

The Cross-Linguistic Influences of Third Language Acquisition in Refusal Speech Act

Zijie Shu^{1,*}, Yi Bao²

¹*Department of Korean Language and Literature, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, 2066, South Korea*

²*School of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, Newark and Camden, New Jersey, 07102, United State*

**Corresponding author. seojiye@g.skku.edu*

ABSTRACT

During the process of language acquisition, the cultural environment has an impact on the learning process. People who use multiple languages will also have different usage habits when they use different languages. For students, learning a new language in a multilingual environment will also let them have a certain impact on language learning. Therefore, the main purpose of this project is to study the influence of the second language and mother tongue on the learning process when the second language is used to learn the third language. This paper will use interviews to collect data, in which the interview will set up scenarios for participants to respond. Respondents' language usage habits due to multiple language environments can be reflected in these answers. These answers will be used as data to be analyzed. We hypothesize that Chinese people tend to use indirect rejection strategies rather than direct rejection strategies. Also, Chinese people tend to use rationality, choice statements, and regret strategies. And after completing the experiment, the conclusion drawn is consistent with the original hypothesis.

Keywords: *Language Acquisition, Politeness, Refusal Formula, Culture Influence.*

1. INTRODUCTION

This study aims to reveal the cross-linguistic influence of the first language and the second language in the third language acquisition process, focusing on the refusal speech act.

Most existing language acquisition studies are conducted based on the comparative analysis hypothesis. The contrast analysis hypothesis became known in earnest after Lado published '*Linguistics Across Cultures*' as the main cause of difficulties and errors in foreign language learning [1]. Based on this, it was revealed that the difficulty of the foreign language learning process was mainly due to the difference between the two languages. Also, it was argued that the greater the difference between the two languages, the more difficulties the learner is facing. Indeed, this hypothesis has been criticized for being unrealistic and impractical, but the fact that second language acquisition is influenced by the first language is a widely accepted theoretical basis in linguistics.

However, most of the studies based on the contrasting linguistics hypothesis focus on the learner's 'errors' and

focus on areas with strict standards such as grammar and phonology. On the other hand, in the case of speech acts, the criterion of error is relatively vague. Although this is an expression with 'accuracy' in grammatical rules and phonological rules, it is recognized as an expression with lower 'appropriateness' when compared to the linguistic customs of native speakers from a speech act perspective. However, second language learners often find it more difficult to communicate than in strict grammar or phonological domains that have a theoretical basis. This is very abstract and difficult in terms of understanding and assimilating. It includes linguistic knowledge, the community using the language, and the culture of the community, as the speech act is greatly affected by the culture.

Language learning cannot be separated from the influence of culture and culture can be defined as a way of life [2]. Speech acts are in a way of showing the culture of a country through language expressions. It is very culturally influenced which can be defined as a group interaction process. During this process, one statement produced by one member of a group without interference is accepted by other members as a specific function or

action. Among many speech act themes, refusal can particularly reflect a speaker's sociocultural and practical skills [3]. Behavior such as refusal essentially threatens the face of the listener, which is called 'Face-Threatening Acts (FTA)' [4]. These speech acts are more difficult for second language learners, and culturally sensitive issues may arise.

As mentioned earlier, the influence of the first language in the second language acquisition process is a widely accepted theoretical basis at present, but it is not clear whether the same conclusion can be drawn in the third language acquisition process. In order to elucidate the issues of whether both the first language and the second language have an effect on third language acquisition, and if they both have influence, which aspect has more influence, this study aims to reveal the cross-linguistic influences of the first and second languages in the process of using the third language, specially in the aspect of refusal speech act, through a comparison between the group learning Korean as a second language and the group learning Korean as a third language.

2. LITERATURE VIEW

2.1 Cross-linguistic Influence

Related studies about cross-linguistic influences have mainly focused on the following topics, which includes language transfer, language interference, the role of mother tongue, mother tongue influence, language mixing and other topics [5]. Language transfer and cross-linguistic influences are perhaps the most common topics in second language research. It has been used interchangeably with the terms Cross-Linguistics Influence (CLI), or transfer. In this study, we will use cross-linguistic influence to express the interaction between one language and another, focusing on the relationship between language and language in the process of third language acquisition.

CLI refers to how one language influences another language in multiple ways. It can be observed in interlingual subsystems including linguistics, semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology, and orthography.

Although the study of the CLI on foreign language acquisition mainly focuses on the acquisition of L1 and L2, there is a growing interest in non-native linguistic influence. Studies show that learners' native and non-native languages are influential sources of learning a new language. Bilingual proficiency and bilingual contact play a role in determining how non-native languages affect Third Language Acquisition [6][7][8][9].

According to previous studies, some differences between second and third language acquisition are beginning to emerge. Rather than simply view third language acquisition as an extension of second language acquisition, the current trend is to see third language

learners as learners with unique and specific linguistic structures rather than monolingual second language learners [10]. Cook uses the word 'multi-competence' to refer to multilingual learners' linguistic abilities [11]. He argues that, unlike monolingual learners, multilingual learners learn a new language in different ways, and the cross-linguistic influence is more complicated when three or more languages are used [11].

2.2 Speech Act

In linguistic philosophy and linguistics, speech act refers to something expressed by an individual, which not only provides information but also performs an action. The speech act performs its function whenever it is being spoken or communicated [12]. For example, *'It's so hot today, can we turn on the air conditioner?'*

The function of the above sentence is to express the speaker's feelings of the temperature and his requests to cool down by turning on the air conditioner. According to Bach, almost any speech act is a simultaneous expression of multiple actions, distinguished by the different aspects of the speaker's intentions [13]. These are usually considered to include apologizing, promising, ordering, answering, requesting, complaining, warning, inviting, refusing, and congratulating [14].

In the history of the positivist philosophy of language, language is mainly regarded as a kind of fact-making [15]. Speech act theory is derived from Wittgenstein's philosophical theory, and Wittgenstein believes that meaning comes from pragmatic tradition, which proves the importance of how to use language to achieve goals in specific situations. Wittgenstein put forward the viewpoint of purpose, indicating that language is a new carrier of social activities. The difference in how speakers use language can lead to different results and different social relations between participants. Thus, when language learners have mastered the pragmatic tradition, which showed in their speech act, they can be regarded as having truly mastered the meaning of the language.

In terms of Amthiesese speech acts, refusal is a very special one. As mentioned above, refusal is a face-threatening behavior towards the speaker. Therefore, how to use refusal strategies and formulas has become a characteristic of various languages and cultures. In English, refusal is largely divided into Refusal and Rejection. Refusal is mainly used to deal with people, and Rejection is an expression mainly indicating dismissal of the agenda.

Refusal is not an initiation utterance, but a response utterance to induction speech such as request, invitation, provision, proposal, and forming an adjacency pair with the request act [16]. In addition, because refusal is basics Threatening Acts (FTAs) fact damage the requester's face, refusal can be prolonged using various face preservation strategies or formulas such as delay. While

acceptance can be made simply and clearly, refusal as a response to an initiation speech can lead to acceptance or compromise through postponement, alternative presentation, and complex bargaining activities.

Beebe, Takahashi, Ulises-Weltz pointed out that refusal is a complex speech act that requires a high level of pragmatic competence to be successfully executed [17]. Most importantly, indirect strategies should be used to eliminate the offense to the audience. Crucially, the interlocutor's awareness of cross-cultural differences minimizes the possibility of misrepresentation. In addition, it classifies refusal into two categories: direct refusal and indirect refusal. Direct refusal is when the speaker uses negative propositions to express the fact that he/she cannot comply, including acting phrases such as 'I decline' and non-acting phrases such as 'I cannot.' Indirect refusal indicates the fact that an offer, invitation, or request has been indirectly refused. The specific indirect refusal formulas are organized as follows:

1. Statement of regret.
2. Wish.
3. Excuse, reason, explanation.
4. Statement of alternative.
5. Set a condition for future or regret for past experience.
6. Promise of future acceptance.
7. Statement of principle.
8. Statement of philosophy.
9. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor:
 - 9-1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester.
 - 9-2. Criticize the requester.
 - 9-3. Guilt trip.
10. Acceptance functioning as a refusal
 - 10-1. Unspecific or indefinite reply.
 - 10-2. Lack of enthusiasm.
11. Avoidance
 - 11-1. Non-verbal(silence, hesitation, doing no, thing and physical departure)
 - 11-2. Verbal(topic, switch, joke, repetition of past request, postponement and hedge.)
12. Statement of positive opinion
13. Statement of empathy.
14. Pause fillers.
15. Gratitudeue/appreciation.

The No.1 to No.11's classification is used in current studies on the refusal speech act. There are also some adjuncts to the refusals as No.12 to No.15.

The refusal speech act is characterized by a large dependence on the influence of external conditions. As asserted from the sociocultural point of view, refusal is closely related to external conditions such as gender, social status, education level, and social distance [4][18]. Depending on the external conditions of the conversation participants, different strategies are used when refusing, and the results of the study may be different. Beebe et al. conducted a study on Japanese speakers, Japanese-English speakers, and English speakers (USA) [17]. This argues that Japanese and Americans differ significantly in the order, frequency, and content of semantic strategies in refusal. As a result of the study, it was found that Japanese refusal was changed by the social status of other interlocutors, whereas Americans were affected by the interlocutors' familiarity and social distance. In other words, the Japanese show a lot of apologies and regrets when refusing a high-status listener, whereas they do not show many of these strategies when refusing a low-status interlocutor. Also, while Japanese use more vague reasons, Americans are more likely to use the power of giving specific reasons.

In another influential study, Kwon compared the refusal speech act of 40 Koreans and 37 American English speakers [19]. Studies have shown that Koreans are more indecisive and seldom use outright refusal formulas than English-speaking Americans. In addition, Koreans often pause or apologize before turning down, while English speakers often express positive opinions and express appreciation for suggested actions. Koreans tend to take a more conciliatory approach when conversing with higher-status listeners than other status types. Conversely, he argues that American English speakers do not appear to be particularly sensitive to the identity of the other person. Therefore, based on this point, this study states that Koreans with a Korean cultural background may not be able to express practical meanings when learning a foreign language.

Above all, during many speech acts, refusal is a reflection of the language and culture in which it is used. Many foreign language learners do not understand the target language's style of refusal. Hence, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural misunderstandings occur a lot in communication. Therefore, this study aims to reveal the effects of the first and second language on the third language by comparing the refusal speech act of learners.

3. METHOD

The research questions of this study are as followed:

- 1) Do the first and second languages have a cross-linguistic influence on the refusal speech act in the third language?

2) What are the cross-linguistic influences shown in the specific refusal speech act during the third language acquisition process?

This study aims to answer the above questions by comparing Chinese learners who learn Korean in English at American universities with Chinese learners who learn Korean in Korean. The learners who participated in the experiment were 5 Korean language minors from Rutgers University and 5 Chinese undergraduate students from Sungkyunkwan University. All learners have TOPIK 4 level, and the specific situation is shown in the Table 1 below.

Table 1. Personal Information of the Participant

Rutgers University			Sungkyunkwan University		
No.	TOPIK Level	Learning Duration	No.	TOPIK Level	Learning Duration
1	4	30 month	6	4	20 month
2	4	36 month	7	4	25 month
3	4	27 month	8	4	17 month
4	4	20 month	9	4	15 month
5	4	25 month	10	4	13 month

Two test groups were divided into Chinese-Korean speakers (CKS) and Chinese-English-Korean speakers (CEKS). Table 1 shows the schools of the interviewees, as well as their Korean language ability and learning duration. The Korean Proficiency uses Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK), and the learning duration is the time they costed since they started to learn Korean until now. The Korean proficiency level of both groups is TOPIK level 4. However, because the learning process of CKS Group is more centralized than that of CEKS Group, their learning time of Korean is shorter than that of CEKS Group. What's more, the learners in the CKS group can speak simple English because they have received compulsory education, but communicating in English is at a level that has a lot of difficulties. On the other hand, the learners in the CEKS group of 5 are at a level of 100 or higher in the English TOEFL test and have a high level of English without difficulties in daily life and academic life in the United States.

This study will use a qualitative method by conducting interviews and will proceed with Discourse Completion Tests (DCT). A discourse completion test is a tool used to elicit specific verbal behaviors in linguistics and practical linguistics. Experimental participants need to assume that they are in the context of the given

situation and respond based on their experiences and first reactions. The design of discourse situation is divided into 9 situations according to social status and intimacy level and is as follows.

1. On the weekend morning, your father asked you to wash the car. Please reject this request.
2. Your senior at school is in a reading club, and he suggested you to joining the club and have fun together. Please reject this offer.
3. This semester, the professor offered an opportunity to give bonus credits if you can work as a teaching assistant. Please reject this offer.
4. A close friend asked you to travel with him/her this holiday. Please reject this request.
5. You have to do a team-work-presentation and your classmate came and suggested to present together. Please reject this offer.
6. A stranger at school asked you to do a survey. Please reject this request.
7. Your cousin had difficult math homework, so he asked you to do it instead. Please reject this request.
8. Junior student asked you to participate in a study meetin , which aisalready full. Please reject this request.
9. Your nephew from a distant relative asked for a gift on New Year's Day. Please reject this request.

4. ANALYSIS

This study will analyze the cross-linguistic effect on the third language by analyzing the difference in the use of refusal speech act formulas between Chinese-Korean speakers (CKS) and Chinese-English-Korean speakers (CEKS).

4.1 Overview

The difference between CKS and CEKS's uses of refusal formulas is as follows:

First of all, the level of the Korean Language Proficiency Test of CKS and CEKS is almost the same at level 4. However, when considering that they are living in completely different cultural backgrounds, it can be inferred that CKS's comprehensive Korean ability is generally higher than that of CEKS. It is difficult to ascertain whether the cause of this difference is language ability, lack of awareness of Korean culture, or cross-linguistic influence. Therefore, for the overall analysis, this study will focus on the more significant differences.

Table 2. The Overview in Uses of Refusal Formulas

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS		
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Direct	4	4.30%	8	8.99%	
1	25	26.88%	25	28.09%	
2	2	2.15%	10	11.24%	
3	33	35.50%	29	32.58%	
4	7	7.52%	6	6.74%	
5	0	0.00%	5	5.62%	
6	12	12.90%	4	4.49%	
7	1	1.08%	0	0.00%	
In-direct	9-1	3	3.23%	4	4.49%
	9-2	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
	10-1	5	5.36%	0	0.00%
	10-2	1	1.08%	0	0.00%
	11-2	8	8.60%	1	1.12%
	14	4	4.30%	3	3.37%
	15	5	5.38%	1	1.12%

Based on the above results, the differences in the use of refusal formulas between two groups can be found as follows.

First of all, Wish. In this study, the number of times the wish formula was used in the CKS was 2, which was less than the 10 times in the CEKS, when having refusal speech acts. 2 uses of the CKS occurred in scenario 3 and scenario 4, while 10 uses of the CEKS occurred in scenarios 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Second is Setting conditions or past acceptance. In CKS, set condition for future or past acceptance is used to make assumptions about the future or past, such as stating 'I would go with you if I had money.' and so on do not appear. On the contrary, it appears 5 times in CEKS, from scenario 2 to scenarios 4.

Then, Promise of future acceptance. In the CKS, the use of the promise of the future acceptance occurs 12 times, which was found in scenarios 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9, except for the sixth scenario. In CEKS, however, using an agreement for the future occurs only 4 times, in cases 2, 4, and 5. In this case, the difference between 2) and 3) in the CKS versus CEKS is not very significant. However, in the longitudinal analogy, we find that 'Set condition for future or past acceptance' and 'Promise of future acceptance' are not used very differently in the CEKS group. However, in the CKS group, 'Set condition for future or past acceptance' is not used in any case, but used 'Promise of future acceptance' 12 times. That is, for the CKS, they are not used to using such methods as

making assumptions about the past or future to refuse others, while the CEKS showed acceptance of this refusal formula.

For such a difference, it is possibly because of the influence of the English language. According to Liao and Bresnahan, study of Chinese and the American refusal speech act, Americans are more accustomed to refusing people with positive responses[20]. Making assumptions about the past or future, and being very willing to accept an invitation or request if one has a certain condition, is a very typical positive response method. However, no one in the CKS has used such a method in any situation before, while the CEKS group has five. This showed that Chinese people are not used to using assumptions about timing to refuse others due to the influence of their native language. However, being influenced by the English language, even when speaking a third language, some Chinese people also demonstrate this type of use of refusal formulas that Americans are more used to.

The last formula is Verbal. In this case, we can find that CKS group the is more often to other methods of refusal such as topic switch and joke. In the CKS group, this method was used eight times in total, appearing in scenario 9. However, in contrast, in the CEKS group, diversion on topic was used only once, appearing in scenario 9. Refusing requests and invitations from others through topic change and jokes is a very ambiguous form of refusal. Korean speakers appeared to be more hesitant in refusing and used direct refusal formulas less often than English speakers [19]. This is in line with the findings of this study. According to the table above, CKS and CEKS demonstrated some differences in the use of direct refusal formulas, with the CKS group using direct refusal formulas four times compared to eight times in the CEKS group. This also comes from cross-linguistic influence. Korean speakers were more tentative, as well as opaque and uncertain in their refusals. English speakers, on the other hand, show a more positive side in expressing their opinions. Therefore, this affects the performance of these two groups used among the refusal.

4.2 Refusal Formula Based on Social Status

Next is to analyze the differences for the use of refusal formulas between the CKS and CEKS groups by social status.

4.2.1. Higher Social Status

No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 scenarios are scenarios in which the listener has a higher social status than the speaker. The two group refusal formulas are used as follows.

Table 3. Usages of Refusal Formulas in Higher Social Status

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Direct	0	0.00%	1	1.12%
	1	8.60%	9	10.11%
	2	1.08%	6	6.74%
	3	13.98%	14	15.73%
Indirect	4	4.30%	3	3.37%
	5	0.00%	3	3.37%
	6	5.37%	1	1.12%
	15	4.30%	1	1.12%

As shown above, the refusal formulas used by CKS and CEKS when talking to a person of higher status are statement of regret, wish, excuse, reason, explanation, statement of alternative, set condition for future or past acceptance, promise of future acceptance and gratitude/appreciation.

In this part, there is almost no significant difference between the two groups. Although the CKS used the direct refusal formula four times, none of them occurred in conversations with people of higher social status. The CEKS group used the direct formula eight times in all scenarios, including once when talking to people of higher social status, in scenario 3. The analysis of the specific usage can be interpreted as a lack of proficiency in the Korean language and a lack of understanding of Korean culture.

Other than that, the slight differences are in ‘promise of future appreciation. For the ‘promise of future acceptance’ part, most of the CKS groups usually use it in conjunction with the meaning of refusal to ease the embarrassment and displeasure of the speaker. Here are the details of the usage from CKS.

‘아빠, 난 친구랑 약속이 있어서 다음에 같이 가도 되나?’ (‘Dad, I have an appointment with my friend. Can I go with you next time?’)

‘아빠, 죄송하지만 저 진짜 배가 너무 아파요. 내일, 내일 꼭 같이 가줄게요!’ (‘Dad, I’m sorry, but my stomach really hurts. I’ll be there with you tomorrow!’)

More than CKS, the CEKS group focuses on the refusal and the resolution of the problem, they are more interested in explaining the reasons, expressing regret, and apologizing. Here are the details of the usage from CEKS.

‘죄송해요. 선생님. 저 이미 다른 동아리를 신청했는데 독서 동아리에 들어갈 수 없는 것 같아요. 미안해요.’ (‘I’m sorry, senior. I already applied for another club, but I don’t think I can join the reading club. I’m sorry.’)

‘이런 좋은 기회를 주셔서 너무 감사해요. 근데 저는 알바도 해야 하고 남은 시간이 진짜 부족할 것 같아요. 조교를 못할 것 같아요. 정말 죄송합니다.’ (‘Thank you so much for giving me this great opportunity. But I have to work part-time and I don’t think I’ll have enough time left. I don’t think I can be an assistant. I’m really sorry.’)

The above two comparisons reveal that in refusing people of higher social status than themselves, CKS’s refusals are less explicit in expressing their refusal. Instead, they shift the focus of the conversation away from the refusal of the invitation through a future or future appearance promise, etc. In CEKS, however, they are more trying to focus the conversation on their current situations, expressing a more transparent refusal marker through their words.

According to Kwon, Korean speakers tend to use more mitigation methods to deal with people of higher social status, while English speakers do not seem particularly sensitive to one social status from another [19]. Also, Li concludes that Americans and Chinese express their refusal in different ways and aspects in terms of different cultures and situations [21]. The Chinese are more indirect than the Americans. In addition, the Chinese are more eager to use politeness strategies and Chinese tend to emphasize repairing interpersonal relationships, while Americans focus more on problem solving. Even though their first and third languages have similar cultural backgrounds in terms of refusal, they still exhibit the use of refusal formulas that are more closely related to English.

4.2.2. Same or Lower Social Status

Among the nine scenarios, the four of six listeners were in the same social status, and the seven of nine were with listeners of lower social status than themselves. The specific usage is as follows.

Table 4. The Usages of Refusal Formulas in Lower Social Status

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Direct	4	4.30%	7	7.87%
	1	17.28%	16	17.98%
	2	1.08%	4	4.49%
	3	13.98%	15	16.85%
Indirect	4	3.23%	6	6.74%
	5	0.00%	2	2.25%
	6	7.52%	3	3.37%
	7	1.08%	0	0.00%
	9-1	3.23%	4	4.49%

9-2	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
10-1	5	5.38%	0	0.00%
10-2	1	1.08%	0	0.00%
11-2	8	8.60%	1	1.12%
14	4	4.30%	3	3.37%
15	1	1.08%	0	0.00%

Based on the comparison in the table above, it can be seen that there is no very significant difference in the use of the refusal formula between CKS and CEKS when conversing with people who have the same social status as themselves, and those who have a lower social status than themselves. Both groups simultaneously demonstrated more casualness and more direct expression of attitudes than when talking to people of higher social status themselves, as compared above. For example, CKS used the following refusal formula in the situations of friends' friend's travel invitations (scenario 4) and brother's requests for help with homework (scenario 7).

‘아...가고 싶다. 근데 난 돈이 없어. 못 갈 것 같은데...’ (‘Oh... I want to go. But I don't have money. I don't think I can make it.’)

‘숙제는 혼자 하는 거지. 일단 해봐. 모르면 알려줄게.’ (‘Homework should be done alone. Just do it. If you don't know, I'll tell you.’)

This shows that they use a more direct form of refusal in equal social relationships, displaying more 'elder' status in front of their brother who is younger than them to criticize the brother who makes such a request. The CEKS group also demonstrates this. The specific scenarios scenario 4 and 7 are as follows.

‘미안. 난 그때 약속이 있어. 다음에 같이 가자. 미안~’ (‘Sorry. I have an appointment then. Let's go together next time. I'm sorry.’)

‘야. 자기 일은 자기가 해야 돼. 이 숙제는 내꺼 아니야.’ (‘Hey. You have to do your own thing. This homework is not mine.’)

It follows that for the CKS and CEKS groups, the cross-linguistic influence is only found for communication with people from a higher social status.

4.3 Refusal formula based on intimacy

Next is to analyze the differences in the use of refusal formulas between the CKS and CEKS groups by intimacy. In the act of refusal speech, the intimacy of the relationship still influences the use of people's refusal formulas even when they are talking to people of their lower social status. In this study, scenarios 1, 4, and 7 are intimate relationships, scenarios 2, 5, and 8 are less intimate relationships, and scenarios 3, 6, and 9 are not intimate relationships.

4.3.1. Intimate Relationships

In this study, the use of the refusal formula of intimate relationships is shown in the table below.

Table 5. The Usages of Refusal Formulas in Intimate Relationships

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Direct	4	4.30%	5	5.62%
1	9	9.78%	7	7.87%
2	1	1.08%	5	5.62%
3	10	10.75%	8	8.99%
4	3	3.22%	4	4.49%
5	0	0.00%	3	3.37%
6	5	5.38%	4	4.49%
7	1	1.08%	0	0.00%
9-	3	3.22%	2	2.25%
In-direct	1			
9-	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
2				
10	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
-1				
10				
-2	1	1.08%	0	0.00%
11	3	3.23%	1	1.12%
-2				
14	4	4.30%	2	2.25%
15	2	2.15%	0	0.00%

According to the table above, it can be seen that there is no major difference between the refusal formulas used by CKS and CEKS in intimate relationships. Both groups demonstrate a more relaxed and direct approach. The specific ways used are as follows.

CKS:

‘아빠, 주말이잖아. 조금만 자게 해주세요. 낮잠을 자고 싶어요.’ (‘Dad, it's the weekend. Please let me sleep a little bit. I want to take a nap.’)

‘난 이번에 진짜 안돼...돈도 없고 시간도 없어. 너무 바빠서 나 어떡해...’ (‘I really can't this time...I don't have money and time. What should I do because I'm so busy?’)

‘꿈 꾸지마! 과제는 혼자해야지. 아니면 너가 내 과제를 해줘?’ (‘Don't dream! You have to do your homework alone. Or do you want me to do my homework?’)

CEKS:

‘아빠, 저 정말 졸려요. 가고 싶지 않아요. 엄마한테 물어보세요.’
(*Dad, I'm really sleepy. I don't wanna go. Ask your mom.*)

‘친구야. 미안해. 나도 가고 싶는데 시간이 없어. 다음 방학 때 같이 가자.’ (*My friend. I'm sorry. I want to go, but I don't have time. Let's go together on the next vacation.*)

‘안되지. 선생님한테 들키면 어떡해.’ (*No. What if the teacher finds out?*)

It can be seen that in intimate relationships in both CKS and CEKS focus the conversation on the transmission and expression of meaning, and there is no opaqueness or hesitation manifested in the intimate relationship.

4.3.2. Less intimate relationships

Here is a refusal formula used when talking in a less intimate relationship.

Table 6. The Usages of Refusal Formula in a Less Intimate Relationship

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS		
	Frequen cy	Percenta ge	Frequen cy	Percenta ge	
Direct	0	0.00%	3	3.37%	
1	8	8.60%	8	8.99%	
2	0	0.00%	5	5.62%	
3	12	12.9%	10	11.24%	
4	2	2.15%	2	2.25%	
5	0	0.00%	2	2.25%	
6	3	3.22%	0	0.00%	
In- dire ct	9- 1	0	0.00%	2	2.25%
10	1	1.08%	0	0.00%	
-1					
11	2	2.15%	0	0.00%	
-2					
14	0	0.00%	1	1.12%	
15	1	1.08%	0	0.00%	

In this section, it can be seen that the refusal formula of CKS starts to become more discreet, while CEKS's refusal formulas are still more direct.

First, when talking to less intimate counterparts, the CKS group did not use any direct refusal formulas. However, the CEKS group used three direct refusals. Meanwhile, the section ‘9-1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester’ was not used by CKS in less intimate relationships, although they used it 3 times in more intimate relationships. CEKS, on the

other hand, was still used twice in less intimate relationships.

The specific ways in which they were used are as follows.

CKS:

‘죄송해요. 선배님. 저는 진짜 이번 학기 생각보다 바빠서... 다음에 꼭 같이 가요.’ (*I'm sorry, senior. I was busier than I thought this semester would be...Let's go together next time.*)

‘미안해요. 다른 친구랑 약속했는데... 어떡해요? 아니면 ㅇㅇ한테 물어볼까? 아직은 팀이 없는 것 같아요.’ (*I'm sorry. I made an appointment with another friend. What should I do? Or should I ask xxx(another friend's name)? I don't think there's a team yet.*)

‘어떡하지? 오늘 이미 만원인 걸로 기억하는데 나 물어봐줄까? 아니면 다음에 미리 알려줄까?’ (*What should I do? I remember it's already full today. Do you want me to ask? Or should I tell you in advance next time?*)

CEKS:

‘선배님. 저 안돼요. 요새 제 몸이 좀 좋지 않아서 쉬고 싶어요. 못가서 미안해요.’ (*Senior. I can't. I'm not feeling well these days, so I want to rest. I'm sorry I couldn't go.*)

‘미안해요. 못할 것 같아요. 다음에 좀 일찍 말해줘요. 그래야 방법을 찾을 수 있어요.’ (*Sorry. I don't think I can do it. Please tell me earlier next time. That's how you can find a way.*)

‘미안. 미리 좀 말하지 그랬어. 이미 만원이 되어서 어떡해 해.’ (*Sorry. Why didn't you tell me in advance? It's already full. What should I do?*)

As seen in the examples above, the CKS group did not directly say ‘I can't’ or ‘no’ in the less intimate relationships. They began to demonstrate some sense of boundaries and politeness, yet the CEKS students continued to show a more direct attitude.

This can be caused by the definition of intimacy in different cultural circles. As it will be mentioned in the analysis of non-intimate relationships below, for CKS, due to the influence of Korean language and culture, they become more sensitive to the definition of boundaries between people and have a more precise and accurate take on the three types of relationships: intimate or less intimate, and not intimate. On the contrary, the CEKS group may be more familiar with the American culture where the boundaries between human relationships are more blurred, so there are some differences in the perception of the less intimate relationship.

4.3.3 Not intimate relationships

Finally, the refusal formula for the three cases of non-intimate relationship is used as follows.

Table 7. The Usages of Refusal Formulas in No Intimate Relationship

Refusal formulas	CKS		CEKS	
	Frequen cy	Percenta ge	Frequen cy	Percenta ge
1	8	8.60%	10	11.24%
2	1	1.08%	0	0.00%
3	11	11.82%	11	12.36%
4	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
In-dire ct	6	4.30%	0	0.00%
10	2	2.15%	0	0.00%
-1				
11	3	3.23%	0	0.00%
-2				
15	2	2.15%	0	0.00%

On the whole, CEKS uses only ‘statement of regret’ and ‘excuse, reason, and explanation’ in not intimate relationships. CKS, on the other hand, exhibits more selectivity. In addition to the two described above, there are ‘wish, statement of alternative, promise of future acceptance, unspecific or indefinite reply, verbal, and gratitude appreciation. All of these refusal formulas are characterized by change of topic, promise of futue, and ambiguous replies to reduce the requester's level of face-threatening, which was not found in the CEKS group.

Specific uses are shown in the following examples.

CKS:

‘교수님, 좋은 기회를 주셔서 정말 감사합니다. 너무 영광스러워요. 근데 저는 이번 학기가 생각보다 너무 바쁜 것 같아요... 잘하는 자심이 없어요...’ (‘Professor, thank you so much for giving me a good opportunity. It’s such an honor. But I think this semester is busier than I thought. I don’t have self-esteem to do well.’)

‘죄송합니다. 지금 조금 급해서요. 죄송합니다.’ (‘I’m sorry. I’m in a hurry. I’m sorry.’)

‘어떡하지. 이모는 돈이 없다. 엄마한테 돈 좀 달라고 할까?’ (‘What should I do? Aunt(I) don’t have money. Should I ask your mom for some money?’)

CEKS:

‘교수님, 죄송합니다. 저는 이 일을 받을일 수 없습니다. 저는 정말 조교할 시간이 없고... 이번 학기에 할 일이 너무 많습니다. 그래서 정말 죄송합니다.’ (‘Professor. I’m sorry. I can’t take this job. I really

don’t have time to be an assistant. There are so many things to do this semester. So I’m really sorry.’)

‘죄송한데 저는 바로 시험이 있어서 설문조사를 할 시간이 없어요.’ (‘I’m sorry, but I don’t have time to survey because I have exams right away.’)

‘미안하네. 준비를 못했네...’ (‘I’m sorry. I didn’t prepare it.’)

Usage differences are also reflected in these scenarios. In Korean culture, non-intimacy represents the need to maintain distance and etiquette, while in American culture, non-intimacy is greatly likely to be interpreted as unfamiliarity by CEKS. Therefore, the translations of not intimate relationships shown by the two groups are different.

5. CONCLUSION

This study explores the influence of cross-linguistic influences on third language acquisition by comparing the use of refusal formulas in the refusal speech behavior of Chinese - Korean speakers (CKS) and Chinese - English - Korean speakers (CEKS). Five CKS and five CEKS were interviewed, and their responses were analyzed to draw the following conclusions.

First, cross-linguistic influences do occur in third language acquisition, with the second language showing more influence than the first language. For example, the CEKS group, originally more indirect native Chinese speakers in refusal, were influenced by the second foreign language, and displayed more direct attitudes during conversations in Korean.

Second, in terms of social status, CKS and CEKS similarly categorize each other with higher social status than themselves, and use different refusal formulas by categorizing the subordinate with the inferior. However, CKS appears more hesitant and opaque in front of the counterpart who is more senior than oneself. Conversely, CEKS is influenced by English thinking and focuses the conversation on expressing reasons and completing the act of refusal.

Third, CKS and CEKS originate from the same social contextual environment. However, CKS has a more sensitive relationship boundary perception system than CEKS. Influenced by both Korean and English, the two groups of the same native language show a cognitive difference in the definition of relational closeness when using Korean. CKS has a clearer understanding of the middle value of intimacy and not intimacy, which is less intimacy, and exhibits more refusal formulas between the two types of relationships. However, CEKS had some ambiguity in their perceptions of less intimate relationships, and they still used the more direct and casual refusal formulas embodied both in intimate relationships and less intimate relationships. Also, for not

intimate relationships, the CKS response is to maintain a sense of boundaries through politeness, whereas the CEKS response is understood as a sense of strangeness. This derives from the second language perception of social relationships and is also reflected in the third language act of refusal speech.

With this award, the conclusion of this study was concluded. According to the results of the experiment, it is consistent with the hypothesis. The cultural influence found after the experiment has indeed caused many problems in communication. It is hoped that this study will be helpful in the third language acquisition process, especially during the learning process or educational process of non-native speakers of Korean learning in the United States or other countries.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Lado (1957) Linguistics across cultures. *Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.
- [2] E. C. Condon (1973). Introduction to Cross-Cultural. New Brunswick, NJ: Rogers University Press.
- [3] R.Y. Hirokawa (1980). A comparative analysis of communication patterns within effective and ineffective decision-making groups. *Communication Mono-graphs*, 47, 312-321.
- [4] P. Brown, S. C. Levinson (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] T. Odlin (2003). Cross-Linguistic Influence. *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell. p. 437.
- [6] B. Hammarberg (2001). Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 Production and Acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 21-41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [7] H. Ringbom (1987). The Role of L1 in Foreign Language Learning. *Clevedon: Multilingual Matters*.
- [8] S. Williams, B. Hammarberg (1998). Language Switches in L3 Production: Implications for a Polyglot Speaking Model. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 295-333.
- [9] D. Mohle (1989) Multilingual Interaction in Foreign Language Production, H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (eds.), *Interlingual Processes*, 179-194, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- [10] G. De Angelis, L. Selinker (2001). Interlanguage Transfer and Competing Linguistic Systems in the Multilingual Mind. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 42-58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [11] V. Cook (1995) Multi - competence and the learning of many languages, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 8:2, 93-98.
- [12] J. L. Austin, J. Langshaw (1975). *How to do things with words*. Urmson, J. O., Sbisà, Marina. (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- [13] K. Bach, R. M. Harnish (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*.
- [14] Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA): Pragmatics and Speech Acts. *carla.umn.edu*. Retrieved 2019-02-20.
- [15] K. Bach, Speech Acts. *Speech Acts*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d. Web. 10 Feb. 2014
- [16] S. Gass, J. Neu (eds.) (1999). Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese- English. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [17] L. M. Beebe, T. Takahashi, R. Uliss-Weltz (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL Refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. Anderson & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp.55-73). New York: Newbury House.
- [18] B. Fraser (1990), Perspectives on politeness, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 14, Issue 2, Pages 219-236.
- [19] J. Kwon (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. , 23(4), 339-364.
- [20] C. C. Liao, M. I. Bresnahan (1996). A contrastive pragmatic study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. In K. Jaszczolt & K. Turner (Eds.), *Contrastive semantics and pragmatics* (pp. 703-727). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- [21] H. L. LI (2010). A comparative study of refusal speech acts in Chinese and American English. *Canadian Social Science*, 3(4), 64-67.