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Linguistic indirectness has been shown as avenues to achieve politeness. However, its central motive claimed to be universal in terms of face has of late been open to debate concerning its orientation toward western individual image. This study thus offers a culture-specific description on Chinese refusals by two means of communication to elucidate the contextual dimensions relevant to language instruction. The data base is a set of 132 responses elicited via requests to recruit assistants. Analyses on linguistic formulae show prevalent occurrences of excuses and multiple politeness markers, which vary in phone and email data as to orders and frequencies. Email also displays more complex structures and fewer presences of indirect strategies, hence carrying a higher degree of formality and social distance than phone interaction. This characterizes a typical opposition between spoken and written discourse. Motivated by different types of facework, internal and external excuses are proven to be sensitive to requesting situations. These findings suggest a culture-unique link in action between linguistic representations and interpersonal management. This dynamic interface between forms and functions also indicates the importance to highlight sociopragmatic factors in speech act instruction.

1. Introduction

With ever-increasing attention to the study of speech act behaviors, there has arisen a concomitant interest in the socio-cultural and pragmatic factors involved in achieving polite social interaction. In their politeness theory, Brown and Levinson (1978) propose
strategies for positive and negative politeness that help alleviate face damage likely to occur in *face-threatening acts*. These acts, as demonstrated by requesting, suggesting, complimenting, and criticizing, require performers’ effective use of linguistic maneuvers to maintain interlocutors’ face wants. Their theory supposes a close relationship between speech acts and politeness manifestation. Subsequent to the publishing of this proposal, a wide variety of studies on speech acts (e.g. Kim and Bresnahan 1994; Macaulay 2001; Golato 2003; Upadhyay 2003) have confirmed that indirect use of language aims toward the interpersonal goal of politeness. Nevertheless, hot debates have also been provoked on the generality of face want. The *positive/negative face* advocated in Brown and Levinson’s work has frequently been challenged because ideologically it rests on the western culture where individual image is highly valued. Some scholars (e.g. Lii-Shih 1994; Gu 1990; Mao 1994; Tseng 1999; Yu 1999) have pointed out the incompatibility of *universal politeness* with non-western cultures. Chinese society, for example, places more importance on *communal image* in which it is the harmony of personal behaviors with the public judgment that matters (see Mao 1994; Yu 1999). Such individual-society balance produces a telling influence on Chinese interpersonal communication.

The speech act to be examined in this study, refusals in response to requests, also belongs to the family of face-threatening acts for its performance potentially clashes with the face wants of the requester. A number of scholars (e.g. Shih 1986; Beebe et al. 1990; Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1991; Liao and Bresnahan 1996; Turnbull and Saxton 1997; Nelson et al. 2002) have verified that refusals embody on the part of the refuser an effort to manipulate strategies for restoration of face for both sides. These face-saving tactics have been found to exhibit Brown and Levinson’s (1978) positive and negative politeness. However, given the idiosyncrasy of Chinese culture, it seems inadequate to apply the western politeness theory to the interpretation of social meanings in Chinese refusals. In consequence, the purpose of this paper is two-fold. We attempt to present an empirical analysis on the forms and functions of naturally occurring refusals in Chinese by two means of communication. We also intend to detect the socio-pragmatic abilities required in the acquisition of refusals to help learners develop communicative competence that paves the way for successful social negotiation.

## 2. Related Studies on the Speech Act of Refusals
As a widely discussed domain, studies on speech acts can be divided into three components: within one specific language (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1987; Koike 1989; Turnbull and Saxton 1997), between two or more languages (e.g. Chen 1993; Lee-Wong 1994; Fukushima 1996; Liao and Bresnahan 1996; Pair 1996; Nelson et al. 2002), and between languages produced by native and non-native speakers (e.g. Beebe et al. 1990; Yu 1999; 2004; Hassall 2001; 2003; Byon 2004). These studies have disclosed diverse politeness strategies in favor of facework in acts that intrinsically threaten interlocutors’ face. Given that refusals involve impediment of compliance that is highly face-threatening, refusers are expected to call for face-saving maneuvers to fulfill social interaction. Such belief lends to research targeting this area a theoretical impetus for the validation of various linguistic elements adopted as politeness devices.

One such study within the scope of a single language is conducted by Turnbull and Saxton (1997). They designed situations to induce phone interviewees to reject a research assistant’s request to participate in psychological experiments. Their data indicate that English refusers constantly engage themselves in interpersonal work with modal structures. These include markers of ‘epistemic probability/possibility’ (e.g. I don’t think so), ‘root necessity/probability’ (e.g. I have to work), and a combination of both (e.g. I don’t think I can). They are distributed across five types of refusing strategies: ‘negate request’, ‘negate ability’, ‘indicate unwillingness’, ‘performative refusals’, and ‘identify external impeding factors’. The modal logic denotes reluctance or obligation to decline, thereby taking on a critical role in repairing interlocutors’ face.

There are also studies intended to offer a comparison of refusals between different languages. On the assumption that Chinese do facework in a fashion divergent from other cultures, a few scholars have carried out contrastive analysis on Chinese and English refusals. Shih (1986) proposes that off-record strategies are familiar in Chinese refusals because saying ‘no’ is more difficult than not answering at all. Liao and Bresnahan (1996) inspect how American and Taiwanese university students give refusals in reply to six hypothetical scenarios of requests. They recognize social power as a controlling factor in that Taiwanese students supply definite reasons more often than American students when refusing people of higher status.

The above literature assessing the politeness strategies across languages brings out the effect of speakers’ underlying sociocultural values on their linguistic behaviors. This
has stimulated linguists’ interest in exploring how these factors shape language learners’ productions in comparison with corresponding native patterns. It has been acknowledged that cultural discrepancies may pose formidable obstacles for learners in the process of acquiring refusing mechanisms. In Beebe et al. (1990), for instance, cultural influence is substantiated by the observation that Japanese learners of English lack apologies or regretting expressions in answer to requests of lower positions, unlike Americans’ chief concern for social distance. The former group is also reported in Beebe et al. (1990) to prefer excuses that leave specific time and places unspecified, as opposed to Americans’ unequivocal indication of their plans. This contrast, as Beebe et al. (1990) conclude, can be attributed to learners’ transfer of their indigenous sociocultural principles. This also suggests that as a people and culture oriented behavior, refusing may form a complicated task for language learners. A cross-linguistic research is therefore worth pursuing.

3. Research Design

As upheld by Yuan (2001), an inquiry into speech act behaviors via oral Discourse Completion Test (DCT) has its advantage of being lifelike. Beebe and Cummings (1996) also argue that the orally elicited data are more comprehensively elaborated than outputs in written forms, for the sheet does not provide sufficient space for respondents to yield complete reactions. Accordingly, the present study devised genuine requesting situations with due deliberation to draw out realistic Chinese refusals.

We first announced access to part-time assistant positions on four TANet BBS’s (Taiwan Academic Network Bulletin Board Systems) set up by well-known universities located in northern Taiwan. Applicants were required to send in their contact information for later notification of job details. After 132 students signed in, we randomly bisected them into Group A and Group B. The research assistant then emailed Group A describing the job about cleaning classrooms at National Chiao Tung University from seven to ten o’clock every Saturday and Sunday morning for three consecutive months. If the applicant replied to reject this job, we successfully obtained one piece of email data. For those who said yes, we replied to their email inquiring about another job that involved writing Chinese introductions to more than one hundred English websites, which needs to be completed within a given time. Another set of email data was then collected from students refusing to take this second job. Next, in exactly the same manner and order as
what we have done to Group A, we contacted Group B by telephone to enquire whether they would like to take the two jobs. Their conversations with the research assistant were tape recorded. At the end of the talk they were informed of the object of this study, and all agreed to offer their linguistic contributions to the present investigation. Their refusals were transcribed, making up the phone data of this study. The last step was to ask for Group A’s permission to use their productions for analysis. We purposely deferred this step to a later phase after phone data were collected. This avoided a potential risk for Group A to reveal our research to Group B volunteers.

Of the total 132 applicants, 27 accepted both jobs. Their responses were excluded from further inspection. The rest participants refused either one job, 52 by email; 53 by telephone, which constitute the refusal corpus for the discussion to follow.

4. Results

Results indicate that email and phone data differentiate conspicuously from each other in relation to the linguistic formulae and refusing strategies applicants put in use. These will be attested in 4.1 and 4.2.

4.1. Linguistic Formulae

The data feature linguistic formulae that comprise two basic components: refusals and excuses, the latter serves to indicate refusers’ reluctance or obligation to say no. Their linear order varies significantly in email and phone data. Email refusers tend to state the reason for rejection before actually reject, as illustrated by (1) and (2). In this way they prepare the requester for the ensuing rejection; a sense of politeness is thus intended and delivered. However, the sequential structure in phone data is rather flexible. Excuses may precede or follow the rejection, as shown in (3) and (4).

(1) Yinwei shijian bushi hen fangbian, suoyi meiyou banfa qu dagong.
    because time not very convenient so no way go work
    ‘Because the time is not very convenient, I cannot go to work.’

(2) Yinwei pa zuo bulai, suoyi bu yingzheng le.
    because afraid handle unable so not apply Part.
    ‘Because I am afraid that I cannot handle it, I am not going to apply for it.’
In addition, there is a tendency for email refusers to use a large amount of politeness markers, including appreciations and apologies. They may follow or precede the refusal, as (5)-(8), or simultaneously appear before and after the refusal, as (9) and (10). However, such markers show up in only 5% of the phone data, normally the apologetic expression buhaoyisi ‘sorry’ at sentence final positions, as (11) and (12). Markers of appreciation indicate refusers’ gratitude to the requester’s effort and time spent in explaining the job to them. This turns the request into a favor, thereby alleviating damage to the requester’s face. Likewise, by apologizing for the rejection or for the reason that impedes their compliance, refusers act as if they owe the requester for his/her kind offer, which also helps to save the requester’s face. Therefore, markers of appreciation and apology fulfill politeness by reducing the negative force brought about by refusals, serving a vital function in facework.

(5) Xiexie xuejie, wo bu yao le. (appreciation–refusal)
   Thank upperclassman I not want Part.
   ‘Thank you, upperclassman. I don’t want it now.’

(6) Hen baoqian, wo meiyou yiyuan. (apology–refusal)
   very sorry I no willingness
   ‘I’m very sorry. I am not willing to (take this job).’

(7) Kongpa wufa danren, xiexie. (refusal–appreciation)
   afraid cannot serve thank
   ‘I am afraid that I cannot take this job. Thank you.’

(8) Wo ziyuan fangqi zhege gongzuo jihui, baoqian. (refusal–apology)
   I voluntary give up this work chance sorry
   ‘I voluntarily give up this working opportunity. Sorry.’
4.2. Refusing Strategies

The result also demonstrates that the refusing strategies that occur most frequently in both email and phone data belong to the indirect type, where the act of declination is not verbalized. It can be further classified into three subtypes: excuses intended as refusals, reference to alternatives, and language switch.

*Excuses intended as refusals* refer to the type of refusers’ response that comes to the end immediately after impeding factors are identified. This occurs in email data such as (13) and phone data such as (14). To carry out the research assistant’s demanding requests designed in this study, applicants must meet certain criteria. The writing job requires knowledge, skills, or abilities in English reading and word processing; the cleaning job, physical strength and free time on weekends. By indicating poverty of characteristics involved in these criteria, applicants allow the requester to retrieve the premise that there exist prerequisites for compliance. This presupposition of being unfit for the position leads the requester to infer the resulting declination. Since the consequence is deduced rather than spoken out, the face wants of both sides are more likely to be satisfied. In this
way the applicants also hint at a situation that it is not that they are reluctant to grant the request, but that they are not qualified enough for granting it. Such ascription of noncompliance to lack of capacity on the part of refusers themselves helps to justify the rejection and also make it understandable. This is how face-repairing strategy takes effect here.

(13) Baoqian, wo bu hui zuo FrontPage.
    sorry I not can do FrontPage
    ‘Sorry, I don’t know how to use FrontPage.’
(14) En... keshi wo liu ri dou hui hui jia ye!
    well but I Sat. Sun. both will go home Part.
    ‘Well, but I will go home on Saturdays and Sundays.’

Reference to alternatives represents another major subcategory of indirect refusing strategy. Occasionally it is adopted by email and phone refusers, as exemplified respectively by (15) and (16). Here refusers bring up an inclination toward other job opportunities without commenting on the one in the case at hand. This evasion is indicative of rejection, but in a less face-damaging manner. For one thing, being refused is a conclusion derived by the requester, not one uttered by the refuser. For another, by showing volition toward an alternative vacancy, refusers somehow direct the target of rejection from the requester to the specific job under discussion. These account for the resultant face-maintaining effect.

(15) Qingwenyixia chule dasao gongdu hai you qita de ma?
    excuse me besides cleaning job still there other Poss. Part.
    ‘Excuse me. Besides the cleaning job, are there other jobs?’
(16) Wo bijiao xiang de shi nimen po zai bibi shangmian de
    I than like Poss. be you post on BBS on Poss.
    lingwai yige e.
    another one Part.
    ‘What I prefer is another one you posted on BBS.’
Still another indirect strategic use is *language switch*, which is attested in email such as (17) and (18). The correspondence between the applicants and the research assistant began with the application mail and proceeded with the assistant’s notification of job details. Throughout this process the language being used remained the interlocutors’ native language, viz. Chinese. Moreover, as a foreign language, English is not what university students in Taiwan would feel most free to use. This can be seen from the simple sentence patterns in (17) and (18). Consequently, the applicants’ sudden shift to English when making refusals cannot be incidental. Since English is experienced as a language psychologically distant to interactants, shifting to it enables refusers to distance themselves from the requester no matter whether this is done purposely. This accounts for how language shift serves to reduce the face-impairing force following from rejection.

(17) Sorry! I already have a job!
(18) Sorry! I quit…

5. Contextual Factors

After observing the Chinese-favored linguistic formulae and refusing strategies, this section will identify two contextual factors that can account for patterns emerging from our refusing data.

5.1. The Influence of Communication Media

The previous section points out a greater sense of formality in email than in phone data. A possible explanation for such difference is a closer resemblance of email language to the written communication on one hand and a stronger similarity of phone language to the oral interaction on the other. In email exchange, instant responses are not assumed or expected by the requester as in the case of telephone conversation. This allows refusers to have more time to make careful and adequate considerations for how their negative reply should be constructed and manipulated. For this reason, email refusers tend to produce structures more intricate and sophisticated than what commonly appears in phone discourse. This intrinsic distinction between the two types of communication media can be observed from the varied fashions in which they manifest *linguistic formulae, politeness markers* and *indirect refusing strategies*. 
As noted previously in 4.1, the *linguistic formulae* of refusal data in this study contain refusals and excuses as fundamental constituents, the ordering of which creates a primary disparity between email and phone data. While the former has a preference for refusals to be located after excuses, the latter outstrips the email antithesis in the variety of sequencing. The transitory nature of oral speech as to the exchange of messages provides an explication for the distribution of the negative answer followed by supplementary reasoning in phone refusals. It results in an urgent need to perform effective communication, which may prompt speakers to make a straightforward and transparent response to the request before thinking about or even thinking of any legitimate excuses. In contrast, written language lacks such demand for instantaneous give-and-take negotiations. Upon sending back a reply to the requester, email refusers complete the act of answering to the request. From this point of view it does not matter whether refusals precede or follow excuses. In consequence, email refusers tend to follow the chronological logic of *cause-effect* to place excuses before refusals.

Further evidence for the stylistic variation can be found in the occurring frequency of *politeness markers*. As demonstrated by the contrast between (5)-(10) and (11)-(12), expressions of appreciation or apology in email considerably outnumber those in phone conversations. This can also be ascribed to the distinguishing qualities inherent to the two types of communication media. With written words as predominant information carriers, email language retains part of the characteristics pertaining to the traditional forms of writing, such as letters and documents. One shared feature regarding lack of face-to-face contact distances email interactants from each other. The greater interpersonal space they perceive, the more polite they would try to behave, which can be responsible for the high frequency of politeness markers in email refusals. Another property email agrees with traditional writing is the possibility for writers to reflect sufficiently on message development and interpersonal management. Under such circumstance, it is more likely for email refusers to ponder over how politeness can be best attained before they act. The Chinese concept as conveyed by the old saying *liduorenbuguai* ‘civility costs nothing’ thus stands a better chance to play a part here. This also contributes to email refusers’ extensive use of politeness markers.

On the other hand, the oral dimension can explain the relatively limited distribution of politeness markers in phone refusals. During the process of responding to the request,
phone speakers have access to prosodic elements including pauses, volumes, rhythms, tones, and intonations—all acting as linguistic cues that signal multi-faceted pragmatic meanings. In particular, these elements can encode modality that assists in mitigating embarrassment or awkwardness caused by declination, as what politeness markers serve to do. Accordingly, phone refusers do not need to rely solely upon lexical expressions to get their appreciations and apologies across. In addition, in phone data the tendency for politeness markers to fall behind declination corresponds to the placement of excuses. As what we have addressed in the above discussion on linguistic formulae, this sequencing may be a consequence of immediate turn-takings expected in the process of verbal communication. The speaker is led to have the refusal come out first, and then supply politeness markers to attend to facework.

Finally, a larger number of indirect refusing strategies are also found in phone than in email refusals. One possible cause is that, through his/her tone of voice, phone refusers are more likely to feel the requester’s humanity, such as his/her friendly disposition and need to recruit assistants. This recognition may strengthen refusers’ concern about the face want of both sides and further motivate them to turn to indirect refusing strategies. Another reason relates to refusers’ presuppositions. As mentioned earlier, phone interactants are able to convey their opinion or attitude via prosodic components. Therefore, when adopting indirect strategies, they have a better chance to suppose that their intention to decline will be deduced by the requester at a lower risk of communication failure than in the case of email. This offers an explanation for a wider use of indirect strategies in our phone refusals, which in turn serves as another argument in support of the effect of the attribute of communication media on how refusals are manifested.

5.2. The Influence of Requesting Situations

Our data also indicate excuses as situation-dependent in the sense that the type of reasons refusers bring up varies with the nature of requested events devised in this study. These excuses for declination can be grouped into internal impeding factors and external impeding factors with reference to their accessibility by refusers.

First, internal impeding factors encompass such personal traits as ability, intelligence, physical strength, and psychological conditions of the refuser. Hence, by
pointing out the impediment of internal factors, refusers refer their declination to absence of certain necessary characteristics pertaining to themselves. Our data show that excuses of this type all appear in refusals in response to the writing job. More specifically, when dealing with requests which belong to the category of mental work, refusers are inclined to make clear what particular internal feature they are short of. An indication of this is presented in (19)-(22), (19)-(20) and (21)-(22) being email and phone data respectively. In (19) and (21), refusers indicate deficiency of ability in word processing or webpage editing. In (22), obstacles concerning English proficiency are identified. In (20), on the other hand, the refuser recognizes the hindrance of a certain internal factor, but leaves its details unspecified. Excuses of the above examples are rational in the sense that to accomplish the writing job job-takers need to possess a given level of computer and English skills. By alluding to lack of these skills, they can uphold their declination and thereby minimize its face-threatening effect.

(19) Wo dui wangye bu shouxi, kongpa wo wufa shengren zhege job but if have other Poss. job I very willing try out ‘I am not familiar with webpage. I am afraid that I cannot handle this job. But if there are other jobs, I am very willing to try them out.’

(20) Yue bi gongzuo neirong yihou, zi jue nengli huo you read finish work content after self feel ability perhaps have buzui, bu gen zai darao, ganxie nin. insufficient not dare again bother thank you ‘After reading the working requirements, I realized that I might not be well qualified. I dare not bother you anymore. Thank you.’

(21) En… qishi diannao wo bu tai xing ye. FrontPage wo jihu du well actually computer I not too can Part. FrontPage I almost all bu tai liaojie. not too understand ‘Well… actually I am not very good at computers. FrontPage, I almost don’t know well about it.’
On the other hand, external impeding factors refer to reasons for rejection that arise from considerations for factors out of the range of capacities that refusers are equipped with. Reasons of this type occur more often in situations where refusers respond to requests to participate in the cleaning job than in those about the writing job. A principal cause is that cleaning classrooms requires job-takers no particular capabilities as what are expected in the case of writing introductions to English websites. Almost every university student with normal physical conditions as well as available working hours is able to carry out the duty of cleaning. Along such line of reasoning, it appears illegitimate and thus insincere to turn the cleaning job down by ascribing the blame to impeding factors internal to the refusers. However, external impeding factors, especially those beyond the control of refusers, provide a locus for the validity of their declination. As in the case of the internal type, examples of the external impeding factors differ with respect to how much detailed information refusers furnish. This can be seen from the contrast between (23) and (24), both taken from our email data.

(22) Na... keshi zhege wo you keneng meiyou banfa, yinwei wo well but this I have possibility no way because I yingwen bu shi hen hao. English not be very good ‘Well… but this (job) I may not be able to make it, because my English is not very good.’

(23) Xiexie nin gei wo zhege jihui, dan yin zhongzhong yinsu thank you give I this opportunity but because various reason wo jueding fangqi, xiexie. I decide give up thank ‘Thank you for giving me this opportunity, but for various reasons I decided to give up. Thanks.’

(24) Xiexie nin de huixin, yinwei shijian haoxiang hen gan, zai thank you Poss. reply because time seem very hurry at zhe zhigian reng you hen duo qimokao, suoyi keneng bu neng this before still have very many final exam so may not can
shengren, xiexie.
manage thank
‘Thanks for your reply. It seems to be very urgent, and before this (due date) I still have many final exams, so I may not be able to handle it. Thanks.’

In (23), the refuser may consider it unnecessary to reveal to an unacquainted email sender what his/her exact external impeding factor is. In (24), conversely, this concern may have been taken place of by a stronger need the refuser feels to make the impeding factor explicit—explicit to the end that the requester would be better convinced of the refuser’s being actually involved with a certain obligation that inevitably intervenes. This sense of obligation, no matter whether it is covertly insinuated as in (23) or overtly stated as in (24), helps the refuser to move the responsibility for rejection from himself/herself to some other authority that may be specified or simply implied in the context. A connotation that refusers are compelled to decline against their own will is rendered. In consequence, by directing the requester’s attention to the existence of external impeding factors, refusers better defend their failure to comply and also bring their reluctance to refuse to the fore. In this way they are more likely to be able to restore the face want of both communicators.

In brief, our data demonstrate the influences contextual variables may exercise on the manner Chinese speakers display refusals. In particular, we have shown that refusers shift their choices of various linguistic expressions and refusing strategies in conformity with the contextual types classified according to communication mediums and requesting situations. They do so out of pragmatic intentions to deal with conflicting face needs between interactants and to achieve the ultimate purpose of interpersonal harmony. Interpretations of the connection between contextual factors and linguistic conventions therefore uncover the socio-pragmatic and psycholinguistic aspects embedded in the performance of Chinese refusals.

6. Conclusion

Different contexts with different social variables interwoven with each other can induce diversified linguistic manifestations. On this account, the present research has restricted its focus to the speech act of refusals performed in the contexts of email and
telephone communication. Four sets of naturally occurring refusals have been obtained via the two media under two genuine requesting situations, one demanding mental work, and the other labor work. Analyses on the data have lent empirical support to the dynamic interface between forms and functions under the effect of contextual factors devised in this study. It has been indicated that the refusing formulae and strategies all typify at the interpersonal level the goal to maintain or reach politeness. These two aspects have also been proven illuminating in distinguishing the varied degrees of formality attached to email and telephone discourse. Moreover, our discussions have pointed in the direction that the type of excuses for rejection can be traced back to a variation in requesting situations. These all provide striking support for the argument that the appropriateness of speech act behaviors are determined to a great extent by whether or not they fit in with the interacting context.

Consequently, this paper proves contextual factors decisive in accounting for the manipulation of linguistic mechanisms in the performance of Chinese refusals. Their effects further disclose a cultural peculiarity germane to the way Chinese regard as polite to make refusals. Therefore, our findings suggest a culture-sensitive association between linguistic representation and interpersonal management. This serves as groundwork for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural investigations in the future.

Our research also contributes a part to pedagogical applications. The linguistic formulae and refusal maneuvers categorized in preceding sections are of value in the instruction of Chinese speech act of refusals. The data collected also provide samples for the design of textbooks and testing materials. In addition, our conclusion brings out an important fact that learners need to be equipped with competence not only at a linguistic but at a cultural level for successful mastery of their target language. Along the logic of cultural idiosyncrasy, learners will be able to acquire linguistic knowledge within a conceptual world more comprehensive and thus more conducive to language learning. In dealing with face-threatening situations such as refusing in compliance with requests, learners endowed with such logic will possess interpersonal skills guiding them to avoid responses that are socio-pragmatically inappropriate. Therefore, it is hoped that this study will assist in achieving accuracy of the descriptions of linguistic rules that are capable of offering explanatory power and predictive value in language theory as well as language pedagogy.
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