

The Refusal Speech Act Techniques Employed by Native Sorani Kurds and American English Speakers

Broosk Ali Jalil

Language and Translation Center, Salahaddin University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Email: Broosk.jalil@su.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 2/6/2024

Accepted: 19/9/2024

Published: Spring 2025

Keywords:

speech act, refusal strategy, intercultural communication, pragmatics, request, invitation, offer, suggestion.

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.10.1.52

ABSTRACT

The following is a comparative study between Kurdish Sorani Dialect and American English in terms of the strategies both speakers rely on to give refusals during different daily life situations. This study uses discourse completion task (DCT) method to collect the data. The different circumstances are consisted of four which include invitations, requests, offers and suggestions initiated by lower, higher and equal status persons to receive refusals by the participants. The participants are from different educational backgrounds being B.A., M.A. Degrees holders, schoolteachers, accountants and administrators in different parts of Sorani speaking areas of Iraqi Kurdistan. The strategies used in giving refusals by the participants will be compared to those used by the American native speakers of English given in Abed (2011) which is based on the direct and indirect refusal strategies benchmarked by Beebe et al. (1990:55-73) to find out whether Kurdish speakers of Sorani dialect use different ways to give refusals in such situations during communication. The differences are quite remarkable especially when it comes to the sensitivity towards the interlocutor. It was found that the Sorani Kurds swear to God and they are more sensitive towards both lower and higher status speakers and more sensitive in general than the native speakers of American English

1. Introduction

Speaking a second language using proper grammar and lexis by non-native speakers, some scholars argue, does not necessarily indicate their fluency. Rather, it could be a telling indicator that they exhibit the aptitude to acclimate their speech based on their linguistic surroundings. The aforesaid assertion is closely linked to the concept of communicative competence, in which the capacity to engage and communicate effectively in different social settings is attributable to the intimate relationships developed between language users and their cultural surroundings (Nelson et al., 2002). Thomas (1995: 44) comments on Austin's conviction as regards language asserting that "people do not use language just to make statements about the world; they also use language to perform actions, actions which affect or change the world in some way". This performance of actions through language was later termed as speech acts (see Morkus 2009 for further detail). Put simply, interlocutors recurrently perform a range of communicative acts to meet the needs required in their day-to-day social exchange, including requesting, refusing, giving permissions, apologising, demanding, and so forth (Casper and Rose, 2001).

Studies on the speech act in interlanguage pragmatics have been conducted frequently, they claim that in order to correctly use a speech act in different situations, a language user ought to possess pragmatic aptitudes, which refer to the capacity to understand the meaning of the language being used (Abed, 2011:166). There are several reasons to examine and investigate speech acts. We need to do a lot of experiential investigations to fully grasp how people communicate by employing linguistic behavior. Experiential studies of speech acts also help us understand how people communicate differently and similarly in different cultures and contexts, according to Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985). Similarly, studying speech acts enables academics to recognize particular social norms and guidelines for engagement and communication (Morkus, 2009).

The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the refusal speech acts used by American English speakers and Sorani dialect speakers of Kurdish.

2. Previous studies

There have been many research efforts focusing on speech acts in recent decades. Some of that research centered on how speech acts were used in various languages and cultural contexts. Refusal speech acts are among the most debated and favored in the pragmatics field since they are used differently depending on the community (Abed, 2011). In terms of how they used certain speech acts, native English speakers and native Japanese speakers were contrasted by Beebe et al. in 1990. The study discovered disparities in command, frequency, and substance of the semantic formulations of rejection between Japanese and Americans. Different rejection tactics were utilized by the Americans and the Japanese. The Japanese were more interested in the speakers' group rank than the Americans, who also took into account the elements of social distance and familiarity of the interlocutors. In a study done in 2002, Nelson et al. looked at the directness with which Egyptian Arabic speakers and American English speakers rejected speech acts. While the Americans utilized longer rejection periods than the Egyptians, they discovered that both countries mostly employed the same techniques, such as providing justifications and suggesting alternatives. Moreover, regular dependance on direct and indirect techniques of refusals by both Egyptians and Americans could be detected.

Kwon (2004), whose research included both native Korean and American speakers, presented another analysis of refusals. Kwon compared the semantic language of Americans and Koreans and discovered that while Americans are more forthright, Koreans are more sensitive when they decline and use longer sentences. In contrast to Americans, Koreans also used more risk-reduction techniques and were more sensitive to the status of the other person (lower, equal, or higher).

Phuong (2006) also looked at the rejections made by Australian natives and Vietnamese English learners. The cautiousness with which the Vietnamese declined a request was the distinction Phuong observed. Given that they used "No" so frequently, Americans were more blunt (Abed, 2011, p. 168).

Beebe et al. (1990) contrasted rejection between native English speakers and native Japanese speakers. The discourse completion test (DCT) methodology was applied in this investigation. Finally, they developed the classification scheme for spoken acts of refusal made directly and indirectly (see appendix 2).

Moreover, there has been a number of studies conducted to investigate the refusal strategies used in Arabic language (Al-Issa, 1998; Al-Kahtani 2005; Alrefaee and Al-Ghamdi 2019) which most of them were tested in comparison with refusal strategies in English language, while some others examined the refusal strategies in Persian language (Eslami-Rasekh 1993; Hashemian 2012).

Regarding Kurdish language, based on my best knowledge, little has been done. However, Aliakbari and Changizi (2012), out of 278 test subjects, had 142 Kurdish speakers whom ages were between 18 and 28, while the rest of the test takers were Persians. They found out that both groups employed distinct refusal strategies in all the given scenarios, yet the Persians used a larger variety of strategies when they refused. On the other hand, the Kurdish speakers used more of *wish, regret, postponement and excuse and reason* more in direct refusals. In addition to that, Aliakbari and Changizi (2012) noted that the Kurdish Speakers used more '*swearing*' than the Persian speakers as part of refusing strategies.

In response to that, the following study aims at finding out the strategies used by the Kurds when they refuse offers, requests, invitations and suggestions made by people that have different social status either higher, lower or equal. Furthermore, the sensitivity of the Sorani Kurds towards their interlocutors will be examined. These, to my humble knowledge, are the distinctive points that give value to the current study when it is compared to the above mentioned.

3. Refusals

Speech acts are universal to the languages used on the planet, yet they appear to take distinct forms depending on the language and culture. When a speaker rejects a recommendation, offer, invitation, command, or favor from another, this is referred to as a refusal speech act. The importance of speech acts is highly valued in daily life communications as they come in two different forms that are direct and

indirect refusals of such requests or offers. Furthermore, strategies of politeness and social nuances are also involved in such rejections which are usually shaped by different factors that include the relationships between the two speakers, social norms as well as context. (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Abed (2011) asserts that refusal strategies that work well in one community may not be applicable in another. Additionally, when a speaker's utterance is outright rejected because it conflicts with the auditor's expectations, it is generally thought to be face-threatening (Abed, 2011, p.169).

According to Kwon (2004), it is challenging to generate a refusal speech act from a psychological and linguistic perspective because it suggests a listener's inherent antisocial tendencies. Additionally, due to their sensitivity, preventing facial threats necessitates the employment of an acceptable pragmatic ability in the creation and expression of denials. Interpersonal relationships could be at risk if the communicator is unable to make a healthy utterance. Therefore, communicators typically rely on indirect rejection tactics rather than a clear "NO" option. According to Nelson et al., various cultures decide to rely on various means of rejection. In contrast to native Egyptian Arabic speakers, American English speakers frequently rely on suggestions, acknowledgements, and complementary offers when declining invitations (2002).

3.1 Direct and Indirect refusals

Direct and indirect refusal speech acts are two different tactics employed to reject, decline or refuse an offer, request, order or invitation. A direct refusal is refusing with clarity and without any ambiguity. This type of refusal is so direct without leaving very much room for misunderstanding which is quite practical when clarity is required (Holmes, 2009). For instance, saying "I can't come to the party" is directly communicating to the inviter expressing unwillingness to accept and attend the party.

However, indirect refusals can be more pragmatic and most of the time includes strategies to prevent the effect of the refusal on the interlocutor (Beebe, et. al., 1990). Those strategies can include proposing alternative ideas or solutions, giving

excuses or using a vague language to refrain from offense. Speakers can maintain politeness and social harmony by employing indirect refusal strategies to especially in situations where direct refusal might strain relationships (Brown and Levinson, 1987). For example, instead of a direct refusal, one can say, “I am not sure whether I can attend this time; how about I make it up for you next time?”, this kind of approach guarantees a gentler turn down of an invitation and acknowledges it at the same time.

4. Method and Data collection

Data gathering for this study used the DCT approach. Twelve circumstances total, grouped into four clusters, make up the challenge. These clusters stand for three different invitation scenarios, three different requests, three different offers, and three different proposals. Four situations that should be started by people of lower, higher, and equal status but are rejected by the participants are contained in each of those clusters.

Since Beebe et al. developed it in 1990, this approach has been applied in several investigations. Twelve scenarios from the real world are covered by the questionnaire. In each of these cases, the Participants are told to decline. Four statements are used to classify the conditions listed on the questionnaire. Three points are invitations (3, 4 & 10), three points are making requests (1, 2, & 12), another three points are offering scenarios (5, 6, & 8), and suggestions are in the other scenarios (7, 9, & 11), as illustrated in appendix (1). Each item is a courteous representation of a request, offer, suggestion, or invitation. There is a speaker of every rank in every circumstance, and the statements are made by individuals of greater, lower, or equal status.

The scenarios in the completion were translated into Sorani Kurdish (see appendix 1) by the author and then a copy was given to each participant to complete.

Following completion of the task, the answers are examined to determine the rejection tactics employed by Sorani dialect native speakers of Kurdish. The responses to various offers, invites, ideas, and requests from people with lower, higher, or equal status are contrasted. Abed (2011) conducted a study to compare

those strategies native Arabic Speakers of Iraq and native English speakers of America employ. However, this study aims at focusing on Native Sorani Kurds in terms of using refusals in comparison with what the Americans employed in that study.

4.1 Test subjects

27 natural speakers of the Kurdish language who speak the Sorani dialect are taking part in this study. The participants ranged in age from 29 to 35. These BA and MA graduates were employed as teachers, accountants, and administrative staff in various Sorani-speaking regions of Iraqi Kurdistan at the time this study was being conducted.

5. Analysis

More than half of the native Sorani participants used the technique of: regret statement + negative ability + reason, when declining a request made by someone with a lower status (appendix: item 1), such as: (Sorry \ I can't allow you \ you don't have a replacement). The participants also employed two other strategies for declining requests: (statement of endearment + criticism of the request + explanation of the current position + explanation of the implications of accepting the request) and (statement of endearment + explanation of the situation + statement of remorse).

bibure (*regret*) natwanm rêgat pêbidem (*negative ability*), lebereweyi kes nîye cêgat bigirêtewe (*reason*).

Sorry, I can't allow you... you don't have a replacement.

babe giyan (*statement of endearment*) xot wellamî xott dawetewe (*criticism of the request*), zor serqallîn û nakrêt (*explanation of the current position*), be dawayi lêburdinewe (*statement of remorse*).

My dear, we are so busy, it is not possible, with apologies.

kure rolle giyan (*statement of endearment*) keyi bawî eweye yadî ledaykbûnî daykt bikeyewe (*criticism of the request*), ême lêre kollêk karman heye (*explanation of the current position*), tenha to lem ktêbane dezanî (*explanation of the current position*), eger neyeyt meger dukaneke dabixeyin (*explanation of the implications of accepting the request*).

My dear child, who celebrates his mother's birthday nowadays?! We have a lot to do. You are the only person who knows how to deal with these books. we will have to close it If you don't show up.

25 out of the 27 participants employed regret or excuse followed by negative willingness, excuse and alternative when declining requests from someone of equal status such as the following example:

dawayi lêburdin dekem (regret), natwanm bitdemê (negative willingness), çunike xom zorm îş pêyetî (excuse), eger dekrêt le kesêkî tirî werbigire (*alternative*).

Sorry. I cannot, because I need it, ask someone else if you can.

except in cases of direct refusal: (Pardon, I'm unable to=bibure natwanm) which is negative ability and regret.

55% of the participants (15/27) employed the following strategy when declining an offer from someone with a lower status: (expression of regret + excuse \ negative willingness)

debêt biburî (regret), katm nîye (excuse), natwanm bê (negative willingness).

Forgive me, I do not have time, I cannot come.

dawayi lêburdint lê dekem (regret), debêt birromewe bo mallewe xêzanm çawerrême (excuse).

Forgive me, I need to go home. My wife is expecting me.

The rest of the participants (12/27) used (appreciation + excuse + alternative) to refuse:

zor supas (appreciation), bellam em maweye zor serqallm, (*excuse*) ba bo katêkî tir bêt (*alternative*).

Thanks a lot, but I am busy nowadays, maybe next time.

The vast majority of the participants (24), which is 88%, used “excuses” in their replies to refuse invitation by a person of higher status. They employed the strategy of using appreciation or regret followed by excuse or an alternative suggestion. This is in a way that 44% of them used “appreciation” while the use of “positive opinions” and “alternatives” was nearly equally used by 33% each.

zor supas cenabî berrêweber (*appreciation*), berrastî ewe gewreyiye bo min (*positive opinions*), bellam desgîranekem zor nexoşe (*excuse*), însa ella carêkî tir legelltan beşdar debîn (*positive opinions*).

Thank you very much, this means a lot to me, but my fiancée is sick. Maybe next time.

zor supas bo dawuteket + , bellam karêkî zor grîngm heye natwanm becêyi bihêllm. + bmbûre. (positive opinion + excuse + apology)

Thank you for inviting me, but there is an urgent matter I need to take care of. forgive me.

Almost every participant (24/27) who declined a suggestion from a higher-status individual by providing an explanation for their refusals. It is worth mentioning that all of the test takers used positive opinion in the beginning of their speech followed by excuses and in some cases, they ended their refusal by proposing alternatives and the following are some cases in point:

rast dekeyt (*positive opinions*), bellam xo yek dû îşm nîye (*excuse*), kollêk karm heye. lemêşkm hellîdegrm (*alternative*).

You are right, but I have got tons of things to do. I will keep that in mind.

wella rast dekeyt bîrokeyekî cwane (*positive opinions*), bellam tenha emirro ser em mêze narrêke egerina minîş hemîşe şitekan leşwênî xoyan dadenêm (*excuse*).

So true, it is a nice idea. This table is untidy only today. Otherwise, I always put the things in their places.

A separate remark was needed when rejecting a request with a lower status. Most participants used the phrase "letting the interlocutor off the hook."

pêwîst nakat kakî xom. bîrî lê mekerewe.

No need, dear. Just forget it.

zor asayiye, pêwîst nakat parekem bideytewe

It is quite ok; you don't need to compensate me.

pêwîst bewe nakat xot dllgran bikeyt. her hîç nîye .

Don't worry about it. It is nothing.

kêşe nîye, bellam agat lexot bêt.

It is not an issue, but be cautious next time.

In order to refuse a suggestion from someone with a lower status, the participants used excuses followed by regret and/or negative willingness and empathy followed by excuse and clarification as shown in the following examples:

axir eger wanebêt natwanm hemû wanekan tewaw bikem le katî xoyda (*excuse*), boye nexêr natwanm (*negative willingness*).

If I don't, I won't be able to complete the module. So, I can't.

bibure êsta katm nîye (*excuse*) û natwanm ewe bikem (*negative willingness*).

Forgive me, I don't have time and I can't do that.

lêt têdegem (*empathy*), bellam debêt ewe leberçaw bigirêt ke êsta niyweyi dewame û katî wanekanîş beşî ew çallakiyane nakat (*clarification*).

I get it, but you also need to keep in mind that the course is halfway through, and there isn't much time for these kinds of things during lectures.

On the other hand, to refuse a suggestion came from an equal-status individual, nearly 90% of the participants expressed expressions of gratitude. The strategies that were used included appreciation followed by excuse(s), negative willingness followed by appreciation or both appreciation and negative willingness followed by excuse(s) in their utterances as it can be seen in the cases bellow.

zor supas (*appreciation*), zor ħezim le şîrînê nîye (*excuse*).

Thank you very much, but I don't really enjoy sweets.

natwanm bîxom (*negative willingness*), dest xoş (*appreciation*)

I can't eat that, but thank you.

zor supas (*appreciation*), bese bawerrbike natwanm (*negative willingness*), têrm xward (*excuse*).

Thank you very much. I can't, believe me. I have eaten enough.

More than 22%, gave the following justifications after declining an invitation from a person who is in equal-status, such as a friend: regret - negative willingness – excuse, such as:

bibure hawrrê (*regret*), bexwa natwanm (*negative willingness*) xwêndinêkî zorm heye (*excuse*).

I am truly sorry, dear friend. I won't be able to go because I've got a load of studying to do.

While appreciation followed by negative willingness and/or positive attitude followed by excuse(s) as well as excuse(s) followed by negative attitude and appreciation could be noted in a number of other refusals given by the respondents, such as in:

zor supas (*appreciation*), natwanm (*negative willingness*) karî zor grîngtirm heye (*excuse*).

Really appreciated, but I am unable to. I got other things that are more important.

rojî şemme karêkî zor bepelem heye debêt bîkem (*excuse*). boye nakrêt bêm (*negative willingness*), zor supas bo daweteket (*appreciation*).

On Saturday, there is an urgent thing I need to take care of. This why I won't be able to go. Thank you for inviting me.

A full 100% of participants used excuses and over 90% of them began their statements with expressions of gratitude when declining a higher-status offer. These are a few tactics employed by them:

- (appreciation plus negative willingness/regret plus excuse),
- (appreciation plus excuse with or without alternatives) and
- (empathy plus regret plus excuse).

dest xoş (*appreciation*), bellam natwanm birrom bo ew şwêne (*negative willingness*) leber eweyi daykm pêwîstî pême lêre (*excuse*).

Thank you, but I can't go there. My mother needs me here.

dezanm to qazancî mint dewê hemû kat (*appreciation*), bellam behoyi dakmewe natwanm biçm (*negative willingness*). yekêkî tir binêre meminun debm (*alternative*).

I know you want the best for me as always, but I can't go there because of my mother. I would appreciate it if you could send someone else.

zor supas gewrem (*appreciation*), bellam natunm lew şwêne bijîm (*negative willingness*).

Thank you very much sir, but I can't live in that place.

The Kurdish participants almost equally used mixtures of strategies that embrace positive opinion or regret followed by excuse or negative willingness as well as regret(s) that followed by negative willingness and excuse(s) and statement of philosophy followed by alternative(s) while refusing requests coming from their superior, such as a manager, as can be seen in the following responses:

bibure gewrem (*regret*), bellênîm be hawserekem dawê ke zû bigirrêmewe mallewe (*excuse*).

I am Sorry boss, but I promised my wife to be at home early.

lerrastiya zor hêzim ekrd (*positive opinion*), bellam dawayi lêburdin dekem (*regret*) debêt birromewe mew'îdêkm heye (*excuse*).

I would like to, to be honest, but I need to go due to an appointment. I am sorry.

bawerr bike em îşe wa be zuwîyi kotayî nayet (*philosophy*), hellîbigirîn bokatêk roj bêt zor başitire (*ulternative*).

I promise that this will not finish soon, therefore it is best to wait till daytime.

6. Discussion

The current intercultural communication (henceforth ICC) research explores the ways in which native speakers of Sorani Kurdish and American English speakers differ and resemble in terms of the techniques they employ to convey refusals in different situations.

The results of the current study show that native speakers of the Sorani Kurds used only seven direct (0.064%) and (101) indirect refusals (99.93%), compared to Abed (2011) who reported that American English speakers used 37 direct (17.06%) and

(179) indirect (82.94%) refusals. These numbers could indicate that native Sorani speakers of Kurdish and English speakers in the United States choose to use indirect rather than direct refusals. It can be argued that Sorani Kurds are considerably less direct in comparison with the Native English speakers of America who were tested in Abed's (2011), whereas the percentages of the groups are rather similar.

The results of the investigation showed that "explanation/excuse" was the most frequently used tactic by native Kurdish speakers. Even though this approach was employed 57.4% of the time, it was just 23.26% of the time while dealing with native English speakers of America. Moreover, no avoidance technique was used by native speakers of Sorani Kurdish and native American speakers of English scores (%1.85).

The findings indicate that native speakers of Sorani Kurdish often employ denial techniques that are comparable to those discovered by Abed (2011) for native English speakers in the United States. According to Abed's findings, native American English speakers showed significantly greater sensitivity to speakers of a higher status than to speakers of a lower or equal status (see Abed (2011) Appendix P: 179-184). However, by using more justifications, compliments, and occasionally showing empathy while saving face, native Sorani Kurdish speakers demonstrated that they are rather sensitive to lower- and higher-status interlocutors when refusing their request, invitation, offer and suggestion.

6.1 Limitations

This study may have limitations because of the number, gender, and educational background of its participants. Just twenty-seven participants' responses were used to conduct this study. I may not have been able to gather enough samples and due to the small sample size, making it difficult to confidently generalize the findings. To find more realistic disparities in the refusal techniques of native speakers of Sorani Kurdish, the participants' educational backgrounds should have also varied. Further, no female candidate agreed to respond to the questionnaire fully and adequately, which led to the data collected from them to be cancelled. As a result, this research only contains replies made strictly by male.



7. Conclusion

In conclusion, it is important to note that speech acts are regarded as the foundation of communication in all ICC and international language studies. The refusal speech act is one of the most significant speech acts that has caught academics' attention. Refusals are problematic statements that need face saving. According to Ishihara and Cohen (2010), this kind of communication conveys an unwanted message to the reader or listener. Both American English speakers and native Kurdish speakers of the Sorani dialect employ different tactics. The degree of sensitivity with which these two groups of people express their refusals shows the differences between them. According to this study, native Sorani Kurdish speakers are more sensitive than native American English speakers when it comes to expressing rejections. The social standing of the speakers was the base of this sensitivity. Although the American speakers of English showed more sensitivity towards higher-status interlocutors, the Sorani Kurds showed more sensitivity towards lower and higher-status interlocutors. Larger samples from both civilizations' various levels of education and life styles can be gathered in the future in order to provide more generalizable findings and a deeper understanding of the cultures.

References

1. Abed, A. Q. (2011). Pragmatic Transfer in Iraqi EFL Learners Refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 1(1), 166-185.
2. Aliakbari, M. and Changizi, M. (2012). On the realization of refusal strategies by Persian and Kurdish speakers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36: 659– 668.
3. Al-Issa, A. (1998). Sociopragmatic transfer in the performance of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners: Evidence and motivating factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
4. Al-Kahtani, S. (2005). Refusal realizations in three different cultures: A speech act theoretically-based cross-cultural study. *Journal of King Saud University* 18: 35–57.
5. Allami, H., & Naeimi, A. (2011). 'A cross-linguistic study of refusals: An analysis of pragmatic competence development in Iranian EFL learners', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1): 385-406.
6. Alrefaee, Y. and AL-Ghamdi, N. (2019). 'Refusals among Yemeni EFL Learners: A Study of Negative Pragmatic Transfer and Its Relation to Proficiency', *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles* 25(5): 191-214.
7. Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T. and Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990) 'Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals'. In: Scarcella R. C., Anderson E. and Krashen S.D. (Eds.), *On the Development communicative competence in a second language*. Cambridge. Newbury House Publishers. pp. 55-73.
8. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
9. Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (1993). 'A cross-cultural comparison of the requestive speech act realization pattern in Persian and American English'. In L. F. Bouton & Y. Kachru (eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning*. Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois, pp. 85–103.
10. Hashemian, M. (2012). 'Cross-Cultural Differences and Pragmatic Transfer in English and PERSIAN refusals', *Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 4(3): 23-46.
11. Holmes, J. (2009). *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Routledge. Cambridge. Cambridge University press.
12. Ishihara, N. and Cohen, A. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics*. Longman: Pearson.

13. Kasper, G. & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in Language Teaching: An Introduction, in: Rose, K and, Kasper, G. (eds.), Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge:CUP, pp. 1-9.
14. Kwon, J. (2004). 'Expressing refusals in Korean and American English', *Multilingua* 2, 339-364.
15. Mohammad G., Alireza B. and Shirin M. (2013). 'Investigating cross-linguistic differences in refusal speech act among native Persian and English speakers.' *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning* 2(4), 49-63.
16. Morkus, N. (2009). *The Realization of the Speech Act of Refusal in Egyptian Arabic by American Learners of Arabic as a Foreign Language*. ProQuest LLC. [Online]
<http://www.proquest.com/enUS/products/dissertations/individuals.shtml>.
(Accessed in 25/April/2022)
17. Nelson, G. L., Batal, M. A. and Bakary, W. E. (2002). 'Directness vs. indirectness: Egyptian Arabic and US English communication style.' *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 26, 39-57.
18. Olshtain, E. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). 'Cross-cultural pragmatics and the testing of communicative competence.' *Language Testing* 2(1), 16-30.
19. Thomas, J. (1995). 'Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics'. Pearson Education Limited.

رێکاری کردە ئاخوتنیە نەرینییەکانە لە لایەن کوردانی ئاخوهری شیوهزاری سۆرانی و ئینگلیزی ئەمریکییەوه.

پوخته:

ئەمە ی خوارەوه لیکۆلینەوهیەکی بەراوردکارییە لەنیوانی شیوهزاری سۆرانی زمانی کوردی و ئینگلیزی ئەمریکیدا لە رووی شیوازی ناکردنەوه لە چەند دۆخیکی جیاگیای ژبانی پۆژانەدا. ئەم توێژینەوهیە پشت بە ئەنجامدانی ئەرکیکەوه دەبەستیت لە کۆکردنەوهی داتاکییدا. دەبیت بەشداربووان هەلبستن بە پەتکردنەوهی بانگهێشت و داواکاری و ئۆفەر و پێشنیار که لە لایەن کەسانی جیاوازهوه دەخرینە پوو ئەوانیش کەسانی یەکسان و بەرزتر و نزمترن لە پەلی ئەو کەسە ی پەتیان دەکاتەوه. بەشداربووان هەلگری پڕوانامە ی بەکالۆریۆس و ماستەرن وهك مامۆستای قوتابخانە و ژمیریاری و کەسانی ئیداری لەو ناوچە جیاگیایانە ی کوردستانی عێراقدا که ئاخوتن تیایاندا بە سۆرانییە. ئەو رێکارانە ی لە پەتکردنەوهدا لە لایەن بەشداربووانەوه بەکارهاتوون بەراورد کران بەو رێکارانە ی پەتکردنەوه که لە لایەن ئەمریکییەکانەوه بە کارهاتوووە لە (Abed 2011) دا که پیکهاتوووە لە پەتکردنەوه بە شیوه ی راستەوخۆ و ناراستەوخۆ و بەگوێرە ی رێکارەکانی پەتکردنەوه لە (Beebe et al. (1995:55-73) دا پۆژاوه بۆ ئەوه ی بزانی نایا زمانەکانی شیوهزاری سۆرانی لە کاتی پەیهوئەندیکردن دا پێگە ی جیاواز بۆ پیدانی پەتکردنەوه لەم جۆرە بارودۆخانە دا بەکاردهینن یاخود نا. جیاوازییەکانیش که بۆمان دەرکەوتوووە تهواو سەرنجراکێشن بە تایبەت کاتیک باس لە هەستیاری بەرامبەر بە قسەکەر دەرکێت. دەرکەوت کوردانی سۆرانی سویند بەخوا دەخۆن و هەستیارتەن بەرامبەر بە هەردوو قسەکەرانی پەلە نزم و بالا و بە گشتی هەستیارتەن لە چاو زمانە پەسەنەکانی ئینگلیزی ئەمریکی.

تقنيات رفض الخطاب التي يستخدمها الكورد السورانيون والمتحدثون باللغة الإنجليزية الأمريكية

المخلص:

فيما يلي دراسة مقارنة بين اللهجة السورانية الكوردية والإنجليزية الأمريكية من حيث الاستراتيجيات التي يعتمد عليها كلا المتحدثين لإعطاء الرفض خلال مواقف الحياة اليومية المختلفة. تستخدم هذه الدراسة طريقة مهمة إكمال الخطاب (DCT) لجمع البيانات. تتكون الظروف المختلفة من أربعة تشمل الدعوات والطلبات والعروض والاقتراحات التي بدأها أشخاص من ذوي المكانة الدنيا والعليا والمتساوية لتلقي الرفض من قبل المشاركين. ينتمي المشاركون إلى خلفيات تعليمية مختلفة حيث حصلوا على درجات البكالوريوس والماجستير ومعلمي المدارس والمحاسبين والإداريين في أجزاء مختلفة من المناطق الناطقة باللهجة السورانية في كردستان العراق. سيتم مقارنة الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة في إعطاء الرفض من قبل المشاركين بتلك التي يستخدمها المتحدثون الأصليون الأمريكيون للغة الإنجليزية الواردة في (Abed 2011) والتي تستند إلى استراتيجيات الرفض المباشر وغير المباشر التي حددها (Beebe et al. 1995:55-73) لمعرفة ما إذا كان المتحدثون الأكراد باللهجة السورانية يستخدمون طرقاً مختلفة لإعطاء الرفض في مثل هذه المواقف أثناء التواصل. الاختلافات ملحوظة للغاية خاصة عندما يتعلق الأمر بالحساسية تجاه المتكلم. فقد وجد أن الكورد السورانيين يقسمون بالله وأنهم أكثر حساسية تجاه المتحدثين من ذوي المكانة الاجتماعية الدنيا والعليا وأكثر حساسية بشكل عام من المتحدثين الأصليين للغة الإنجليزية الأمريكية.

Appendix (1) the case scenarios given to the participants. Translated by the author.

rênmayîekan: tkaye em doxaneyi xwarewe bixwênewe paşan be beşiyweyek wellamiyan bidewe ke rezamend nebît tiyayanda. katêkî zor be bîrkrdinewe lebareyi ew wellamewe beser mebe ke debêt bîdeyt; lebrî ewe, tkaye ewperrî twanat bixegerr boeweyi beşêweyekî siruşîfî wellamekant bixeyte rû û wellameket bew şêweye binûse ke pêtîbaşe lew doxeda bîlêyt.

1. to xawenî froşgayekî ktêbît. yekêk le başitirîn karmendekant dawat lê dekat qset legellda bikat û dellêt, "dezanm ew pşuwî hefteye serman zorqall debêt lem froşgayeda, bellam rojî ledaykbûnî daykme û planman danawe kobûneweyekî gewreyi xêzanî encam bideyin. pê m xoşe em kotayî hefteye pşû webigirm Leser kar." (dawakarî: kesêk le astêkî nzimtirî komellayetîdaye ew dawayet lê dekat)

welam:.....

2. to le qonaî sêyamî kolêjî. hemîşe amadeyi wanekan debît û têtînî wor baş denûsîte. yekêk le hawpolekant zorbeyi kat waneyek nayet û dawayi ew têtîniyanet lê dekat ke taybetin bew waneye. lew kateda hawpoleket dellêt, "ayî xwaye! sbeyi taqîkrdineweman heye û têtîniyekanî hefteyi rabrdûm nîye. bibûre ew didawayet lê dekem, bellam detwanî dúbare têtîniyekanî xotm pî bideyt?" (dawakarî: kesî yeksan le ruwî komellayetîyewe)

welam:.....

3. to serokî kompaniyayekî çapkrdinî. yekêk le froşiyarekant ke kahez defroşet banghêşitt dekat bo xwanêkî granbehayî êware û froşiyareke dellêt, "ême çend carêk çawman beyektirî kewtuwe bo eweyi berhemekanî kompaniyakeyi min bikrî. pê m xoşe miywanî min bît le (nawî xwardingeyekî granbeha) bo eweyi bigeyin be rêkkewtin. (banghêşitiname: kesêk xawen pleyekî nzimtirle ruwî komellayetîyewe banghêşitt dekat)

welam:.....

4. to berrêweberêkî pleberizî le kompaniyayekî gewreyi jmêriyarî. rojêk berrêwebereket bangt dekat bo nusîngekeyi xoy. dellêt, "rrojî yekşemmeyi dahatû min û xêzanekem ahengêkî biçuk saz dekeyin. dezanm debwaye pêşwexte zûtir pêt billêm, bellam hiywadarm gşit berrêwebere cêbecêkarekan legell xêzanekaniyan amadebin. çî dellêyt?" (banghêşitiname: kesêkî pleyeke beriztirî heye û banghîşitt dekat)

welam:.....

5. to le mallî hawrêyektî û temaşayi telefziyon dekan. hawrrêket pêşniyarî xwardint bo dekat. bellam to retî dekeytewe û dellêyt tozêk kêşit ziyadî krduwe û cle nwêyekant betewawî bot nabin û asûde nît pêyan. hawrîket dellêt, "boçî ew core rêcîme taqî nakeytewe ke pêtm gutibû?" (pêşniyar: kesî yeksan)

welam:.....

6. to le nusîngeketî û beşwên ew raporteda degerrêyt ke berrêwebereket dawayi krdbû. lemianî garrantda benêw ew narrêkiyeyi mêzektada, berrêwebereket dête jûrewê û dellêt, "pîm başe hewll bideyt beşewazîkî başitir xot rêkbixeyt. min hemîşe têtînî biçûk denusmewe boeweyi şitekanm bîr bixatewe. taqî bikerewe." (pêşniyar: kesêkî ple beriztir)

welam:.....

7. dêyte mallewe û debînît ew afreteyi mallt bo pakdekatewe turreye. bepele berewpîrt dêt û dellêt "ayi xwaye! zor dawayi lêburdin dekem! şitîkî naxoşm beser hatuwe. lekatî pakkrdinewe xom be mêzekanda kêşa û gulldane çîniyeket kewt û şka. hestêkî zor naxoşm heye. herweha amadem parekeyt bide mewe." (ofer: kesêk le astêkî xwar xotewe)

welam:.....

8. to mamostayi zanikoyt. le niyweyi korseke nîzk bûnetewe û yekêk le qutabîyekant dawat lê dekat qset legellîda bikat. qutabîyêke dellêt, "beyarmetît mamosta. hendîk le qutabîyekan pêman waye waneyekî zorman le polda pê dellîytewe. detwanît hendêk karî prraktîkî yan lèkollînewe le niyu polman pê bideyt eger beerk nebêt?." (pêşniyar: kesêk le astêkî xwar xotewe)

welam:.....

9. to lemalfî hawrrêyekît bo jemî niywerro. hawrrêket dellêt, "pêt çone parçe kêkîkî tir bixoyin?" (ofer: kesî yeksan)

welam:.....

10. hawrrîyekt banghîşitt dekat bo jemî êware, bellam to tehemulî destgîranekeyi nakeyt. hawrrêket dellêt, "rojî yekşemme layî êmebe bo nanî êware. be niyazî ahengêkî biçûkî." (banghêşitiname: kesî yeksan)

welam:.....

11. to maweyekî zore le kompaniyayekî rêklamkrdinda kardekeyt. berrêweber oferî berizkrdineweyi mûçe û plet pê dedat, bellam legellîda debêt şwênekeşit bigorrît. toş natewêt birroyt. îmirro berrêwebereket bangt dekat bo nusîngekeyi xoyi û dellêt, "demewêt pleyi berrêweberî cêbecêkart pê bidem le nusînge tazekemanda le (nawî şaroçkeyekî biçûktir leweyi xoy). şaroçkeyekî zor xoşe û tenha sê katjmêr lêrewe dûre be frroke. herweha mûçekeşit be rêjeyekî zor baş berizdebibêtewe legell wergirtinî ew posteda." (ofer: lelayen kesêkî ple beriztirewe)

welam:.....

12. to le nusîngeketda legell berrêwebereket le kobûnewedayt. katî tewawbûnî dewamî ew roje nîzk buwetewe û detewêt şwênî kareket cêbihêllît. bellam berrêwebereket dellêt, "eger beerk nebêt, demewêt yek yan dû katjmêrî ziyatir Leser kar bîmênîtewe boeweyi em kare tewaw bikeyin." (dawakarî: lelayen kesêkî plebertirewe)

welam:.....

Appendix 2: Classification of Refusals (Beebe et al. (1990:55-73)

I. Direct

- A. Performative (e.g., "I refuse")
- B. Nonperformative statement
 - 1. "No"
 - 2. Negative willingness/ability ("I can't." "I won't." "I don't think so.")

II. Indirect

- A. Statement of regret (e.g., "I'm sorry...", "I feel terrible...")
- B. Wish (e.g., "I wish I could help you...")
- C. Excuse, reason, explanation (e.g., "My children will be home that night."; "I have a headache.")
- D. Statement of alternative
 - 1. I can do X instead of Y (e.g., "I'd rather..." "I'd prefer...")
 - 2. Why don't you do X instead of Y (e.g., "Why don't you ask someone else?")
- E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., "If you had asked me earlier, I would have...")
- F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., "I'll do it next time"; "I promise I'll..." or "Next time I'll..."—using "will" of promise or "promise")
- G. Statement of principle (e.g., "I never do business with friends.")
- H. Statement of philosophy (e.g., "One can't be too careful.")
- I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor
 - 1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester (e.g., "I won't be any fun tonight" to refuse an invitation)
 - 2. Guilt trip (e.g., waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee.")
 - 3. Criticize the request/requester, etc. (statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack (e.g., "Who do you think you are?"; "That's a terrible idea!")
 - 4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
 - 5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., "Don't worry about it." "That's okay." "You don't have to.")
 - 6. Self-defense (e.g., "I'm trying my best." "I'm doing all I can do." "I no do nutting wrong.")
- J. Acceptance that functions as a refusal
 - 1. Unspecific or indefinite reply
 - 2. Lack of enthusiasm
- K. Avoidance
 - 1. Nonverbal
 - a. Silence
 - b. Hesitation
 - c. Do nothing
 - d. Physical departure
 - 2. Verbal
 - a. Topic switch



- b. Joke
- c. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g., "Monday?")
- d. Postponement (e.g., "I'll think about it.")
- e. Hedging (e.g., "Gee, I don't know." "I'm not sure.")

Adjuncts to Refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement ("That's a good idea..."; "I'd love to...")
2. Statement of empathy (e.g., "I realize you are in a difficult situation.")
3. Pause fillers (e.g., "uhh"; "well"; "oh"; "uhm")
4. Gratitude/appreciation