A study of Refusal Strategies in Kurdish language.

Mr. Ahmad Ramadan Khalil
University of Duhok

Abstract

In the last two decades, many studies have been conducted to investigate speech act performance in general, and the speech act of refusal to suggestion in particular. This genus of research has focused on western languages (Beebe et al, 1990), (Chen, 1996), (Feˊlix-Brasdefer, 2006). However, more recently a number of studies have been carried out in eastern languages (Geyang, 2007), with only a few in Arabic language and its varieties (Nelson, 2002), (Al-Issa, 2003), (Al-Kahtani, 2005). This study is an attempt to investigate the strategies employed by Kurdish students in refusing offers and requesting. This study is also trying to answer two questions related as to whether the participations in question follow the same English strategies classified by Beebe and others (1990) or not, as well as the impact of the gender factor on these strategies. The corpus consists of responses to a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that consisted of six different situations. The informants were 24 Kurdish native speakers (12 males and 12 females) studying at University of Duhok, Kurdish department 4th stage. The survey was written in Kurdish language to elicit responses that approximate verbal refusals to suggestion that might be given in these situations. The participants are required to provide written data to express their refusals to these situations. The data gathered have been descriptively analyzed according to the content, frequency and order of semantic formulas used by Beebe et al. (ibid). In order to arrive at statistical results, the percentage of the most frequently used strategies was counted.
Key words: speech act of refusal, offer, request, semantic formula.

Introduction

M

isunderstanding between the speaker and the interlocutor may appear in the process of communication in lnterlanguage. Thomas (1983) argues that misunderstanding arises not only from language limitation (pragmatic failure) but also from inadequate utilization of social conventions and values in the target culture (socio-pragmatic failure). Thus, we can say that being unfamiliar with cultural and social habits and conventions may lead to misunderstanding and failure in communication between the speaker and hearer. Kurdish people share the view of importance of face introduced by Brown and Levinson (1987). This ties in with the idea of "losing face or being embarrassed or humiliated." For example, a Kurdish speaker avoids uttering something which embarrasses the interlocutor in front of other people. In this case, the word "Face" refers to the desire or want of the speaker and interlocutor, who will seek to avoid "face- threatening acts "(FTAs). FTAs are those which threaten face. Refusing acts constitute FTAs. So the only way to avoid face threatening is to give an accounting. This means to give reasonable politeness when refusing an offer, request, suggestion   etc. By refusing implicitly or politely speakers fulfill their desire to maintain social relations and co-operation. Labov and Fanshel (1977 as cited in Campbell, 1990: 364).

Refusal is a negative response to an offer, request, invitation and suggestions. Refusals   are   important   because   of   their communicatively central place in everyday communication. For example, in refusing invitations, offers and suggestions, gratitude was regularly expressed by American English speakers, but rarely by Egyptian Arabic speakers (Nelson, Al-Batal, and Echols, 1996). When Mandarin Chinese speakers wanted to refuse requests, they expressed positive opinion (e.g., „I would like to….") much less frequently than American English since Chinese informants were concerned that if they ever expressed positive opinions, they would be forced to comply (Liao and Bressnahan, 1996).

It is often difficult to reject an offer. Rejecting request appropriately involves not only linguistic knowledge, but also pragmatic knowledge. In two different cultures, it is even too difficult to reject or refuse an offer or request, where one risk offending interlocutor. One may have a wide range of vocabulary and a sound knowledge of grammar, but misunderstanding may still arise if one doesn't apply pragmatic knowledge appropriately.

The speech act of refusal

Yule (1998) states that refusal acts belong to what is called Expressive Speech Acts and they express what the speaker feels. These kind of speech acts express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. When the speaker uses such expressions, he tries to make words fit the world of feeling. According to Tank (2003), a variety of speech acts is employed by speakers in order to achieve the communication goals. These acts include those of Searle (1969) broad seminal categories-commissives, directives, expressive, and representative-as well as more specific acts such as apologies, requests, complaints, and refusals. Searle and Vander ken (1985, p.195) define the speech act of refusal as follows:" The negative counterparts to acceptance and consenting are rejections and refusal. Just as one can accept offers, applications, and invitations, so each of these can be refused or rejected". The word "no" is probably more important than the answer itself. But the question is that how and when to say the word "no" and what skills are needed to utter such word in different situations. The skill of refusing another's offer, request, or invitation without hurting her feeling is very important since the "inability to say 'no' clearly has led many none native speaker to offend their interlocutors". (Ramos, 1991, as cited in Alkahtani, 2005).Ellis (1994) has suggested, "Speakers have to take account of their relationship with the addressee and the degree of imposition on the addressee in order to ensure that harmonious relations between the speakers are not endangered. This is consistent with Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989),who suggested that, directness tended to rise with increase in familiarity ,that is, it

appears more common in refusing familiar interlocutors offers, such as made by friends or classmate. The more familiar the speaker and the interlocutor are the more direct in the refusal utterances.

According to Al-Shalawi (1997), an act of refusal may provide an illuminating source of information on the socio-cultural values of a speech community and as significant insight into the social norms that are embedded in cultures. Thus, the speech act of refusal would be an n excellent focus for the study of strategies of refusing used by Kurdish students. Yamagashira (2001, p.260) describes the speech act of refusal as a "sensitive pragmatic task "simply because interlocutor in performing refusals, use indirect strategies in order not to offend each other. Thus, the interlocutor may use different forms and contents in the situation they are involved in. Beebe et al (1990) states that refusals are "sticking point" for non –native speakers and are complex in nature.

Literature Review

The major study on refusals was carried out by Beebe et al. (1990) who investigated the pragmatic transfer in the realization of the speech act of refusal by Japanese learners of English. Data were collected using DCT which consists of three requests, three invitations, three offers, and three suggestions. Each situation type includes one refusal to a person of higher status, one to a person of equal status, and one to a person of lower status. Next, the data were analyzed based on the frequency and order of the semantic formulas performed in each situation. The content of semantic formulas was also analyzed. Findings from the study revealed that there was evidence of pragmatic transfer from L1 particularly in the case of the order, frequency and content of the semantic formulas obtained.

Nelson et al. (2002) investigated American and Egyptian perceptions of how they believe they would make refusals in particular situations in terms of strategy, level of directness and the effect on the two variables of social status and gender. Data were collected using a modified version of DCT developed by Beebe et al.

(1990). An interviewer read each situation aloud to the subjects and asked them to respond verbally on audiotape instead of asking the subjects to read the situation and to respond in writing. Thirty American, interviews resulted in 358 refusals and 25 Egyptian interviews resulted in 300 refusals. Generally, the results revealed that the most common strategies used by the Egyptian participants were similar to those used by the American participants. Reasons were the most common strategy used followed by negative willingness.

In the Jordanian context, a study was conducted by Al Issa (2003), in which he examined the realization patterns of refusal strategies by Jordanians and Americans. The main concern of this study was to investigate if there was evidence of pragmatic transfer from Arabic to English and the reasons causing this transfer. Data were collected using a written DCT followed by semi-structured interviews with the Jordanian EFL learners. These interviews were conducted in order to find out the motivating factors for pragmatic transfer from L1. The results showed evidence of pragmatic transfer in terms of frequency, type, number, and content of the semantic formulas used. Moreover, compared to the American use of refusals, the Jordanian participants tend to refuse in lengthy, elaborate ways and use less direct strategies, especially when the interlocutor was of a higher social status. However, Al-Issa's study only collected written data which did not resemble real-life communication. In addition, Al-Issa's study aims to locate evidence of pragmatic transfer from Arabic to English among native-nonnative speakers while the present study aims to investigate the similarities and the differences of intercultural communication of the speech act of refusals in English among non-native speakers of English (i.e. Jordanian and Malay participants in Malaysia), but for whom English is used as a lingua franca in their daily interaction.

Refusal in Kurdish Culture:

In Kurdish culture, because of the sensitivity in relation to maintaining dignity, a person would practically never answer a

request with a blunt and frank "no". A flat-out refusal would cause the person making the request to lose face. This seems to be the case even the request seems impossibly big .and there no way it could be granted. An appropriate answer is always one that takes the embracement off both the one requesting and the one requested , and puts the blame on an outside cause , such as "there is not time" or "I am busy " ,and may hands are not empty. The indirect way in refusing avoids potentially embarrassing conflicts, and is clearly understood as "no", nonetheless. For example, if a person wants to come to a meeting where he is not welcome, another person might tactfully have a third party invite the unwanted person somewhere else, instead of just stating a blunt "no". It is considered shameful to say "no". However, if the request is refused, it can be done in a way which avoids the implication of personal offensive. This can be seen in the way an invitation or offer is refused. For example, if one is especially invited to a wedding, and can't come to the celebration, he will make appropriate excuses and acknowledge the intention of the one inviting, and thus avoid the implication of a personal offensive. In the same way, if one is spontaneously invited over for tea, for example, if he is in neighborhood and happens to meet a friend, he might refuse by acknowledging the courteous intention of the one inviting or offering, while not accepting that actual offer.

In Dohuk society, this may be implied by the phrase, من قەبیل کە "I accept ", which means "I accept your good invitation ", but I can't come بەلێ نەز نەشێم. Of course, there are many instances when a person is expected to refuse an offer. For an outsider, it may be particularly difficult to discern when one should refuse something that isn't offered, It can be helpful to differentiate between the givers sincere intention .and a normal polite show of generosity. For example, a visitor would never refuse food that was especially prepared on his behalf; to refuse it would be considered " شەرمە "shameful.

A light-hearted way to accept someone's refusal , for example , when a guest won't accept any more food , is to say **خێر و گوناهێت ته د** **ستویێ ته دانه**"your good and bad deeds are on your own shoulders " . I other words, that person must take the final responsibility for refusing.

As in all cultures, Kurds can express certain real wishes with seemingly disparate verbal expression that can be misinterpreted if understood literally. For example, if one hasn't visited another person for some time, and then meets that person in any place, that person may say something like "I'm angry with you! " Why haven't you visited? This kind of verbal displacement   seems to be a polite convention to express a desire for continued friendship rather than personally directed anger. It is always important to differentiate between idiomatic and literal meaning of expression. In Kurdish culture, the value of preserving dignity and saving face is an extremely important one. Not understanding this value can lead to a cultural clash that typically comes when foreigners who, value directness and frankness, misinterpret the ways that Kurds preserve dignity as being dishonest. Bellow the classification of refusal strategies in Kurdish.

Refusal Classifications in Kurdish

I. Direct:

Performative (e.g.," **ئه ز قهبیل ناكهم** .")

Non-performative statement e.g.:

NO   " **نه** .

 Negative willingness ability (e.g. **نه ئه ز نهشیم** .)

II. Indirect

Statement of regret (e.g., " **ببوره** ")

Wish (e.g. **ئه ز حه ز دكهم**)

Excuse/reason/explanation   (e.g., " **من كهلهك شول ههیه** ")

Statement of alternative:

23

I can do X instead of Y   ئەس دشێم ڤی تشتی بكم شینا
ڤی

Why don't you do X instead of Y   بوچی ئەم ڤی تشتی ناكن شینا
یێ دی

Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g. ”ئەڤ ئەز دێ
”بەرێ خو دەسە نیمێلا خو)

Promise of future acceptance
(e.g., “ئەز دێ پاشی چێكەم”)

Statement of principle
(e.g., “ئەز ڤی تشتی باوەر ناكەم.”)

Statement of philosophy
(e.g. ئەگەر ئەز هاریكاریا تە بكەم دڤێن هاریكاریا هەمیا بكەم)

Attempt to dissuade interlocutor
Threat/statement of negative consequences to the requester
(e.g. ئەگەر تو من نەبینی تو دێ پەشیمان بی.)

.Criticize the request/requester, etc.
(e.g.”ئەرێ تو ناچی”)

Let interlocutor off the hook
(e.g., باشم ژ خەما نەخو)

Avoidance:
Repetition of part of request, etc.
(e.g. پارا بدە مە؟)

Postponement (e.g., “دڤێت ئەز هزرەكێ بكەم.**)**

III. Adjuncts to Refusals

    Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (باوەركە من
دڤێت......)
Statement of empathy
(e.g.” سوپاس باشە ....)
Gratitude/appreciation

. سوپاس گەلەک مەمنون".e.g)
"

Objective of the study

As mentioned above this study is limited to investigate Kurdish refusal strategies used by Kurdish students in Kurdish department, 4th stage. The main objective is addressed in the following questions:

What are the strategies used by Kurdish students in refusing offer and request?

Are there any differences in the strategies used by female and male students?

Methodology of the study :

The Discourse Completion Task (DCT) procedure was used to obtain the refusal data. It took the form of a written questionnaire consisting of incomplete responses. The original DCT was written in English language (appendix 2) and it was translated into Kurdish language (appendix 3) in order to complete the study .The subjects of this study were 20 students (10 male students and 10 female students). The range of ages of the subjects was 20-24.The DCT consisted of six different situations –three of which elicited refusal to offering and the other three to request. The situations were selected from everyday life that might happen in any time. The relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor was equal.

Data Analysis

The refusal strategies gathered in this study were analyzed in line with the semantic formula used by Beebe et al (1990), Chen (19996) and others. Following Beebe et al classification (1990:72-73), the data were analyzed according to the content, frequency and order of the semantic formula (see appendix 1). The content could be one of the strategies listed below. In order to account for

25

the frequency of formulas, the number of each strategy was calculated. Statistically, the percentage of every strategy was counted. In addition, the formulas have been classified as direct and indirect. Beebe et al.'s classification, also, includes adjuncts which are expressions that accompany refusals, but cannot be used by themselves to stand as refusals. The original classification of refusals is listed as follows (Beebe et al., 1990).

Analysis and discussion
The preferred strategies in refusing offering by males.

To begin with, the first situation in the DCT requires the respondent's refusal of an offer made by his/her friend, as previously mentioned. The second situation is requires the respondent to refuse an offer made by his friend to go to cinema. The third situation requires the respondent to refuse an offer to help his friend in carrying some bags. Respondents were asked to refuse these three offers. The results were 72 refusal strategies of three situations of offers. For refusal strategies used by males, 14 different strategies were used in refusing the offers. The strategies were mixture of direct, indirect and adjuncts. It has been found that adjunct of gratitude or appreciation (سوپاس کەلەک مەمنون)) which is equivalent to the semantic formula (Gratitude +reason/explanation) was used 9 times (%25). That means it is the most preferred semantic formula by male in their refusals. The use of adjunct (من نوکە یا قەخارى) and providing reason (سوپاس کەلەک مەمنون)) may be seen as evidence of a tendency among Kurdish students to mitigate their refusal utterances.

However, the second semantic formula (Gratitude+ Attempt to dissuade interlocutor, سوپاس نەز دشیم هەلکرم) was used for 5 times (%13.888888). The third semantic formula used for 4 times (%11.11) was (Non-performative +Gratitude + attempt to dissuade interlocutor نه نەز نەشیم، سوپاس، نەز دشیم هەلکرم Two semantic formulas were used for two times and they were (Non-performative + reason/explanation + Gratitudeهەنەز نەشیم، من شول هەیه سوپاس and (Wish

+ reason /explanation ‫بخودێ نـەز یـێ بلـەزم‬ ‫نـەز هەزدكـەم بـەلێ‬ (8.3%). **The other strategies were used for one time (%2.7). A close look to the semantic formula used by male reveals that Kurdish students are very polite and careful in refusing the offers in order to avoid any misunderstanding. We can conclude that the most preferred strategies used by males students was (Adjuncts + indirect). The frequency and orders of semantic formulas are shown in table 3**

Table (3): Frequency and Order of Semantic Formula of Males Refusal of Offers .

Order of formula				Percentage %
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	
Gratitude	Reason/Explanation			25
Gratitude	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor			13.88
Non-Performative	Gratitude	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor		11.11
Non-Performative	Gratitude			8.33
Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation	Reason/Explanation		8.33
Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation	Gratitude		5.55
Wish	Reason/Explanation			5.55
Reason/Explanation	Non-Performative			2.77
Pause-filler	Reason/Explanation	Gratitude		2.77
Non-Performative	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor			2.77
Non-Performative	Gratitude	Non-Performative	Reason/ Explanation	2.77
Regret	Reason/Explanation			2.77
Statement of Positive opinion	Reason/Explanation			2.77
Gratitude				2.77
Statement of Positive opinion	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor			2.77

The preferred strategies in refusing offers by females.

It is clear that female students have used 14 different strategies in refusing the three offers mentioned above. Unlike male

27

students, the most preferred semantic formula was (Non-Performative + gratitude + attempt to dissuade interlocutor نـەخێر سوپاس بـۆ تـه، نـەز دشـێم راکـەم)and used for 7 times (19.4٪). The second semantic formula (Non-Performative+ gratitude + reason /explanation, نـەخێر سوپاس نـەز دشـێم راکـەم) and (Gratitude + attempt to dissuade interlocutorسوپاس نـەز دشـێم راکـەم نـه دکـرائن) were used for 5 times (13.88%). Semantic formula (Non-Performative + Reason/ Explanationنـەخێر، من نوکـه یا قـەخاری) was used for 4 times (11.11%). Five different strategies were used for 2 times (5.55%) and used for one time (2.77%). It is oblivious that female students tended to be more polite in their refusals by using word (نـەخێر) which is more polite than word (No) in English followed by gratitude and attempting to dissuade the interlocutors while they refusing the offers. However, we can conclude that female students preferred (direct + Adjuncts + Indirect) strategies in their refusal. What have been said is shown in table (4).

Table (4): Frequency and Order of Semantic Formula of Females Refusal of Offers

Order of formula			Percent %
1	**2**	**3**	
Non-Performative	Gratitude	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	19.444
Non-Performative	Gratitude	Reason/explanation	13.888
Gratitude	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor		13.888
Non-Performative	Reason/explanation		11.11
Non-Performative	Regret	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	5.55
Gratitude	Reason/Explanation		5.55
Regret	Reason/Explanation	Non-Performative	5.55
Excuse	Non-Performative		5.55
Wish	Non-Performative	Reason/explanation	5.55
Gratitude	Non-Performative		2.77
Non-Performative	Gratitude		2.77
Regret	Non-Performative		2.77

Wish	Non-Performative	Reason /explanation	2.77
Regret	Non-Performative	Reason /explanation	2.77
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	Regret		2.77

The preferred strategies in refusing requests by males.

Table 3 reports the content, order, and percentage of frequency distributions of refusing requests by male students. The data revealed that semantic formula (regret+ reason/explanation, بیـوره مـن شـول هەیـه)was used for 15 times (19.4 %).This led us to conclude that this formula is the most preferred formula. The second semantic formula in order was (Attempt to dissuade interlocutor+ Reason/explanation خودێ برا من بیێن هەین بەلێ نەز دێ دەیکا خو بەمـە دەختـورى)and used for 5 times (13.88888%). Two semantic formulas were used for 3 times (8.3333%).The other semantic formulas were used for 2 times (5.55%) and used for one time (2.777%). However, we can conclude that female students preferred (indirect) strategy in their refusal. What have been said is shown in table (5).

Appendix (5): Frequency and Order of Semantic Formula of males Refusal of requests

Order of formula			Percent %
1	2	3	
Regret	Reason/explanation		41.66
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	Reason/explanation -		13.88
Regret	Non Performative	Reason/explanation	8.33
Regret	Reason/explanation	Non-Performative	8.33
Reason/explanation	Regret		5.55
Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation		5.55
Non-Performative	Attempt to dissuade	Reason/explanation	2.77

	interlocutor		
Regret	**Statement of alternative**		**2.77**
Reason/explanation	**Attempt to dissuade interlocutor**		**2.77**
Non-Performative			**2.77**
Wish	**Reason /explanation**		**2.77**
Wish	**Regret**	**Reason /explanation**	**2.77**

The preferred strategies in refusing requests by females.

The data revealed that female students were used 18 different semantic formulas. There were three favored semantic formulas and used for 6 times (16.666%). These formulas were (Regret+ Reason/explanation بيوه نـﻪز پيـﺪﻓﻰ وان پاراﻣـﻪ)Statement of positive opinion +Reason/explanation (باوﻩﺮکـﻪ جـﻪ نينـﻪ سـياﺮﻩ يـﺎ تـژى يـﻪ،), and (Attempt to dissuade interlocutor+ Reason/Explanationنـﻪز بـﺎوﻩﺮ ناکـﻪﻡ جﻪـﻴﻦ تـﻪ بکـﻪتﻪت). Three semantic formulas were used for two times (5.555%). The other semantic formulas were used for one time (2.777). Table (6) explains what have been said.

Table (6): Frequency and Order of Semantic Formula of females Refusal of requests.

Order of formula			Percent %
1	**2**	**3**	
Regret	Reason/explanation		116.66
Statement of positive opinion	Reason/explanation		116.66
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	Reason/Explanation		116.66
Reason/explanation	Regret		5.55
Regret	Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation	5.55
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	Reason/Explanation	Regret	5.55
Mitigated negative willingness	Regret		2.77
Wish	Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation	2.77
Exclamation	Non-Performative	Reason/Explanation	2.77
Regret	Non-Performative		2.77
Non-Performative	Regret	Reason /explanation	2.77
Non-Performative	Reason /explanation		2.77
Regret	Reason /explanation	Statement of positive felling	2.77
Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	Regret		2.77
Regret	Attempt to dissuade interlocutor		2.77
Regret	Statement of positive felling	Reason /explanation	2.77
Pause filler	Wish	Reason/explanation	2.77
Statement of positive felling	Reason/explanation		2.77

Conclusion

The study has revealed that male students have used (adjuncts +indirect) refusal strategies in refusing offers. The RS selections provided evidence of an approach to minimize the threat to the interlocutor face. The use of semantic formula (gratitude) followed by (excuse /explanation) by male participants, is indicates to their carefulness in expressing refusals.

Female respondents to offers, on the other side, have produced different strategies with different frequencies and orders. The most preferred strategy used was (Direct +adjuncts) in their refusing of offers. However, the most preferred semantic formula was (non-performative+ Gratitude+ attempt to dissuade the interlocutor,

It is worth mentioning that female .(نـﻪخي‍ر، سـوپـاس بـو تـﻪ نـﻪز دشـیـﻢ دشـیـﻢ راكـﻪم) **have used the word** نـﻪخيـر **which is more polite than (no). The variety of strategies used by female and male students, it seems, provide an opportunity for minimization of face risks, which in turn, can be used to preserve social harmony among friends and to increase solidarity between the speaker and interlocutor. Regarding the effect of gender on using refusal strategies, it is concluded that male and female have the same number of strategies, but the later have more order than the first one.**

   In refusing requests, male students have used 12 different strategies with different semantic formulas and different orders. It is clear that the most preferred strategy is (indirect).However, the semantic formula (regret+ Reason/ explanation), is the most preferred one by male students and it has been used to keep away from offending the interlocutors as well as to rationalize their act of refusing.

Female students, on the other hand, have used 18 different strategies with different content. There were three preferred semantic formulas, the first one is the same one used by male students (indirect). The second one was (indirect + Adjuncts) and the third one was (indirect+ indirect).

Results of this study seem to reinforce the notion stated by Brown and Levinson (1987) that people cooperate in maintaining face in interactions. Refusals are intrinsically face-threatening, and in natural conversation often involve a long negotiated sequence .Thus, male and female Kurdish students, have employed different strategies with different semantic formulas in refusing offers and requests.

References

   Al_ Kahtani,S.W.(2005) .Refusals realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. Journal of King Saud University, 18, 35-57.

   Al-Issa, A (1998) .Socio-pragmatic Transfer in the Performance of Refusals by Jordanian EFL learners: Evidence and Motivating

Factors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Indian university of Pennsylvania, Indian, PA.

Al –Shawali,H. (1997). Refusal strategies in Saudi and American cultures. Unpublished master thesis, Michigan University, USA.

Beebe, L.M &Takahashi, T. & Uliss, -Welts, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals In R.C Sarcellea, E.S Anderson, and S,D.Krashan (Eds) ,Developing communicative competence in a second language (pp55-90) .New York . Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. House, J. and Kasper, G (Eds.) 1989.Cross Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies .Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Brown. & Levinson S.1987 .Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage .New York: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, KS.1990.Explanations in Negative Messages. More insight from speech act theory .Journal of Business communication.27 (4):357-375.

Elliss, Rod. (Ed) (1987). Second language Acquisition in context. London: Prentice Hall international.

Liao ,C .,& Bresnahan , M.I(1996) .A contrastive Pragmatic Study on American English as Mandarin Refusal Strategies .Language Sciences , 17(3),703-727.

Nelson, G., Al Batal, M. & Bakary E.L (2002). Directness vs. Indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style. International journal of intercultural Relations, 26, 39-57. Available at:

www. udel.educ/eli/2007p4t/pdo_ direct-indirect.pdf.

Tanck,S.(2003). Speech Acts Sets of Refusals and complaint: A comparison of native and non native English speakers' production. TESL Second Language Acquisition, 1-22.

Thomas, J.1983.Cross- cultural pragmatic failure .Applied linguistic (4):91-12.

Yamagashira, Hisako. (2001) .Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese ESL Refusals. Available at: http://www.kjunshin.ac.jp/juntan/libhome/bulletin/No   31/

Yamagashira.pdf. **Yule, George (1998). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press. 53-54.**

Refusal classifications

I. Direct:

 Performative (e.g.,"I refuse.")

 Non-performative statement e.g.:

 "No.

 Negative willingness ability (e.g. I can't. "I won't be able to give them to you.")

II. Indirect

 Statement of regret (e.g., "I'm so sorry.")

 Wish (e.g. I wish I can do it for you)

 Excuse/reason/explanation (e.g., "I have other plans." I'm going to be studying until late tonight.")

 Statement of alternative:

 I can do X instead of Y

 Why don't you do X instead of Y

E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g."Oh if I'd checked my e-mail earlier, I wouldn't have made other plans")

F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., "I will do it next time";" let's make it another day")

G. Statement of principle (e.g., "I don't believe in fad dieting.")

H. Statement of philosophy (e.g. Help one, help all)

I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

 Threat/statement of negative consequences to the requester (e.g. If you don't see me then, you will miss out.)

 .Criticize the request/requester, etc. (e.g."Who do you think you are?")

 Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., that's okay; don't worry about it.')

J. Avoidance:

 Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g. Borrow money?)

34

Postponement (e.g., "I need to think about it.")

III. Adjuncts to Refusals

Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (I'd love to)

Statement of empathy (e.g."While I appreciate….)

Gratitude/appreciation (e.g."Thanks.")

Appendix 2

Discourse Completion Task

This task is designed to investigate how students   of Kurdish language department refuse offers and requests in given situations. Imagine that you are speaking with your friend in actual conversation. `The friend' here means a person whom you know well and who has the same gender.

I. Please circle or answer:

Age:

Gender: a: male   b. Female

II. You are going to be given 6 different situations. Please refuse your friend's offer or request after the word `you'.

1. You visit your friend's home. It is unannounced visit. He/she invites you in and offers you something to drink. You have just had a drink at the refectory.
Your friend: Would you like to have a drink?
You:Your friend: OK.

2. Your friend has a free ticket to the movies but he/she is unable to at-tend. He/she offers to give the ticket to you. At the moment you do not have time because you have a lot of assignments to do.
Your friend: I have a free ticket to the movies. Would you like to go?

You:Your friend: well, I will give it to someone else then.

3. You are shopping at the supermarket and your friend notices you are struggling with several bags of shopping. Your friend offers to assist you to carry the bags. You can handle them.
Your friend: Let me help you to carry the bags.
You:Your friend: OK.

4. Your friend who is staying at the university accommodation has to pay the rent within a week but he/she does not have enough money. He/she wants to borrow $50 from you. You need the money for your own expenses.
Your friend: I am broke and have to pay the rent in a week. Can you lend me $50?
You:Your friend: Well, all right.

5. You drive a car. You come to your class farewell party at the university. One of your friends asks you to drive him/her home. Your car is full of other friends and there is insufficient space.
Your friend: Can you give me a ride home?
You:Your friend: OK. I will ask someone else.

6. Your friend has to return three books to the library which is due at 6 PM. today otherwise he/she will be fined. He cannot make it because he/she has to see his/her supervisor. He/she asks you to return them for him/her. You have to take your mother to see a doctor.
Your friend: I have got three books to return to the library, I cannot do so because I have an appointment with my supervisor. Can you please return them for me?
You: Your friend: Well!!

Thank you for your participation

Appendix 3
 DCT in Kurdish language.

36

- نه ف رابرسینه هاتیه چیکرن بو دیارکرنا وان کهسین ب زمانی کوردی ناخفن ودنه رازینه داخوازکرنی و بیشکیشکرنی دهندک داله تاندا بکه ن، وی هنری بکه کو تویس دیالوکه کا راسته قینه دا دکه هه ڤالی خو و نوهه ڤال که سه کهتوباش دنیاسی کچ بیت یلن کو بیت .

ته هیڤیدارم به رسڤا ڤان بسیاران بدی   ره که ز:

مهن:

- دی شهش داله تین جوره و جو بوته هینه دان، هیپیڤیه داخوازی وبیشکیشرنین ههڤالی خوهت بکه یشتی به یڤا.(تو)

تو ی سهمهدانا هـهـڤالا خو دکهی وهـهـڤال وی چهندی دزانیت ، هـهـڤالی ته دی رابیت ته داخوازکهت کو تو تشتهکی لهڤ ڤهمنوی بهلی بهری تو بچی ته تشتهک یی ڤهنواری.
هـهـڤالی ته :تو حهزدکهی تشتهکی ڤهمنوی؟

تو :
هـهـڤالی ته : باشه بلا

هـهـڤالی ته دوو تکهکهتهکهن سینهمایی یهین هـهین بهلی تو نهشیی دگهل بچی ، نهوهـهـڤالی ته دی هـهردوو تکهکها دهته ته بهلی نوکه تو گهلهک یی مژیلی ، ته گهلهک نهرکهن هـهین پیهڤییه تو ب دوماهیک بینی.
هـهـڤالی ته من دوو تکهکهتهکهن سینهمایی یهگهن هـهین تو حهزدکهی بچیییه سینهمایی

تو :
هـهـڤالی ته :   دی دهمه کهمهکی دیتر.

تو یی لبازاری هندهک کهل و پهلا ه کری و هـهـڤالی ته تو دیتی کو تو یی گهلهک تشتا رادکهی هـهـڤالی تهه داخوازا هـاریکاریی پیشکهکیشی ته دکهت بو همهلگرتنا هندهک تشتان . تو دشیی هـهمی تشتا راکهی.

37

هەڤالێ تە : بەكاڵە نەز هندەك تشتا ھاریتە راکەم.

تو:

هەڤالێ تە

هــەڤـالـێ تــە نــەمێ ناکـنیـی ل پشکـکێن نـاڤـجـوەیـی ێـی قوتابیـان پیکـەڤبیـە ـە دەمـێ دوو حەفتیـاندا کـریا ئو بـەت بـەلێ پـارێن وی تـەکّـرا نـاکـهن و حـەزدکـەت تـو پیکـنیـی دەلارا بـەحـهیـێ وتـو ژی پیکـەفـی وی پـارەک نەرێ تو دێ بارا دەهیـێ؟

- هەڤالێ تە نەز ێـی بـێ پـارهمە و مـن پیکـەفی ب پیکـنیـی دەلاران یا هـەک تاکـو کـریا ئو بـدەم ئو دشـێی تو دشـێی پیکـنیـی   دەلاران ب قـمر بـدەیـە من ؟

تو:

هەڤالێ تە: کـکـشە نینە بلا

تو ێـی تروسبـکـالا ئو ـە هـاڕوی ب مـەرمەسا پشکـدارىکرنێ ـە ئاەنگـەکـا خاتر خواستنکـەدا یا هـەڤالـەکـێ تە ێـی پـولێ ، هـەڤالـەکـێ تە دائـواز ژ تـەکـر تو وی بـگـەهینیـە مال و تروسبـکـالا تە یا تـژیـە ژ هـەڤالان و چ بـەکـن ڤالا نینن.

- هەڤالێ تە تو دشـێی من بـگـەهینیـە مال؟

تو:

هەڤالێ تە : باشە نەز دێ دائـوازێ ژیـەکـەکێ دی کـەم.

پیکـەڤبیـە هـەڤالـێ تـە سێ پـەرتـوکـا بـەرێ دەمـژمێر شـەشکێ ئـنیـڤاری بزفـرینتـە پـەرتـوکـخانێ نـەگـەر دێ سزاێـی گـیروبـونێ دەت وهـەڤالـێ تە نە شکـت وان پـەرتـوکـان بزفـرینیت چونکـی وی ژ ڤـان ێـی دگـەل سـەرپـەرشتی هـەک ، هـەڤالـی چ تە دێ دائـوازێ ژ تە کـەت تـو ژ پیکـشوەرفـە پـەرتـوکـان بزفـرینی و تو نـەشـێی چونکـی دێ دەهـیکـا ئو بـهیـە سـەهـەدانا نوژداری.

-هەڤالێ تە : من سێ پـەرتـوک ێـکێن هـەین پیکـتفـییـە نـەز بو پـەرتـوکـخانێ بزفـرینم بـەلێ نەز نـەشکـەم ژبـەر کـو من ژ ڤـان ێـی دگـەل سـەرپـەرشتی هـەک تو دشـێی وان پـەرتـوکـان شوینا من بـەی؟

38

تو :

ههڤالێ ته : باشه بلا

الملخص

فى العقدين الماضيين اجريت العديد من الدراسات حول استراتيجيات الرفض. ان اول الدراسات المتعلقه باستراتيجيا ت الرفض فى اللغه الانكليزيه قد اجريت من قبل Beebe et al 1990. وقام اخرون امثال(Nelson2 oo2 وAlissa_Al2003 وAl_Khatanni,2005)بدراسه هذه الإستراتيجيات فى اللغه العربيه ولكن على نطاق ضيق. ان هذه الدراسه هى محاوله لدراسه استرايجيات الرفض المستخدمه من قبل الكلبه الكرد فى رفض العرض والطلب. كذلك تهدف الدراسه الى معرفه فيما اذا المشاركين يتبعون نفس الإستراتيجيات التى اقترحها Beebe et al 1990 او يتبعون اجراوات مختلفه و هل هناك تأثير للجنس على هذه الإسترايجيات . تكونت عينه البحث من استجابات الطلبه لإختبار تكمله الخطاب DCT الذى تكون من ست حالات مختلفه ثلاث حالات عرض وثلاث حالات طلب وكان عددالمشاركين فى البحث 24 طالبا (12 ذكر و 12 انثى) فى قسم اللغه الكرديه المرحله الرابعه فى سكول التربيه الإساسيه ،جامعه دهوك .وقدمت كتابه الحالات السته باللغه الكرديه ليكون الطلبه محركين للحالات بشكل يتناسب مع كونهم يتحدثون نفس اللغه الإم الا وهى اللغه الكرديه وطلب منهم رفض الحالات السته كتابه باللغه الكرديه.واخيرا تم معالجه المعطيات بطريقه التحليل الوصفى طبقا للمحتوى والتردد و ترتيب الصيغ الدلاليه المستخدمه من قبل Beebe et al 1990 ولغرض الوصول ال النتائج الإحصائيه تم حساب النسب المئويه للإستراتيجيات.