Dil Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5(2), 352-365, Ekim 2019
Journal of Language Education and Research, 5(2), 352-365, October 2019
https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jlere
Doi: 10.31464/jlere.609958

How Do Men and Women Refuse? A Study on Refusal Speech Acts

Kadınlar ve Erkekler Nasıl Reddeder? Reddetme Söz Eylemleri üzerine bir Çalışma [*]

Ruhan Güçlü [*]

Geliş / Received: 22.08.2019 **Kabul / Accepted:** 03.10.2019

ABSTRACT: Gender and speech behavior are considered to be two interrelated variables. Abarghoui (2012) suggests that gender is one of the social variables which influences the refusing behavior of people. This study is an attempt to investigate refusal speech acts of 20 male and 20 female enactors participated in TV dating programs such as "Esra Erol'da" and "Zuhal Topal'la" in regard to the way how they use refusing strategies. Based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory and face threatening acts, data is analyzed as direct and indirect speech acts and discussed from the perspective of gender difference. Brown and Levinson (1978-1987), Leech (1983), and Searle (1976) agree upon that the indirectness is a feature of politeness. This study shows that women use more euphemistic language while men are more direct in refusal behavior and concludes that gender influences the choices of expressions of refusals.

Keywords: refusal speech act, direct speech act, indirect speech act, politeness, gender differences

ÖZ: Cinsiyet ve konuşma davranışı birbiriyle ilişkili iki değişken olarak kabul edilir. Abarghoui (2012), cinsiyetin insanların reddetme davranışını etkileyen sosyal değişkenlerden biri olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Bu çalışma, "Esra Erol'da" ve "Zuhal Topal'la" gibi TV buluşma programlarına katılan 20 erkek ve 20 kadın eylemcinin ret söz eylemlerini, reddetme stratejilerini nasıl kullandıkları açısından araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Brown ve Levinson'un (1987) Nezaket Teorisi'ne ve tehdit edici söz eylemlerine dayanarak, veri doğrudan ve dolaylı söz eylemleri olarak analiz edilir ve cinsiyet farklılığı perspektifinden tartışılır. Brown ve Levinson (1978-1987), Leech (1983) ve Searle (1976), dolaylılığın bir kibarlık özelliği olduğu konusunda hemfikirdir. Bu çalışma, reddetme davranışında erkeklerin daha doğrudan olmasına karşın kadınların daha örtmeceli bir dil kullandıklarını göstermektedir ve cinsiyetin reddetme ifadelerinin seçimlerini etkilediği sonucuna varmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: reddetme söz eylemi, doğrudan söz eylemi, dolaylı söz eylemi, nezaket, cinsiyet farklılıkları

[*] Research Assistant, Hacettepe University, Department of English Linguistics, ruhang@hacettepe.edu.tr

ISSN: 2149-5602

Introduction

"Esra Erol'da" and "Zuhal Topal'la" are large dating programs built by ATV satellite TV and FOX satellite TV respectively to adapt to the pace of modern urban life, according to the similar program modes in other countries. There are male and female guests coming for dating with women and men who decide to accept their aspirants or refuse. On one hand, there are many studies focusing on these programs, on the other hand, these studies focus on the issues from the perspective of the news media, television art, social, psychological and economic aspects, such as in the studies of Kalkan and Ersanlı (2008), Adam (2009), Yabancı (2010), Yılmaz and Kalkan (2010), Meder and Çiçek (2011), Polat and Karslı (2012), Renkmen (2012), Kaboğlu (2014), Özey (2015).

The popularity of dating TV reality shows in China is incontrovertibly obvious and so many research have been carried out to consider the use of male and female language in their programs. Besides the use of language in Chinese programs, below some research in other countries has been reviewed.

Fumi (1997) studied the discourse strategies of a TV talk show host to reveal how the participants manipulate their language to manage the distance. It was revealed that the participants used two basic discourse strategies for politeness, keigo and joking, not to threaten the negative face and to satisfy the positive face of the individuals. Yuan (2012) analyzed conversation between men and women in "If You Are The One" by means of evaluation theory, to find out the similarities and differences between the two, and revealed the causes of similarities and differences. Sun (2013) also studied program's conversational implicature by indirect politeness strategies, to help everyone understand the true meaning of guests and conversation.

Fullick (2013) examined how men and women construct gendered identities in their self-representations. The analysis of the way how the twenty online profiles use gendered 'selves' revealed that men exhibited more flirtatious implication while women were descriptor about their ideal intimacy.

Vergara (2015) investigated the discourse of men and women participants in Spanish TV dating programs and revealed that all of the participants that were analyzed used uptalk regardless of their gender. His another finding is that females used uptalk for flirting while men did not.

There are many investigations focusing on the indirect speech acts from the perspective of gender difference. However, in the sense of the refusal speech act strategies illustrated by male and female enactors in Turkish dating programs, it may not be wrong to say that this study is the preliminary one.

Speech Act Theory

A speech act can be defined as a small component of discourse as well as a fundamental element of communication (Nelson et al., 2002). Speech acts can be classified into five fundamental types as declaratives, representatives, expressives, directives and commissive as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Five Fundamental Speech Acts

Act	Definition	Example
Declaratives (Performatives)	Declarative acts are those that make a notable or important change after having been performed.	"Henceforth, you are all graduates of Minnesota State University, Mankato."
Representatives	Acts that allows the speaker to convey viewpoints, feelings, assertions and others.	"I believe that this is the most opportune time to grow roses."
Expressives	These are acts that allow the speaker to express the speaker or listener's psychological state of being. It is considered to be one of the most important types of speech acts for a language learner.	"I really like your new shirt!"
Directives	Directives are face- threatening acts as they allow the speaker to articulate a want while compelling the listener or listeners to fulfill the want.	"Go help your cousin in the garage."
Commissive	Commissive speech acts are also face-threatening. With a commissive, the speaker obligates (or refuses to obligate) himself or herself to take a future action. The use of such verbs as "promise" or "refuse" strengthens the commissive.	"I promise to help you tomorrow."

(Searle, 1975 cited in Drid, 2018)

These acts are categorized by Searle (1975 in Drid, 2018) according to the way how social communication between or among the individuals is affected.

Refusals

Chang (2008) describes refusals as "actions of speech that are a rejection of another individual's initiation of social interaction." Refusals require a great deal of pragmatic proficiency as the act in and of itself threatens the other individual's positive or negative face. On the other hand, according to Félix-Brasdefer (2009:3), refusals are as "second pair parts in conversation and belong to the speech act of dissent which represents one type of assertive act or negative expression" and (2009) further breaks the refusals down as direct and indirect refusals by stating that a direct refusal is precise and clear in the sense of intended meaning, such as "No; I am unable to help you." The complexity of a refusal is increased when it is articulated indirectly as it needs long progression of negotiation in order to alleviate the face-threatening effects of a direct refusal. In order to create an indirect refusal, ten components may be included in the refusal. These ten components are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Components of Indirect Refusals (from Félix-Brasdefer, 2009)

E**Component of an Indirect Refusal**	**Example**
Mitigated Refusal	"Sorry, I don't think I can cover your shift tomorrow."
Reason/Explanation	"I have to study for a test tonight."
Indefinite Reply	"I'm not positive if I can really help you."
Alternative	"Can we plan to meet up for dinner tomorrow instead?"
Postponement	"I know I need the course, but I would rather I take it next year."
Request for Clarification/ Request for More Information	"This coming weekend?"/ "What day were you planning to go fishing?"
Promise to Comply	"I can't promise you for sure, but I'll do my best to make it."
Repeat of Previous Utterance	"...July?"
Express Regret or Apologize	"I'm really sorry, I just can't make it"

(cited in Moody, 2011:21)

Ewert (2008) makes the claim that unlike requests and apologies, refusals are under-examined in linguistics. The study of Beebe et al. (1990) created a methodology for examining refusal acts from the sociolinguistic perspective. Below is the classification of refusal strategies proposed by Beebe et al. (1990).

Table 3: Classification of refusal strategies

1. Direct
A. Performative (e.g., "I refuse")
B. Non performative statement
1. "No"
2. Negative willingness/ability ("I can‟t." "I won‟t." "I don‟t think so.")
2. Indirect
A. Statement of regret (e.g., "I‟m sorry...", "I feel terrible...")
B. Wish (e.g., "I wish I could help you...")
C. Excuse, reason, explanation (e.g., "My children will be home that night.")
D. Statement of alternative
1. I can do X instead of Y (e.g., "I‟d rather do..." "I‟d prefer")
2. Why don‟t you do X instead of Y (e.g., Why don‟t you ask someone

else?")
E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., "If you had asked me earlier, I would have...")
F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., "I‟ll do it next time"; "I promise I‟ll...")
G. Statement of principle (e.g., "I never do business with friends.")
H. Statement of philosophy (e.g., "One can‟t be too careful.")
I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor
1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to thevrequester (e.g., "I won‟t be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation)
2. Guilt trip (e.g., waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can‟t make a living off people who just order coffee.")
3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); Insult/attack (e.g., "Who do you think you are?"; "that‟s a terrible idea!")
4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., "Don‟t worry about it." "That‟s okay.")
6. Self-defense (e.g., "I‟m trying my best." "I‟m doing all I can."
J. Acceptance that functions as a refusal
1. Unspecific or indefinite reply
2. Lack of enthusiasm
K. Avoidance
1. Nonverbal
a. Silence
b. Hesitation
c. Do nothing
d. Physical departure
2. Verbal
a. Topic switch
b. Joke
c. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g., "Monday?")
d. Postponement (e.g., "I‟ll think about it.")
e. Hedging (e.g., "Gee, I don‟t know." "I‟m not sure.")
Adjuncts to refusals
1. Statement of positive opinions/feeling or agreement ("That‟s a good idea...")
2. Statement of empathy (e.g., "I realize you are in a difficult situation.")

3. Pause filler (e.g., "uhh"; "well"; "uhm")
4. Gratitude/appreciation

Chang (2008) notes that while refusals exist in all languages and cultures, the degrees of politeness can be different across languages and cultures. As the refusals require the pragmatic knowledge, the investigations on the refusal acts uncovers many features that belong to the society.

Face and Politeness

The issue of politeness has been touched upon under the pragmatics in many studies since the mid 1970s with several theories and pragmatic approaches to the issue of politeness (Lakoff, 1973; Fraser and Nolen, 1981; Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Ide, 1989; Gu, 1990; Blum-Kulka, 1992). Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) theory of face and face-threatening acts (FTAs) are considered one of the most notable theories of politeness. In their politeness theory, Brown and Levinson (1987) defines the 'face' as 'the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. It consists of two specific types: positive face is the desire to be approved and liked by others whereas negative face is the desire to be unimpeded by others and to feel freedom from imposition. On the other hand, Face Threatening Act (FTA) is any act which damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other.

Brown and Levinson (1987) believed that the speech act of refusal is one of FTAs along with the other speech acts such as orders, requests and apologies. face threatening act. It is a type of speech act that threaten the positive face of the speaker, hearer or both by not caring about the addressee's feelings and desires. According to Tanck (2002), refusal occurs when a speaker rejects an invitation directly or indirectly.

Brown and Levinson (1978-1987), Leech (1983), and Searle (1976) associated the indirect speech act with politeness as people tend to be indirect to be polite in their conversation and to mitigate their production to avoid threat to each other's face with using "politeness strategies."

There are many socio-cultural factors affecting the directness-indirectness of utterances. Nguyen (1998 cited in Abarghoui, 2012) proposes twelve factors may affect the choice of directness and indirectness in communication such as age, sex, residence, mood, occupation, personality, topic, place, communicative setting, social distance, time pressure, position. In this study, the influence of the gender on the way how the male and female refuse each other is investigated.

Aim and Methodology

This paper aims to explore the speech act of refusal in Turkish TV programs in terms of the gender difference perspective. In parallel to this aim, the study attempts to answer in which ways men and women refuse each other in this context and to reveal whether and how the gender of the individuals impacts the way of refusing. The researcher randomly selects the parts of the programs from the channels's official websites broadcated from September 1, 2015 to December 30, 2015.

Analysis and Discussion

Refusal Speech Act in Turkish TV Dating Programs

Language is the main tool of communication among people, and in the expression of rejection, guests will generally use direct or indirect speech to ensure communication to be complete. In this paper, analyzed refusal speech acts are discussed under the category of direct refusal and indirect refusal speech acts.

Direct Refusal

Direct refusal generally use direct, concise and unreserved manner to achieve the speaker, by containing refused to central word sentence realization, or through the negation of will or their ability to express. In "Esra Erol'da" and "Zuhal Topal'la" direct refusal most exist in the male guests' refusal, use the form of apology.

(1) Man: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).
Woman: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you)
Man: Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming). Kusura bakmazsanız kararım 'olumsuz' (My decision is 'negative' if you don't mind).

(2) Man: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).
Woman: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).
Man: Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming). Kusura bakmazsanız ilk defa bir talibime 'olumsuz' cevabı vereceğim (If you don't mind, I will give the answer 'negative' first time to one of my aspirants).

(3) Man: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).
Woman: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you). Soru sorabilirsiniz (You can ask questions).
Man: Sorum yok (I have no questions). 'Olumsuz' (Negative)

(4) Man: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).
Woman: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).
Man: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you). Kararım 'olumsuz' (My decision is 'negative').

With the "negative" refuse is an impolite way of refusing, it exists in Turkish dating programs, mostly in men's answer. The examples occurred in female guests are willing to get-together with male guest, but the premise is that the men do not want to be in relationship with their aspirants. The answer "negative" is very direct and not polite.

Indirect Refusal

Indirect refusal is way beyond the direct refusal, mainly based on pragmatic principles and it has varied forms. In this study, indirect refusals are analyzed according to Félix-Brasdefer's (2009) categories of indirect refusal speech acts. It has been observed that in this study mainly used indirect refusal speech acts are indirect indefinite reply, reason/explain, mitigated refusal, express regret or apologize. These types are given below with the examples from the conversation between men and women. Data analysis shows that these indirect refusals may stand alone or may be combined with more than one indirect refusal types.

Indefinite Reply

The refusals below are commonly used for indirect way for refusing the request. Interlocutors do not directly say no, but thanks.

male and female guests normally expressed gratitude to the identity.

(5) Woman: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).

Man: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you). Nasılsınız (How are you?)

Woman: İyiyim, teşekkür ederim (Fine, thank you). Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming).

(6) Man: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).

Woman: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).

Man: İyi misiniz? (Are you fine?).

Woman: İyiyim, siz? (Fine and you?)

Man: İyiyim, teşekkür ederim (I am fine, thank you). Sorunuz var mı? (Do you have any questions?).

Woman: Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming).

Mitigated Refusal

(7) Woman: Locadan aday beklemiyorum (I don't expect an aspirant from the loggia). Adaylarımı dışardan bekliyorum (I expect my aspirants from outside).

(8)Man: Çocuksuz taliplerimi bekliyorum (I expect candidates without children).

Explanation

(9) Man: Benden büyük (She is elder than me).

Two or more than two types of indirect refusal are observed in the conversation. These types are given with the examples below:

Explanation + Mitigated Refusal

(10) Woman: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome). 60, 65 yaşlarında mısınız? (Are you about 60, 65 years old?)

Man: 64

Woman: Beyefendi, beklediğim yaşın üzerinde (Sir is over the age what I am expecting). Kusura bakmayın, etkilenmedim (Sorry, I haven't been affected).

(11) Man: Kararı olumsuz olsa bile, benimle çay içmesini ve beni tanımasını istiyorum (Even if her decision is negative, I want her to drink tea with me and get knowledge about me). Ve de onu tanımak istiyorum (Moreover, I want to get to know her). Çünkü locada kendimi en yakın hissettiğim kişi o. (Because she was the one to whom I feel affection in the loggia).

Woman: Dikkatimi çekmedi (He has not taken my attention). Daha önce benim arkadaşımdan hoşlanmıştı (He has liked my friend before). Anlaşamayacağımızı bile bile onunla nasıl çaya gideyim! (How can I go with him to drink tea knowing that we will not get on with each other, though!)

Woman: Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming).

Man: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).

Woman: Evlilik için hazır olduğunu düşünmüyorum. (I don't think that he is ready for marriage). Bu benim düşüncem (This is my own opinion).

(12) Woman: Oğluyla yaşıyor (He lives with his son). Etkilenmedim (I haven't been affected).

Mitigated Refusal+ Indefinite Reply

(13) Woman: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome)

Man: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).

Woman: Sarışın olsaydı, ben buraya size talip olarak gelirdim (If he were blonde, even I could have come here for him as an aspirant). Çok teşekkür ederim (Thank you very much. Kendinize iyi bakın (Take care).

(14) Woman: Kalbimin atmasını istiyorum ve yaşıma uygun birisini istiyorum (I want my heart to beat up and a person whose age is in compatible with mine). Geldiğiniz için de teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming, though).

Indefinite Reply + Mitigated Refusal + Apologize

(15) Man: Geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming). Sizinle gitsem dahi kararım değişmeyecek.(Even if I go with you, my decision will not change). Özür dilerim (Sorry).

Explanation + Apologize

(16) Woman: Hoşgeldiniz (Welcome).

Man: Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).

Woman: Sedat Bey, yaş kriterime uymuyorsunuz (Mr. Sedat, you are not compatible with my age criteria). Kusura bakmayın (Sorry).

Indefinite Reply+ Explanation

(17) Woman: 'Olumsuz' dersem lütfen üzülmeyin (If I say "negative", please don't get upset). Buraya kadar geldiğiniz için teşekkür ederim (Thank you for coming up to here). Teşekkür ederim (Thank you). Hakkınızı helal edin (Give your blessing). Ama yaşınız biraz büyük (But your age is a bit elder than me).

Explanation + Apologize + Indefinite Reply

(18) Woman: Ben hacca gitmiş birine uyum sağlayabilirim (I can get on well with a man who has made a pilgrimage). Saçımı kapatabilirim (I can cover my hair). Onun hayat tarzına uymak isterim (I would like to get in with his life style). Ama sen bana uyum sağlayamazsın (However, you cannot get in with me). Kusura bakmayın (Sorry).

Man: Niye size uyum sağlayamam? (Why cannot I get in with you?)

Woman: Ben yılda üç kere Kıbrıs'a gidiyorum (I go to Northern Cyprus three times a year).

Man: Belki Kıbrıs'a gidemeyebiliriz (Maybe we cannot go to Cyprus). İzmir'deki kaplıcalara ve denize götürebilirim. Kız kardeşlerim yaşıyor orada (I can take you to the thermal springs in İzmir and to the sea. My sisters live there).

Woman: Yaşadığım yerde kaplıacalar var (Thermal springs are available in the town I live in). Bu yüzden kusura bakmayın (So sorry). Teşekkür ederim (Thank you).

Mitigated Refusal + Indefinite Reply + Mitigated Refusal + Apologize

(19) Woman: Son zamanlarda talihsizlik yaşıyoruz (We have come across a tough break lately). Paravan açıldığında, kalbimin gerçekten atmasını istiyorum (After this folding screen is opened, I really want my heart to beat up). Buraya kadar geldiniz, zahmet ettiniz (You have come upto here and you have bothered). Ama sohbet edemeyeceğim (But I won't be able to have a conversation). Kusura bakmayın (Sorry).

The speech act of refusal put some objective problems between men and women guests, such as distance, age, personality differences, but also indirectly shows that the refusal is objectively required, to ease their embarrassment to each other.

For the need of politeness principle in communication, guests tend to explain a lot of reasons, especially women guests. Indirect refusal speech is often a variety of refusal strategies used including main refusal language and auxiliary refusal language.

Table 4 below indicates the frequency of the direct and indirect speech acts used by women and men guests in the analyzed Turkish dating programs.

Table 4: Direct and Indirect Refusal Speech Act used by Men and Women

Speech act	Men	Women
Direct speech act	50%	10%
Indirect speech act	50%	90%

As can be understood from Table 4 above, 50% of men uses direct speech act in refusing their aspirants whereas 10% of women uses direct speech act in refusing their aspirants. This means that women refuse their aspirants more politely than men as they use more indirect language.

Gender Differences In Refuse Mode

Language is the production of society. Under the influence of history and culture, social gender has specific expectations for male such as being mature, serious and hard-working while women should be kind, gentle, demure and understands courtesy. So this kind of social and cultural heritage has a long history in the psychological sense of gender. Jagger (1998) suggests that female consists of the traits such as empathy, intuition, therapist and communication while male traits include strength of character and principles and ambition.

From the point of gender-bound language use, many researchers propose the differences between male and female language. Tannen (1990) states that females use the language of connection to achieve intimacy, while men's language concerns the features such as language of status and independence. On the other hand, Lakoff (1975 cited in Holmes, 1993: 314) suggests ten features of female language such as lexical hedges, tag

questions, rising intonation on declaratives, empty adjectives, precise color terms, intensifiers, hypercorrect grammar, super polite forms, avoidance of strong swear words and emphatic stress. In regard to politeness, Lakoff (cited in Nemati and Bayer, 2007) put forwards that men's language is assertive and direct while women's language is non-assertive and hyper polite. In her research, Wahyuningsih (2018) investigates the gender difference in terms of vocabulary, attitudes, syntax and non-verbal aspect of language use. The study indicates that men tend to be more directive whereas women are more expressive and polite. The other proposition of Lakoff (1975) in regard to male speech is that their language use is "direct, forceful, confident using features such as direct, unmitigated statements and interpretation" (cited in Mills: 165).

The findings of the present research are corresponding to the previous studies which reflect the image of females in the society as being more polite than men in regard to using refusal strategies. When expressed refuse in "Esra Erol'da" and "Zuhal Topal'la", male guests are often directly thanks or apology, but female guests prefer indirect refusal speech act, with a long list of thanks or explanations to show courtesy.

Male Guests' Refusal Mode: Indefinite Reply+Direct Refusal

People who are familiar with the "Esra Erol'da " and "Zuhal Topal'la" programs know that the guest's refusing his or her aspirant usually occurs in the final round after the folding screen is opened. At this time, the guest explains his or her decision. According to the data collected, it can be understood that male guests rejected directly and decisively through expressing gratitude and apology. The study shows that the main refusal mode of male guests is by direct refusal and by the utterance "negative" and "indefinite reply+direct refusal." But some male guests also use "sorry" and some explanation which is felt more polite.

Female Guests' Refusal Mode: Diversification

The analysis of the study shows that women mostly use indirect language, pay attention to emotion and care about others. In comparison with male refusal behavior, female guests' refusal language is more euphemistic and polite and the reject mode is diversified. Besides the similar modes with the male guests, the female refusal also includes more euphemistic modes, such as "indefinite reply + mitigated refusal + apologize", "explanation + apologize + indefinite reply", "mitigated refusal + indefinite reply + mitigated refusal + apologize" and so on. In the examples given above, the refusal expression is very polite, euphemistic and indirect, it fits for the principle "the more indirect the more polite." This study is the preliminary one in such a way that how female refusal speech acts are diversed and subsequented.

Conclusion

The current research was an attempt to investigate the use of refusal speech acts by native speakers of Turkish males and females and the effect of the social variable "gender" on their refusal behavior. The refusal speech acts of Turkish male and female enactors participated in the chosen TV dating programs have been analyzed and discussed as direct

and indirect refusal speech acts as categorized by Félix-Brasdefer (2009). The results illustrate that men behave generally more direct while women are more euphemistic and polite in refusal speech act. By analysis of real oral corpus from "Esra Erol'da and Zuhal Topal'la", our understanding of the speech act of refusal becomes more in-depth.

This study has contributed to our understanding of the way how Turkish males and females refuse each other. The findings relate to the existing research on refusals in several ways (Tannen, 1990, Wahyuningsih, 2018, Lakoff cited in Nemati and Bayer, 2007). However, it is still necessary to conduct more research on refusal in Turkish from the framework of sociolinguistic perspective. It is also highly recommended that the future researchers investigate other speech acts or even other languages as well. Beebe et al.'s (1990) classification of refusal speech acts can be taken as the framework for the analysis of the speakers' speech acts as different speech acts for elicitation can make a difference in their choice or use of refusal strategies. On the other hand, since the issue of educational background, residential locus and age were not considered as variables in this study, it would be a good idea for other researchers to consider these variables as well. Furthermore, refusal speech act categories can be compared and contrasted in terms of written and oral versions.

All in all, the present study has made some contributions to our knowledge about refusals from the sociolinguistic perspective and it can be expanded in numerous ways in regard to the methodology and other social variable.

References

Abarghoui, M. A. (2012). A comparative study of refusal strategies used by Iranians and Australians. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(11), 2439.

Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., and Uliss-Weltz , R.(1990). Pragmatic transfer in Esl refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E.S. Andersen, and S.D. Krashen (Ed.) *Developing communicative competence in second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In S. I. Richard Watts (Ed.) *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice* (255-280). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (56-289). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics, 4. Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

Cao, X. (2014). *Discourses on urbanism: "Reality televisions" by Jiangsu Satellite Television since 2010*. Published Master Thesis, University of Hong Kong Baptist.

Drid, T. Language as Action: Fundamentals of the Speech Act Theory. *Praxis International Journal of Social Science and Literature*, *1*(10), 9.

Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *27*, 93-111.

Fullick, M. (2013). "Gendering" the self in online dating discourse. *Canadian Journal of Communication,* 38, 4: 545-562.

Fumi, M. (1997). Managing distances: discourse strategies of a TV talk show host. *Edingburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics,* 8: 63-75.

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 237-257.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, *8*(2-3), 223-248.

Jagger, E. (1998). Marketing the self, buying another: Dating in a postmodern, consumer society. *Sociology*, 32, 795–814.

Kaboğlu, G. (2014). İzdivaç programları ve şiddet üzerine. Retrieved from http://www.gizemkaboglu.com/2014/06/04/izdivac-programlari-ve-siddet-uzerine/

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* 8, 292-305.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Meder, M. and Çiçek, Z. (2011). Özel hayatın kamusal alanda tartışılması: Kadın programları üzerine sosyolojik bir değerlendirme. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 9: 69-80.

Nemati, A., & Bayer, J. M. (2007). Gender differences in the use of linguistic forms in the speech of men and women: A comparative study of Persian and English. *Language in India*, *7*(9), 1-16.

Özey, S. (2015). Evlilik programları üzerine: İyi Uykular Türkiye. Retrieved from http://www.dikgazete.com/m/evlilik-programlari-uzerine-iyi-uykular-turkiye-makale,106.html

Polat, F. and Karslı, B. (2012). Evliliğe ilişkin Türk televizyon programlarının sosyolojik analizi. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi,* 16, 51: 31-44.

Renkmen, M. S. (2012). *Evlilik programlarında hegemonik erkekliğin inşası, temsili ve ataerkil söylem.* Published Master Thesis, University of Ankara, Ankara.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*(01), 1-23.

Sun, F. (2013). *An analysis of the implicature in TV program "If you are the one" according to the off-record strategy*. Unpublished Master dissertation, Henan University.

Tanck, S, (2002). Speech act set of refusal and comparison of native and non-native English speakers' production. *TESOL Working Papers*, *4* (2), 1-22.

Vergara, D. (2015). Uptalk in Spanish dating shows?. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics,* 21, 2: 188-196.

Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). Men and women differences in using language: A case study of students at stain kudus. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, *3*(1), 79-90.

Wei Luo (2013). *If You Are the One: China's TV Dating Shows and Sheng Nü's Predicament*. Presented at 11th International Conference on New Directions in the Humanities, Eötvös Loránd Univeristy, Budapest, Hungary.

Yabancı, S. (2010). Evlilik programlarının psiko-sosyal analizi. Retrieved from https://www.doktorsitesi.com/makale/evlilik-programlarinin-psiko-sosyal-analizi

Yılmaz, T. And Kalkan, M. (2010). The effects of a premarital relationship enrichment program on relationship satisfaction. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 10*, 3: 1893-1920.

Zuo, T. (2013). *Discourse Studies of Middle-Aged TV Dating Shows.* Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Guangxi.