate different varieties of Spanish in the U.S. Further measures are needed to better understand heritage speakers' language of thought. Data collection tools such as think-aloud protocols (Cohen, 2012; Kasper, 2000) could be used to gather this type of information. For some of the participants of the current study, it was difficult for them to recall their language of thought, which is an important aspect in understanding this populations' pragmatic knowledge, given that it can provide information on how they process the information in this speech act. To conclude, this area of research is scarce and future investigators should examine how, and why the pragmatic systems of heritage speakers differ from monolingual Spanish speakers and second language learners.

6. Conclusions

The results from the study showed that Spanish heritage speakers, like monolingual Spanish speakers, prefer the use of indirect refusal strategies. This result demonstrates that the participants want to engage in solidarity activities with the interlocutor, despite the fact that they refused an invitation or a suggestion given by the interlocutor. In addition, the participants are aware of the negative effects of their refusals and include internal modifiers in their strategies in order to soften the face-threat of the refusals. Furthermore, the participants are aware of differences in cultural norms between the Latino community and the Anglo community when it comes to refusing. The participants, despite limited Spanish input, possess Spanish pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge, which shows that they are highly competent bilingual speakers.

References

- Arellano, S. (2000). A hierarchy of requests in California Spanish: Are indirectness and mitigation polite? In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 319-332). Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. (2012). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Press.
- Beebe L. M., Takahaski, T., Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. S. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen, (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G., (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, X., Ye, L., & Zhang, Y. (1995). Chinese refusal behavior. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (pp.119-164). University of Hawaii: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.
- Cohen, A.D. (2004). Assessing speech acts in a second language. In D. Boxer & A.D. Cohen (Eds.) *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 302-327). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, A.D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2 (3), 275-301.
- Cohen, A.D. (2012). Research methods for describing variation in intercultural pragmatics for cultures in contact and conflict. In J. C. Félix-Brasdefer & D. A. Koike (Eds.), *Pragmatic variation in first and second language contexts: Methodological issues* (pp. 271-294). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 33-56.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dumitrescu, D. (2005). Agradecer en una interlingua. In J. Murillo Medrano (Ed.) *Actas II Coloquio Internacional del Programa EDICE* (pp. 375-406). San Pedro, Costa Rica: Programa EDICE.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp.221-247). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2003a). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in Latin American Spanish and American English. *Multilingua*, 22, 225-255.

- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2003b). Validity in data collection methods in pragmatics research. In P. Kempchinsky & C. E. Piñeros (Eds.), *Theory, practice, and acquisition: Papers from the 6th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium and the 5th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese* (pp. 239-257). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2158-2187.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Natural speech vs. elicited data: A comparison of natural and role play requests in Mexican Spanish. *Spanish in Context*, 4(2), 159-185.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008a). Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness*, 17, 195-211.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008b). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States: A contrastive study of the realization and perception of refusals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2010). Data collection methods in speech act performance: DCTs, role plays, and verbal reports. In A. Martínez-Flor & E. Usó Juárez (Eds.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical, and methodological issues* (pp. 41-56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., & Koike, D. A. (2014.) Perspectives on Spanish SLA from pragmatics and discourse. In M. Lacorte (Ed.), *Handbook of Hispanic applied linguistics* (pp. 25-43). New York: Routledge.
- García, C. (1992). Refusing an invitation: A case study of Peruvian style. *Hispanic Linguistics*, 5, 207-243.
- García, C. (1999). The three stages of Venezuelan invitations and responses. *Multilingua*, 18, 391-433.
- García, C. (2007). “Ché, mirá, vos sabés que no voy a poder”: How Argentineans refuse an invitation. *Hispania*, 90, 551-564.
- García, M. E. (1981). Preparing to leave: Interaction at a Mexican-American family gathering. In R. P. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 195-215). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon.
- Hassall, T. (2008). Pragmatic performance: What are learners thinking?. In E. Alcón Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 73-93). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Hundsniischer, F. (1981). On insisting. In H. Parret, M. Sbisà, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Possibilities and limitations of pragmatics* (pp. 343-357). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jefferson, G. (1986). Transcript notation. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social interaction. Studies in conversational analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 316-369). London: Continuum.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: A case of morphosyntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7, 125-142.
- Montrul, S. (2005). Second language acquisition and first language loss in adult early bilinguals: Exploring some differences and similarities. *Second Language Research*, 21, 199-249.
- Montrul, S. (2010). Dominant language transfer in adult second language learners and heritage speakers. *Second Language Research*, 26, 293-327.
- Pinto, D. (2012). Pragmatics and Discourse: Doing things with words in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 121-138). Washington D.C.: Georgetown Press.
- Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2007). A comparative study of requests in heritage speaker Spanish, L1 Spanish, and L1 English. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11, 135-155.
- Pinto, D., & Raschio, R. (2008). *Oye, ¿qué onda con mi dinero?* An analysis of heritage speaker complaints. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2, 221-249.
- Placencia, M. E. (2008). Insistence among family and friends in Quiteño Spanish: From connectedness to empowerment. *Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 3, 88-113.
- Placencia, M. E. (2011). La insistencia entre familiares y amigos en el español Quiteño: ¿De la interconexión hacia la autonomía?. In C. García & M. E. Placencia (Eds.), *Estudios de variación pragmática en español* (pp. 185 - 214). Buenos Aires: Editorial Dunken.
- Potowski, K. (2008). I was raised talking like my mom: The influence of mothers in the development of MexiRicans' phonological and lexical features. In J. Rothman & M. Niño-Murcia (Eds.), *Linguistic Identity and Bilingualism in Different Hispanic Contexts* (pp. 201-220). New York: John Benjamins.
- Puga Larraín, J. (1997) *La atenuación en el castellano de Chile: Un enfoque pragmalingüístico*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch Libros.
- Rivera-Mills, S. (2012). Spanish heritage language maintenance: Its legacy and its future. In S. M. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 21-43). Washington D.C.: Georgetown Press.
- Robinson, M. (1992). Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (pp.27-82). Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Ronquest, R. (2013). An acoustic examination of unstressed vowel reduction in Heritage Spanish. In S. Blackwell & C. Howe (Eds.), *Selected*

- proceedings of the 15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 151-171). Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W. (2001). *Intercultural communication*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W.. (2012). Interpersonal politeness and power. In *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd ed.) (pp.45-68). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Shigeta, M. (1974). Ambiguity in declining requests and apologizing. In J. C. Condon & M. Saito (Eds.), *Intercultural encounters with Japan: Communication, contact, and conflict* (pp. 193-195). Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Silva-Corvalán (2014). *Bilingual Language Acquisition: Spanish and English in the First six years*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 95-119.
- Valdés, G., & Pino, C. (1981). Muy a tus órdenes: Compliment responses among Mexican-American Bilinguals. *Language in Society*, 10, 53-72.
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts: Volume 1 principles of language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walters, J. (1979). Strategies for requesting in Spanish and English: Structural similarities and pragmatic differences. *Language Learning*, 29, 277-293
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widjaja, C. (1997). A study of date refusal: Taiwanese females vs. American females. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers*, 15 (2), 1-43.
- Woodfield, H. (2010). What lies beneath?: Verbal report in interlanguage requests in English. *Multilingua*, 29, 1-27.
- Woodfield, H. (2012). Pragmatic variation in learner perception: The role of retrospective verbal report in L2 speech act research. In J. C. Félix-Brasdefer & D. A. Koike (Eds.), *Pragmatic variation in first and second language contexts: Methodological issues* (pp. 209-239). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Youmans, M. (2001). Cross cultural differences in politeness epistemic modal use in American English. *Journal of Multicultural Development*, 22, 57- 73.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Appendix A

Refusal to invitation (-distance)

Participante: Estás en camino a clase cuando te encuentras con un amigo/a quien no has visto en más de un mes. Ustedes asisten la misma universidad y tienen muchos amigos en común. En el pasado pasaban mucho tiempo juntos estudiando en la biblioteca y también salía juntos todo el tiempo. Este semestre no tienen clases juntos y tú has estado trabajando mucho para ahorrar dinero para tu viaje este verano a Europa y por eso tiene tiempo que no se ven. Tu amigo/a te informa que este sábado a las siete él/ella se encontrará con unos amigos que tienen en común para cenar y luego ver una película en el cine. Sabes que sería una buena ocasión para ver tus amigos quienes no has visto en unas cuantas semanas, pero desafortunadamente no puedes ir.

Interlocutor: Estás en camino a clase. Te acabas de encontrar con amigo/a quien no has visto en más de un mes. Ustedes asisten la misma universidad y tienen muchos amigos en común. En el pasado pasaban mucho tiempo juntos estudiando en la biblioteca y también salía juntos todo el tiempo. Este semestre no tienen clases juntos y tú has estado estudiando mucho y por eso tiene tiempo que no se ven. Este sábado tú y unos amigos van a ir a cenar e ir al cine a las ocho. Invitas a tu amigo a cenar. Él/ella dice que no puede ir, pero tú quieres que él/ella vaya contigo.

Participant: *You are on your way to class when you run into a friend you haven't seen in over a month. Both of you attend the same university and have a lot of friends in common. In the past, you would spend a lot of time together studying in the library and you would go out together all the time. This semester you don't have any classes together and you have been working a lot to save money for a trip you are taking this summer to Europe and that's why you haven't seen each other in a while. Your friend tells you that this Saturday at 7pm he will meet up with friends you both have in common to have dinner and see a movie. You know it would be a great opportunity to see your friends that you haven't seen in a while, but unfortunately you cannot go.*

Interlocutor: *You are on your way to class. You run into a friend you haven't seen in over a month. Both of you attend the same university and have a lot of friends in common. In the past, you would spend a lot of time together studying in the library and you would go out together all the time. This semester you don't have any classes together and you have been studying a lot and that's why you haven't seen each other in a while. This Saturday you and some friends are going out for dinner and a movie. You invite your friend to dinner. He/she says they cannot go, but you really want them to go with you.*

Refusal to a suggestion (-distance)

Participante: Hoy es jueves y tú y tu amigo/a están en el autobús en camino a la última clase de la semana. Ustedes asisten la misma universidad y han tomado varias clases juntos. Son muy buenos amigos y siempre salen juntos y

tienen muchos amigos en común. Este semestre tienen dos clases juntos. Tu amigo recibe un mensaje de Roberto, un amigo que tienen en común. Roberto los invita a ver la película nueva de Paul Walker, el actor favorito de ustedes, que comienza en veinte minutos. Mañana, Roberto se irá de viaje por un mes y no lo verás. Tú amigo/a sugiere que no vayan a clase y que mejor vayan al cine, desafortunadamente no puedes ir.

Interlocutor: Hoy es jueves y estás en el autobús en camino a clase con uno de tus mejores amigos. Ustedes asisten la misma universidad y han tomado varias clases juntos. Son muy buenos amigos y siempre salen juntos y tienen muchos amigos en común. Recibes un mensaje de tu amigo Roberto invitándolos al cine para ver la nueva película de Paul Walker, el actor favorito de ustedes. Roberto se irá mañana de viaje por un mes y no lo verás. Le sugieres a tu amigo/a que no vayan a clase y que mejor vayan al cine para ver la película. Él/ella dice que no puede ir, pero tú quieres que él/ella vaya contigo.

Participant: *Today is Thursday and you and your friend are on the bus on your way to the last class of the week. You both attend the same university and have taken several classes together. You are very good friends and always go out together and you have many friends in common. This semester you have two classes together. Your friend gets a text message from Robert, a friend you have in common. Robert has invited both of you to see the new Paul Walker, your and friend's favorite actor, movie that starts in twenty minutes. Tomorrow, Robert will leave for a month on a trip and you won't see him. Your friend suggests that you skip class and go to the movies instead. Unfortunately, you cannot go.*

Interlocutor: *Today is Thursday and you are on the bus on your way to class with one of your best friends. You both attend the same university and have taken several classes together. You are very good friends and always go out together and you have many friends in common. You receive a text message from your friend Robert inviting the two of you to the movies to see the new Paul Walker, your and your friend's favorite actor, movie. Robert will leave tomorrow for a month on a trip and you won't see him. You suggest to your friend that you skip class and instead go to the movies to see the movie. He/she tells you they cannot go, but you really want them to go with you.*

Refusal to invitation (+distance)

Participante: Tienes una junta en quince minutos y vas llegando a tu oficina. Cuando entras a la oficina, te llama tu jefe para que vayas a su oficina. Él/ella apenas lleva un año trabajando por Coca Cola. Tú, sin embargo, llevas más de cuatro trabajando por la compañía. Tu jefe te invita a una fiesta de despedida para José este sábado a las ocho en su casa. José es el supervisor quien te dio el empleo en la compañía. Tú y José se llevan muy bien, incluso de vez en cuando salen juntos fuera del trabajo. Sin embargo, como tu jefe solamente lleva un año en la compañía no has trabajado mucho con él y no has tenido la

oportunidad de conocerlo mejor porque José es el que te daba las órdenes. Desafortunadamente no puedes ir a la fiesta.

Interlocutor: Llevas un año como jefe en Coca Cola. Este sábado a las ocho vas a dar una fiesta de despedida en tu casa para uno de tus empleados, José. José lleva muchos años trabajando por la compañía y tiene muchas amistades cercanas en la compañía. Llamas a tu oficina a uno de los empleados quien lleva varios años trabajando por la compañía. José y este empleado tienen una muy buena amistad y sabes que José estaría feliz si él/ella fuera a la fiesta. Cuando llega a tu oficina tú lo/la invitas a la fiesta. Él/ella te dice que no puede ir, pero tú quieres que él/ella vaya a la fiesta.

***Participant:** You have a meeting in fifteen minutes and you are arriving at your office. When you enter your office, your boss calls you into his/her office. He/she has only been working for Coca Cola for a year. You, however, have been working for the company for over four years. Your boss invites you to a farewell party for José this Saturday at eight at his house. Jose is the supervisor that hired you in the company. You and José get along well and sometimes you hang out together outside of work. Nevertheless, since your boss has only been with the company for a year you haven't work much together and you have not had the opportunity to get to know him better because Jose was the one who would tell you what to do. Unfortunately, you cannot go to the party.*

***Interlocutor:** You have been the boss at Coca Cola for a year. This Saturday at eight you are throwing a farewell party for one of your employees, Jose. Jose has been working for the company for many years has many close friends in the company. You call into your office of your employees who has been working for the company for several years. Jose and this employee have a good friendship and you know Jose would be happy if they came to the party. When he/she arrives to your office you invite him/her to the party. He/she says that they cannot go, but you want them to go to the party.*

Refusal to a suggestion (+distance)

Participante: Estás en la oficina de tu consejero discutiendo las clases que tomarás el próximo semestre. El próximo mayo te graduarás con tu licenciatura, pero aún te faltan nueve clases para completar los requisitos de graduación. Tú y tu consejero tienen una relación muy formal, solamente lo/la ves una vez al semestre cuando estás eligiendo las clases que tomarás el próximo semestre. Este verano ofrecerán dos clases que son obligatorias para tu especialización. Tu consejero te sugiere que tomes estas clases durante el verano en vez de tomarlas en el otoño para que no tengas que tomar cinco clases en el otoño. Tú no quieres tomar clases este verano.

Interlocutor: Estás en tu oficina con un estudiante ayunándolo/la a escoger sus clases para el próximo semestre. Ves este estudiante una vez al semestre cuando él/ella viene a tu oficina para escoger sus clases para el siguiente

semestre y no lo conoces muy bien. Solamente le faltan nueve clases para terminar los requisitos de graduación. Durante el verano se ofrecerán dos clases que son obligatorias para su especialización. Le sugieres que tome estas dos clases durante el verano para que no tenga que tomar cinco en el otoño. Él/ella te dice que no quiere tomar las clases durante el verano pero piensas que sería muy útil que las tomara.

Participant: *You are in the office of your academic advisor discussing the classes that you will take next semester. You will graduate with your bachelors next May, but you are still missing nine classes to finish the requirements for graduation. You and your advisor have a distant relationship, you only see them once a semester when you are choosing the classes you will take the following semester. This summer they will offer two classes that are required for your major. Your advisor suggests that you take these classes this summer instead of in the fall so that you won't have to take five classes in the fall. You do not want to take classes this summer.*

Interlocutor: *You are in the office with a student helping him/her choose the classes they will take next semester. You see this student once a semester when he/she comes to your office to choose classes for the following semester so you don't know him/her well. They need nine classes to finish the requirements for graduation. This summer they will offer two classes that are required for his/her major. You suggest that they take the two classes this summer so that they do not have to take five classes in the fall. They tell you they do not want to take classes this summer, but you think it would be useful for them to take them.*

Appendix B. Background questionnaire

PARTICIPANT # _____ **Sex:** M F (Circle one) **AGE:**

Answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. At what age did you begin learning Spanish? (for example: from birth or age 5)

2. At what age did you begin learning English? (for example: from birth or age 5)

3. Have you studied in a Spanish-speaking country? (e.g. Puerto Rico, Mexico)

Circle one: **YES NO**

If you answer YES.... What country? _____ From age _____ to age _____

4. Have you studied in a bilingual education, immersion or dual language program (a school where you learned Spanish and English at the same time)??

Circle one: **YES NO**

If you answered YES.... Which grades? _____

5. Do you study Spanish in school now? Circle one: **YES NO**

Have you studied Spanish in the past? Circle one: **YES NO**

If you answer YES, please write how many academic years you have been studying Spanish: _____

6. If you study Spanish, write briefly your main reason for studying Spanish.

7. Do you travel to your family's home country? **YES NO**

If YES, how often: _____ For how long?

8. What language, Spanish or English, do you feel more comfortable in?

9. Which language, Spanish or English, do you use more in your daily activities?

Appendix C

Transcription Conventions

.	marks fall in tone
,	marks continuing intonation
?	marks rising tone
?,	marks weaker rising tone
!	marks an animated tone
↑↓	marks rising and falling shifts in intonation
> <	marks that the enclosed utterance is delivered at a faster pace
< >	marks that the enclosed utterance is delivered at a slower pace
:	marks lengthened syllable
(())	enclosed description of gestures or other non-verbal information
()	marks unintelligible utterances
[]	marks overlapping speech
=	marks a break and subsequent continuation of a single utterance
(# of seconds)	indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause
(.)	A brief pause, less than 0.2 seconds
ALL CAPS	marks shouted or increased volume speech
<u>Underline</u>	marks emphasizing or stressing in speech
(h)	marks laughter in speech