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ABSTRACT

The current study attempted to point out similarities and differences in the ways people from different cultures and languages perform refusals, such as Saudi Arabic, American English, and Pakistani Urdu. A total of 75 participants (25 participants from each language), university male and female students, were involved in this study. The data were collected by using a written Discourse Completion Task, which included six scenarios. All the participants were asked to respond to the given scenario in their native language to examine the role of cultural differences in refusals. The data were analyzed in terms of the types of refusal strategies (direct, indirect, and adjunct) and frequency. The study explored that all participants used the three types of refusal strategies: indirect strategies, direct strategies, and the types of adjuncts to refusals. Additionally, the indirect strategies were used more frequently than the direct strategies and the types of adjuncts to refusals. For instance, the use of 'reason/explanation' was used mostly by Americans and Pakistanis; however, the use of 'plain strategy' and 'regret/apology' was used mostly by Saudis and Americans. Refusal is considered as a face-threatening act; as a result, most of the strategies employed in the responses were indirect for face-saving.
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1. Introduction

The speech act of refusal is a negative response to an offer, an invitation, a request, or a suggestion. Refusal occurs in all speech communities in the world; however, it differs in the way of performing refusal, i.e., directly, indirectly, or adjunct to refusal strategies. Many studies have been conducted to investigate speech act of carrying refusal in general between two groups using their native language or using English to study the impact of L1 on L2 such as Al-Shalawi (1997), Al Issa (2003), Al-Kahtani (2005), Al-Eryani (2007), Nelson, Al Batal, and El Bakary (2002b) and Sattar, Lah, and Suleiman (2010), but few studies examined the responses of cultural or linguistic differences in refusal across languages and dialects, and how these performances translate different standards and norms of societies (e.g., Almansoor, Patil, & Alrefae, 2019; Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Olshain, 1989; Wolfson, 1981; Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989). Refusal strategies may act as a source of information on the sociocultural values of a community and lead into the social values that are embedded in various societies. Refusals are functional and minimal units of communication (Searle, 1969; Cohen, 1996). According to Beebe et al. (1990), refusal strategies are a "sticking point" for nonnatives and are complex in structure. Yamagishira (2001) discussed the speech acts of refusal strategies as a "sensitive pragmatic task" because speakers use indirect strategies in order not to offend each other.
Yamagashira (2001) also mentioned that speakers might use different structures and strategies in one situation in which they are involved in. Although refusal strategies are universal across languages; however, their occurrence and their linguistic structure are all culture-specific. Thus, the present study aims to investigate the usages of the refusal strategies in Saudi Arabic, American English, and Pakistani Urdu using Beebe's framework. The main purpose of this study is to fill the gap between two different cultures to understand refusals for better communication and to avoid misunderstanding, which is considered as a face-threatening act. Also, this study might help language teachers and learners to have a clear picture of socio-pragmatic differences between these communities.

2. Theoretical Framework and Background

Speech acts are an area of research that has become very popular with Sociolinguists because of exploring various contexts to understand language use. Speech acts aim to observe and recognize pragmatic features that are performed by people in their native language and how they achieve their communicative needs in many different speech situations. A speech act is a term that has been defined as a minimal unit of discourse as well as the primary and functional unit of communication (Searle, 1969). Moreover, it is an utterance employed for responding to inviting, requesting, thanking, complaining, apologizing, and refusing. According to Al Issa (2003), speech acts carry different values, social norms, and communication styles that appear on speakers' utterances from different cultural backgrounds.

Refusal is a negative response to an offer, invitation, request, or suggestions. The speech act of refusal occurs in all of the world languages; nevertheless, it differs in the way of producing refusal. Refusal is a real issue because it is a face-threatening act in the speech act to both refuser and refusee. The performing of refusal strategies sometimes causes miscommunication and misunderstanding between speakers and listeners due to their coming from different cultures. For instance, the direct refusal strategy 'no' is not acceptable in Arabic culture because it has disadvantageous meanings about the refuser. In American culture (western culture), in contrast, it is normal and acceptable because it means saving time (Sattar, Lah, & Suleiman, 2010).

A face-threatening act is a universal issue in speech act, which differs from one culture to another depending on social norms in that culture (Brown & Levinson, 1978). What is appropriate in one culture might be impolite in another (Al-Shalawi, 1997). Face-threatening act is the behaviors that threaten want, desires, needs, and feelings in social interactions (Al-Shalawi, 1997; Nelson, Carson, Al Batal, & El Bakary, 2002a). Using more direct strategies leads to an increase in the degree of face-threatening. Therefore, speakers usually tend to use indirect strategies for face-saving (Al-Shalawi, 1997).

Strategies are the ways or the methods that the speaker and the hearer use in communication. Strategies include direct forms such as 'no', 'I refuse' and indirect ones such as 'I am sorry,' and 'thank you.' According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, the direct and indirect dimensions refer to the 'extent speakers reveal their intentions through explicit communication' (cited in Nelson et al., 2002b, p. 40). The direct speech act indicates what a speaker means exactly and explicitly. On the other hand, the indirect speech act means that the speaker means more than he/she says and tends to conceal some information. In other words, indirect Speech may refer to "verbal messages that camouflage and conceal speakers' true intentions in terms of their wants, needs, and goals in the discourse situation" (Nelson et al., 2002b, p. 40).

3. Literature Review

Several studies have been conducted on the speech act of refusals in Arabic and English. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study has ever investigated and compared the use of refusal strategies in Saudi Arabic, American English, and Pakistani Urdu, which will be considered as a new contribution for this study.

Al-Shalawi (1997) examined the semantic formulas that were used by American and Saudi male undergraduate students in their refusals. He used a discourse completion questionnaire in his study, which showed that the subjects used the same semantic formulas with the exception of the direct refusal—Saudi males used 'no' as a direct way of refusing people of equal and lower status. In contrast, Americans used 'no' in all situations. Moreover, the study pointed out that the subjects differed in the number of semantic formulas and the content of their explanation. For example, Saudis were found to use avoidance strategies and provided unclear responses. Americans, on the other hand, were direct and concerned about the clarity of their explanations. Another interesting find is that Saudis talked about family engagement as an excuse; whereas, Americans talked about personal engagement. Saudis also made references to religious terms while Americans did not refer to them.

Al-Ghamdi and Alqarni (2019) examined the use of strategies in invitations and requests employed by Saudis and American female students in terms of the content of semantic formulas and their frequencies. The findings showed that both groups used the same strategies, but they differed in frequency. For instance, Americans used 'no' more frequently than Saudis. Additionally, Saudis used 'regret' and 'explanation' more frequent than Americans, which reflect the cultural differences between Saudis and Americans.
Alhaidari (2009) investigated the refusal strategies employed by Saudi native Arabic speakers and Australian native English speakers in academic settings by using a discourse completion test and role play. The research found that there was a preference for using indirect strategies used by all participants. However, Saudis focused more on group harmony and face maintenance rather than clarity. In contrast, Australian refusals were more clear and direct than Saudis, which reflect a collectivist culture and individualistic culture.

Al-Kahtani (2005) assumed that there are differences in the ways people from different cultural backgrounds perform refusals even when using the same language (i.e., English) in his study. Three groups of participants, Arabs, Americans, and Japanese, were compared in the ways they produce the speech act of refusal. All groups were different in the ways of performing refusal according to the three dimensions of the semantic formula: order, frequency, and content. The researcher found that Japanese and Americans used gratitude when refuser was in a high status to the refusee. Arabs, on the other hand, did not use gratitude at all. In suggestion, Arabs and Americans were similar in using a direct strategy like ‘no’ when they were in equal status to the refusee. In contrast, Japanese subjects did not perform the direct strategy ‘no’, and they used explanation as an indirect strategy.

Alrashoodi (2020) identified the influence of gender and social status in refusal strategies in Saudi Arabic. The data were collected orally by recording their responses to the discourse completion test that has a situation of request with three different levels in the social status: higher, equal, and lower status. The study explored that males were more direct than females. In addition, the females employed more words than the males in their responses. Both males and females used the indirect strategies, which are 14 strategies than direct strategies employed more in the situation of equal status. Regarding the common strategies, only males used ‘giving advice’ and ‘negative consequences’ whereas strategies such as ‘repetition of part of the request,’ ‘lack of empathy,’ and ‘reprimand’ was used only by females.

Nelson et al. (2002b) compared the refusal strategies of males and females in Egyptian Arabic and American English in their study. The researchers used a discourse completion questionnaire in collecting data, and the responses were recorded orally. The results were analyzed in terms of frequency of strategy use, the frequency of direct and indirect strategies, as well as the effect of social status on the refuser. The researchers pointed out that both groups used the same strategies with similar frequency in making refusals. However, Egyptian males were more direct from either American males or females in the higher and lower status of refuser. Additionally, American and Egyptian females were similar in using direct strategies in higher, lower, and equal status situations.

Another important refusal study conducted by Nelson et al. (2002a) investigated similarities and differences between Egyptian and American English refusals in terms of frequency of direct and indirect strategies, the average frequencies of specific indirect strategies, and the effect of status on the refuser. A discourse completion test was used for collecting data, and the responses were recorded orally. They found that Americans used more refusal strategies than Egyptians. Both groups, the US and Egyptians, utilized more indirect strategies of refusal than direct strategies to avoid face-threatening, i.e., remarks of embarrassment and shame which occur on the face of refuse due to refusal of desires and wants. In addition, both groups performed reasons and statement of regret in making indirect refusals.

Sattar, Lah and Suleiman (2010) examined the semantic formula, which was used in refusing suggestions in Iraqi Arabic in terms of frequency, direct, and indirect strategies. The researchers pointed out that Iraqis preferred employing indirect strategies in refusing a suggestion. When they use the direct strategy ‘no,’ they tend to follow ‘no’ with ‘explanation’ and ‘giving reasons’ to avoid face threatening. Finally, Iraqis tend to use specific semantic formula with higher status such as a professor.

Al Issa (2003) examined the phenomenon of sociocultural transfer and its motivating factors within the speech act of refusal by Jordanians who were English Foreign Learners (EFL). He had three groups of subjects: English Foreign Learners (Jordans), Jordanian Arabic Native Speakers, and American English Native Speakers. The researcher compared the responses of EFL refusal to Jordanian Arabic responses and American English native speakers’ responses. He used the discourse completion questionnaire to compare the choice of semantic formulas, the length of responses, and the content of the semantic formula. He found that EFL learners used semantic formulas from Arabic culture, i.e., they translated Arabic meaning into English literally. Jordanian Arabic Native Speakers used responses, which indicate their Arabic culture. Therefore, they differed from Americans in the choice of semantic formula. In the length of responses, EFL and Arabic native speakers’ responses were longer than American subjects’ responses. Americans were more specific in their explanation than EFL and Arabic speakers in the content of their semantic formulas. EFL tended to transfer their culture to L2 in their responses due to some religious reasons and the dominance of their native language.

Another study was conducted by Al-Eryani (2007) to look at the refusal strategies of Yemeni EFL learners and compared their performance with those of native speakers of Yemeni Arabic and native speakers of American English. The study revealed that all groups of participants were similar in the range of refusal strategies, whereas they differed in the frequency and the content of their semantic formulas. Yemeni Arabic native speakers preferred
using indirect refusal strategies such as 'reasons' and 'explanation' in refusing. Also, Yemeni EFL used refusal strategies from their native speech community norms, which support the results of Al Issa's (2003) study. Americans, in contrast, carried out 'regret' with direct strategies.

Although refusal strategies have not been conducted in Urdu yet, some studies examined the speech act of apology. For example, in a cross cultural study of apologies in British English and Urdu Bashir, Rasul and Mehmood (2018) investigated: (1) how speech act of apology is realized between two different cultures (British & Kashmiri) with different languages (English & Urdu) and (2) what situations or offences demand apologies among native speakers of two languages in naturally-occurring and real-life conversations. It was reported that despite similarities in the realization of the speech act English and Kashmiri speakers differed in the selection of apology strategies and their frequency. The two groups also reportedly differed in relation to the apology rate to the same offence due to cultural differences.

Sultana and Khan (2014) examined the differences and similarities in apology strategies devised by Urdu and Pashtu speaking undergraduate students in different situations with the cultural effect of gender. Considerable variations were reported in male-female students’ handling of apology strategies due to different gender. On the contrary, fewer differences were noticed among the member of the same gender. The study also reported that students’ responses were in consonance with their sociocultural background. It was also revealed that respondents behaved more carefully in dealing with members of the opposite. However, reportedly students behaved by adhering to a predominantly gendered social structure.

Majeed and Janjua (2013) investigated the structure of the apology speech act of English, Urdu and Punjabi languages in a multilingual context. A comparison was made between the form and sequential pattern. The study reported that English outnumber Urdu and Punjabi language in the use of systematic, direct and explicit apologies. On the contrary, the use of implicit and indirect apology strategies was reported highest in Punjabi in comparison with English and Urdu. Some more studies also investigated the use of apology speech act in Urdu (e.g., Akram, 2008; Saif, Asif, & Dogar, 2017; Saleem, Anjum, & Naz, 2018).

The review of existing literature indicated that previous studies investigated and compared the speech act of refusal strategies in Arabic and English. It has been evident that not much has been explored about the refusal strategies made by the native speakers of Urdu; existing studies mostly investigated and compared the speech act of apology in Urdu with either English or local languages such as Punjabi, Pashto etc.

Since hardly any studies have investigated the refusal strategies used by the native speakers of Saudi Arabic, American English, and Pakistani Urdu, this study will shed light on similarities and differences and frequency in the three different cultures to understand how language users perform refusals in these different languages.

4. Methodology
4.1. Data collection

This paper adopts the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) as its methodological framework in collecting the data. There are six scenarios written in the target languages, and each participant has to act on these cases using his/her native languages (See Appendix A). The participant included 25 Arabic-speaking Saudi, 25 English-speaking American and 25 Urdu-speaking Pakistani university students. Thus, the total number of participants in this study is 75 university students. The participants were from different majors and were not asked to identify themselves and their ages range from 21-35 years old. They were told that they were participating in a sociocultural study of refusal strategies. Furthermore, they were asked to produce what they would do in real situations rather than what they thought they should do. For the Pakistani and Saudi participants, this paper used google form to collect the data, and for the American participants, Survey Monkey was used. Finally, this paper attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How can refusal strategies be described in Saudi, American, and Pakistani cultures?
2. What are the structures and the frequencies of these strategies in these languages?
3. What do these strategies entail about the Saudi, American and Pakistani cultures when performing refusals?

4.2. Data analysis

The purpose of this study is to examine the differences in the form of refusal and frequency from three different languages. All data were coded according to the modified version refusal strategies (see Table 1), which was developed by Beeb et al. (see Campillo, Jordà & Espurz, 2009). For instance, if a refuser said ‘I am sorry, I have an appointment’ to refuse an invitation, this was analyzed as a regret statement. Another example of refusal is ‘thank you; I am busy today.’ It was analyzed as a statement of gratitude and giving reasons. The classification of refusal strategies has three main parts: direct strategies, indirect strategies, and adjunct to refusal strategies, as indicated below in Table 1.
Table 1. Classification of refusal strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of refusal strategies*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bluntness (e.g., ‘I refuse.’/’No’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative willingness (e.g., ‘I can't. I won't be able to give them to you.’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Statement of regret (e.g., ‘I'm so sorry.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reason (e.g., ‘I have other plans.’ ‘I'm going to be studying until late tonight.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regret/apology (e.g., ‘I am sorry I can’t.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Statement of alternative (e.g., ‘If you work half the day, I'll give you the afternoon off.’) / Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., ‘Oh, if I'd checked my e-mail earlier, I wouldn't have made other plans’) / Promise of future acceptance (e.g., ‘I'll do it next time’; ‘Let's make it another day’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criticize the request/ requester (e.g., ‘Who do you think you are?’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Statement of principle (e.g., ‘I don't believe in fad dieting.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Avoidance (e.g., ‘I need to think about it.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (I'd love toy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Statement of empathy (e.g., ‘While I appreciate’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., ‘That’s okay; don’t worry about it.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gratitude (e.g., ‘Thanks.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hedging (e.g., ‘Oh, I’m not sure.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Adjunct To Refusals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (e.g., ‘I'd love toy’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Willingness (e.g., ‘I would love to do, but……’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gratitude (e.g., ‘Thanks.’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agreement (e.g., ‘Fine, but……’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Statement of empathy (e.g., ‘While I appreciate’).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Taxonomy on the speech act of refusing (Campillo, Jordà & Espurz, 2009)

5. Findings

The analysis of the Saudi Arabic, American English and Pakistani Urdu participants' responses revealed that there are three main types of refusal strategies: direct strategies, indirect strategies, and adjuncts to refusals, as shown in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 1. The frequency and types of refusal strategies used by the participants](image)

Obviously, the number of indirect strategies were the most common refusal strategies employed by participants, but they differed in frequency. Most of the indirect strategies were used by Americans (282 times),
followed by Saudis (190 times) and then Pakistanis (132 times). However, using the direct strategies and adjuncts to refusal were the least common. All the above strategies were categorized based on subcategories and frequency in Figures 2, 3, and 4.

![Types of Indirect Refusal Strategies](image)

**Figure 2.** The frequency and types of indirect refusal strategies used by the participants

According to Figure 2, the participants used seven indirect strategies which differed in frequency such as ‘plain,’ ‘reason/explanation,’ ‘regret/apology,’ ‘alternative,’ ‘disagreement/dissuasion/criticism,’ ‘statement of principle/philosophy,’ and ‘avoidance.’ However, the most common indirect strategies were ‘reason/explanation’ (210 times), ‘alternative’ (144 times), ‘regret/apology’ (141 times), and ‘plain’ (90 times). Using ‘reason/explanation’ was used more frequently by Americans (79 times) and Pakistanis (78 times), and the frequency was almost the same. In contrast, it was used only 53 by Saudis. The American participants utilized ‘alternative’ 75 times, whereas Saudis used it only 37 times and 32 times by Pakistanis. ‘Regret/apology’ was used mostly by Americans (86 times), followed by Saudis (50 times) and with very low frequency by Pakistanis that is only 5 times. Also, ‘plain’ was used only one time by Pakistanis; however, it was employed mostly by Saudis (47 times) and 42 times by Americans. Finally, the least common indirect strategies which did not show a large number of frequency were ‘disagreement/dissuasion/criticism,’ ‘statement of principle/philosophy,’ and ‘avoidance.’

![Types of Direct Refusal Strategies](image)

**Figure 3.** The frequency and types of direct refusal strategies used by the participants
Figure 3 indicates the frequency of the two types of direct strategies; ‘Bluntness’, which was the most common type (34 times) and ‘negation of purpose’ (13 times). ‘Bluntness’ was used more frequently by Saudis (17 times), followed by Americans (12 times), and Pakistanis (5 times). In contrast, ‘negation of purpose’ was utilized only by Americans, which was 11 times and Saudis only 2 times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive opinion (1)</th>
<th>Willingness (2)</th>
<th>Gratitude (3)</th>
<th>Agreement (4)</th>
<th>Solidarity (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistanis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. The frequency and types of adjuncts to refusals used by the participants*

Figure 4 displays the least common pattern to refuse, adjuncts to refusals. Also, not all three groups of participants used all the types of adjuncts to refusals. As shown in the figure, adjuncts to refusals have 5 types such as ‘positive opinion,’ ‘willingness,’ ‘gratitude,’ ‘agreement,’ and ‘solidarity.’ ‘Gratitude’ was the most common adjunct used only by Saudis (6 times) and by Pakistanis only one time. ‘Agreement’ was employed only by Pakistanis that is 6 times. ‘Positive opinion’ was used only 4 times by Saudis, followed by Americans only once. ‘Solidarity’ was used only 3 times by Saudis and only 1 time by Pakistanis. Finally, ‘willingness’ was used only 2 times by Pakistanis and only one time by Americans.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the use of refusal strategies and frequency in three different languages with different cultures: Saudi Arabic, American English, and Pakistani Urdu. The participants were asked to respond in refusal to the situations to identify the cross-cultural and linguistic differences. All participants employed the three types of refusal strategies: indirect strategies, direct strategies, and the types of adjuncts to refusals. However, the indirect strategies were used more frequently than the direct strategies and the types of adjuncts to refusals. This result is supported by most of the studies in the literature review. It was obvious that all the three cultures preferred the indirect strategies over the direct strategies and the adjuncts to refusals, but they differed in frequency. Refusal is considered as a face-threatening act; therefore, language users tend to use indirect strategies to face-saving (Al-Shalawi, 1997; Nelson, Al Batal, & El Bakary, 2002a). The most common indirect strategies were found ‘reason/explanation,’ ‘alternative,’ ‘regret/apology,’ and ‘plain,’ respectively. The use of ‘reason/explanation’ was used mostly by Americans and Pakistanis. In contrast, the use of ‘plain strategy’ and ‘regret/apology’ was used mostly by Saudis and Americans. This result does not support Al-Shalawi’s (1997) and Alhaidari’s (2009) findings, which found that Saudis use more avoidance and unclear responses whereas Americans use direct strategies and the clarity of their explanations. Saudis and Pakistanis were quite similar in using ‘alternatives.’ Regarding the use of indirect strategies, there was no big difference in frequency in using the indirect strategies such as ‘bluntness’ among Saudis and Americans. However, they differed in frequency in terms of using the strategy of ‘negation of purpose,’ which was not used by Pakistanis. In addition, the participants differed in frequency in using the adjuncts to refusals. Finally, the results of the current study cannot be generalized because of the limited number of participants. Therefore, the researchers suggest enlarging the number of participants for future studies and examining the role of social status in influencing choosing a particular strategy. In addition, the researchers cannot interpret the differences among the participants in frequency based on the notions of a collectivistic culture and
individualistic culture to avoid creating stereotypes about a specific culture and the complexity of the role of context in choosing a particular strategy.
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**APPENDIX A.**
The six scenarios were given to the participants to fill in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>The Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One of your friends is attending a wedding ceremony this weekend. She/he asks to borrow your nicest dress/suit for only one night...but you really don’t like to loan out your fancy clothes. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A classmate wants your help on the final class project, which is due tomorrow. You are already exhausted because you have been working on your own project for days. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Your little sister wants you to take her to the playground this afternoon, but you have already made plans to meet with your friend at the same time. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Your family has been invited to a very nice dinner by your next-door neighbor because they are celebrating their daughter’s engagement. Your father or mother wants you to go to dinner, but you really don’t want to go. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Your professor wants you to represent the department by attending a conference that will be held in another city. You have already made really fun plans for that weekend with your friends, and you don’t want to go at all to the conference. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Your little brother asks you to buy him a very expensive present for his graduation. However, you don’t want to buy it. What do you say?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>