

<https://www.doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2032.23>

e-ISSN (2617-0752)

p-ISSN (2617-0744)



## **A Comparative Pragmatic Study of the Speech Act Offering between English Native Speakers and Kurdish Foreign Learners of English**

Sania Zero Shero

Soran Computer Institute

[saniazero87@gmail.com](mailto:saniazero87@gmail.com)

Dr. Karmand Abullah Hamad

Soran University

[karmand.hamad@soran.edu.iq](mailto:karmand.hamad@soran.edu.iq)

## Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore the differences and similarities between English and Kurdish languages when using speech act offer strategies in different social contexts. The study has made use of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) that consists of 8 situations designed to elicit the speech act of offering between the participants. The study, more specifically, attempted to find out whether there was any pragmatic transfer. It also examined the perception of directness/indirectness in the realisation of offer strategies in both languages. The DCT was administrated to 30 Kurdish male and female speakers and 30 English male and female speakers. The study adopted Barron's (2003) classification of speech acts as a theoretical framework. The study concluded that English and Kurdish participants used different offer strategies; the most used strategies were; *Query preparatory, mood derivable, locution derivable, hedged performatives*. Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more, while English speakers used indirect strategies more. Factors of gender do not have any effect among Kurdish participants, in contrary among English participants, females used indirect strategies more, and males used direct strategies more. This study also revealed that Kurdish speakers seem to be pragmatically less competent than English native speakers.

**Keywords:** Pragmatics, the speech act of offering, social variables, Situational Context

## **A Comparative Pragmatic Study of the Speech Act Offering between English Native Speakers and Kurdish Foreign Learners of English**

## Introduction

Communication, in both first language (L1) and second language (L2), entails the appropriate use of speech acts and failure to do so, and this can result in numerous difficulties. Many experts in pragmatics share a common idea that speech act is a unit of speaking and each unit performs specific functions in communication such as to request, offer, invitation, complaint, compliment, prohibition, etc., Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Grice (1975), Levinson (1983), Yule (1996). The speech act of offer occurs in every language and as it been investigated by many researchers in different languages.

During the history of English language teaching, the effective language use has been observed as a central principle, and the use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was an attempt to foster the successful language use (Hymes, 1971). Therefore, the accuracy of language use has been influential in the acquisition of the second language. When Hymes(1971) proposed the concept of "communicative competence", i.e., the speaker's knowledge of both linguistic and socio-cultural rules in spoken language, the style of both second language teaching and learning subjected a change of focus from grammatical competence to communicative competence.

Throughout time, cultures have developed their own rules of the appropriateness of verbal behaviour, particularly considering politeness and other successful interaction devices. Members of every community tend to interpret communications on the basis of their own pragmatics and sociolinguistic parameters. Having the knowledge of pragmatic differences among cultures and knowing proper ways of production of speech acts in other languages may

help decrease the negative impacts considering unintentional rudeness and enhance the quality of the communication (Molavi, Biria, and Chalak, 2018).

## **Problem**

There is a series of problems, such as

1-The lack of academic studies on making "offer" in Kurdish language.

2-The lack of comparative studies on making "offers" in Kurdish and other languages.

3-The confusion of Kurdish EFL learners, especially, when they select their most appropriate strategy for making an "offer" in English. They seem to be less polite or sound odd as they use those strategies that are common in the Kurdish language.

## **Research Questions**

1. What is the most common strategy in making an offer in English and Kurdish? And to what extent they used direct and indirect strategy?
2. Is there a gender-based difference in selecting the strategy of making offers?
3. Can an offer be judged as a face-threatening act (FTA) without considering the context situation in which the offer emerges?
4. Is Kurdish EFL competent pragmatically in using offer strategies as native English speakers in this study?

## **Aims of the Study**

The main purposes of this study are:

- 1- Examining the social parameters of the situations in which "offer" is made, especially, the categories of gender, and age of the people who make offers and receive them. The conditions under which "offers" are made, how frequently they occur, the purposes of offering, and the types of responses which offer strategy elicit are all addressed and examined here, especially in terms of the participants, the settings, and the conversational topics involved.
- 2- Specifying the particular characteristics of "offer" strategies cross-culturally.
- 3- Discovering the most frequent "offer" strategies in the form of a top-bottom hierarchy in English and Kurdish.
- 4- Investigating the impulses, in certain situations, to select that strategy for making the "offer" in those particular situations.

## **Hypothesis**

1. Kurdish native speakers prefer direct offer strategies.
- 2-English native speakers prefer indirect offer strategies.
- 3-Gender has different significant impacts on making offers by participants in both societies.
4. Kurdish native speakers might not be pragmatically competent in using offer strategies as English native speakers

## **Value of the study**

This research can revise, refine and extend the existing knowledge in the area of making "offers" in both English and Kurdish. The research study also advances knowledge on the issues of classification of Kurdish and English linguistic structures as well as situations in making "offers". Thus, this study can be an addition to the field of pragmatics in general and "offer" in particular. The

data that will be taken from Kurdish participants, which is an untouched language in this area, can contribute to the literature. The results of the study lastly can assist Kurdish learners of English language in thinking and speaking appropriately when making "offers", as they can be aware where the two languages use the same or different strategies in "offer" making.

### **The scope of the study**

1-The present study is restricted to the investigation of using offer strategies between English and Kurdish speakers.

2-The framework, within which this study is rooted, is inter-language pragmatics, which is concerned with cross-cultural variations in employing certain pragmatic features.

3- The participants of this study are both 30 Kurdish native speakers (EFL) (15 male) and (15 female), and they were from a different educational background. In addition, all of them can speak the English language in a good way, and they have long experience with the English language. And 30 English native speakers (15 male) and (15 female) were the participants and their age ranged from 23-60.

4- The researcher of the study gathered eight offer scenarios to check the pragmatic competence of the participants regarding offer as a speech act. The data collected through DCT questionnaire, and was categorised according to Barron (2003), and are analysed qualitatively in order to show the preference of the offer strategies that were used by the participants in both groups. Which one modified the categorisation of cross-cultural speech act realisation? Barron (2003) schematised offer strategies into eight categories:

*Mood derivable, Hedged performative, Locution derivable, Want Statement, Suggestory formula, Query Preparatory, State Preparatory, and Strong Hint.* In addition to the eight strategies, *imperative* was added following All-Ami (2012) and Barron (2017).

## **Literature Review**

The theory of speech act can be associated with previous philosophers and researchers; but the British philosopher J.L Austin (1962) was the first one who wrote about speech acts. Austin (1962) defines speech acts as acts performed by utterances such as giving orders, offers, making promises, complaining, requesting, among others. When one utters a sentence or a phrase, s/he is performing an act to which s/he expects listeners to react with verbal or nonverbal behaviour (as cited in Jalilifar, 2009).

Furthermore, working definition of "offer" is needed here, as for the literature surveyed in that regard, no specific and satisfactory definition for the offer has been found. Therefore, "offer" has to be defined based on Brown and Levinson (1987) as "a speech act which essentially involves identifying the components which go into the making up of an offer". It is a weak definition because he didn't mention the components of the speech act of offer. Rabinowitz (1993) defines an offer as "a speech act, generally indirect, which voluntarily proposes, without an obligation to do so, to extend an item or a service which the speaker considers beneficial to the receiver and proposes to furnish. It arises from the interlocutors' shared knowledge of the situational context, and is usually based upon a preference or a need on the part of the receiver which the offerer perceives and indicates a willingness to address" (cited in Al-Qahtani, 2009, p.50). Within

the "Speech Act" paradigm, offers are commissives, which means they involve a commitment on the part of the speaker for the benefit of the hearer (Searle 1969). As based on all the definitions thusly obtained, the following definition is constructed for the study.

An offer is the proposal to do something for somebody when there is no obligation in doing that. This definition includes two key concepts:

- a) Suggesting to do or to give something,
- b) The absence of obligation relating to this suggestion.

### **Felicity conditions for speech act offering**

Moreover, for an offer to be valid, it should be felicitous. Searle (1969) suggests four types of felicity conditions for an offer which are: (cited in Abu-Al Fillat, 2017).

1. "Propositional content condition". A performative should only be uttered in the context of a sentence which predicates some future act of the speaker/hearer.

2. "Preparatory condition". The utterance is to be uttered only a) if it is the case that normally the act, which is proposed, would not be done and b) if the speaker believes it is the case that the hearer would prefer the speaker to do what is proposed and c) if the hearer prefers the speaker do what is proposed.

3. "Sincerity condition". Any performative utterance should only be uttered if the speaker intends to do what is proposed or if the speaker believes in his words.

4. "Essential condition". For an utterance to be performative, it is essential for the utterance to count as an obligation to do what is proposed.

### **Performative formula/ Hypothesis**

Austin's performative formula attempts to define performative utterances in terms of a grammatical formula. It is a proposal that underlying every utterance; there is a clause with a verb that identifies the speech act. The aim is to make explicit the illocutionary act that the speaker intends to carry out in uttering the sentence (Yule, 2000). This is also known as a performative hypothesis. The basic format for the formula/hypothesis is as follows;

#### **I (hereby) VP you (that) U**

The structure of the formula begins with the first person singular subject "I" and an active performative verb "VP" in the simple present tense that makes explicit illocutionary act. In addition, the formula may contain "hereby". There is also an indirect object second person singular "you" which may be replaced by another indirect object followed by the conjunction "that" ( which is optionally used), and ends with an underlying clause "U" that makes explicit which is implicit. Such forms are called *explicit performative*. See examples:

*I (hereby) order you that you can clean up this mess.*

*I (hereby) offer you that you can use my car. (offering)*

It is apparent from the literature and pragmatics studies how language is used and how it is integrated into a specific context. In such a way, meaning can be changed from one context or culture to

another (Wierzbicka, 1985). For example, an utterance like "*If I were in your shoes*", in English culture, is used when a person wants to inform someone else what he would do if they were in his/her position or situation, but in other cultures like Kurdish such an utterance seems to be very confusing in the absence of an immediate equivalent idiom in Kurdish. On the other hand, an utterance may have a different meaning in the same language. For example, "*The young woman had always wanted to work in a bank*" of course *bank* is an ambiguous word in English, with the sense 'financial institution' and 'side of a river'. Hence, the role of context in determining the meaning of any linguistic unit has long been seen as a key consideration.

Gender "refers to the attitudes, feelings, and behaviours that a given culture associates with a person's biological sex. Behaviours that are compatible with cultural expectations are referred to as "gender-normative" concepts; behaviours that are viewed as incompatible with societal expectations constitute "gender non-conformity" (Gainor, 2000)."

Social distance is a concept that is born out of sociological terms instead of spatial and biologic terms and refers to the distance regarding the sociological parameters instead of the latter. With the advent of technology, it has become apparent that individuals can feel socially distant or close without being "co-present" or without the confines of physical distance (Cerulo, 1997; Chayko, 2002; Katz and Rice, 2002; Meyrowitz, 1997). In fact, the locality and spatial parameters are now being considered to have lost at least a portion of their significance in terms of social studies. This has been labelled "annihilation of space through time" and is mostly attributed to the developments in economic and technological aspects of daily life. Still, even if the spatial and

biological distances can interact with social distance, many researchers believe that such a variable should be considered an autonomous one (Bourdieu, 1999; van den Berghe, 1987).

In the pragmatic study, there were a great number of studies that investigated the speech act of offering. Most of these studies were conducted cross-culturally and used DCT (Discourse Completion Test) to collect the data. A study conducted by Chun (2003) had compared the languages of Korean and English in terms of how they implemented the acts of politeness when they wanted to offer advice. The participants of the study were given a questionnaire that described eight different situations which were previously suggested by another study (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The study has concluded that Korean speakers employed a more direct and concise speech (the bald-on-record) approach as defined by Brown and Levinson, 1987) compared to the English speakers. An interesting revelation of the study was that, while the face-value concerns were similar in different cultures, the notion of "politeness" showed considerable variation between them. This led to the conclusion that "there is no universal criterion of what authentic morality or politeness" (Chun, 2003)

Tsuzuki et al. (2005) also studied the use of various techniques by speakers of American English and Chinese languages when trying to implement acts of spoken offers or requests. A series of scenarios, ranging from very impolite to very polite, were provided to the participants who were asked to respond. The results have revealed both similarities and differences between the cultures. Both cultures were, for example, cutting of imperatives, like, "*have some more milk?*" when making offers. This was indicative that both cultures believed that the use of the imperative, like "*will you have more milk?*" was too polite. Furthermore, both cultures placed

more emphasis on politeness and equal relationship, both when making offers and requests. On the other hand, the cultures acted differently when the social distance between the participants was greater.

Al-Qahtani (2009), in her study, investigated "the differences in the female use of politeness strategies in the speech act of offering between spoken Saudi Arabic and spoken British English". She used Discourse Completion Task (DCT) for collecting data in her study. She examined two factors; the gender of the addressee and the degree of the speaker's participation in making offers. The study discovered that the type of strategies used by the Saudi females in making offers was greatly influenced by the gender of the addressee and that the degree of involvement in making offers showed a high effect on the use of politeness strategies in both Saudi and British cultures. The upshots showed that there were differences between the Saudi Arabic and the British female participants, in the use of politeness strategies, in making offers.

Allami (2012) performed research where he evaluated the methods employed when implementing the spoken act of offering in the Persian language. The study used a DCT method to obtain the data from the participants, and the results indicated that many factors like age group, sex, the type of offer used in the sentence, the social relationship (or lack thereof) between the participants, and the relative power levels of the participants had no effect when selecting the implemented offer approach. Furthermore, it was revealed that the Persian language was relatively indirect where locution derivable, query- preparatory, and imperatives, particularly hedged ones, were influential in determining the approach to the spoken act of offering.

In another study in Jordanian society, Al-masri (2015) investigated the speech act of making, accepting, and declining offers. For collecting data, he used Discourse Completion Task (DCT), which consisted of 14 items and answered by 180 male and female Jordanians. The data was analysed by taking into account some factors that could affect the type of strategies employed like age, gender, social distance, and geographical location. The study revealed that age, gender, social distance, and geographical location affect the choice of the strategies used. Also, the study highlighted that the most used strategies were imperatives, query preparatory, and mood derivable; swearing and repetition were the most frequently used strategies to emphasise an offer (reoffer).

The methods employed by different cultures, when offering advice, were also investigated by another study (Babaie and Shahrokhi, 2015), in which the spoken acts of advice offers of Iranian EFL students and native English speakers were compared. The pivotal point of the research was to reveal if the Iranian EFL students employed any pragmatic transfers from their own language. The DCT method was used to collect the research data. The results indicated that the Iranian students were not employing any pragmatic transfer in terms of social power and social distance between the participants, particularly, due to not being at a competence level of mastery to do so. Another interesting finding was that Iranian EFL students and English speakers employed similar methods of implementing offering advice.

Another study carried out, in Korea, by Min Sujung (2019) entitled 'sociopragmatic study of the speech act of offers by Korean L2 learners of English', showed that Korean L2 learners of English were not as balanced as native English speakers in the use of strategies. Findings also demonstrated differences in the choice of

the offer strategies between two groups of participants with regard to offering types. Typically, to compare the findings of the present study with the relevant literature, it should be noted that this result echoes the findings of previous studies on the same phenomenon.

### **Data collection**

The participants of this study are both Kurdish native speakers (EFL learners) and English native speakers. 30 Kurdish native speakers, their age ranged from 23-60 (15 males and 15 females) were from a different educational background, and all of them can speak the English language in a good way, and they have long experience with the English language, and 30 English native speakers (15 male) and (15 female), their age ranged from 23-60, both males and females speakers with different academic backgrounds and professional experiences (i.e. computer/ electrical engineering, anthropology, communication studies, psychology, business, English teachers etc...) participated in the study. The native English speakers' consents were obtained by a research assistant. The questionnaire was distributed to English native speakers with the help of researcher's friends who live in the UK. They (my friends) assisted with appropriate instructions to be followed by the English participants while filling the questionnaire. As for the Kurdish informants, the questionnaire distributed to the Kurdish native speakers by the researcher herself.

The process of distributing and collecting Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) was carried online. Offer refusals and acceptance were not included in this study. This test was initially designed by Blum-Kulka in 1984 titled Cross-cultural Realisation Project and has been broadly used since then in collecting data, on speech acts realisation, both within and across language groups.

Though the naturalness and authenticity of the data elicited by DCT are under doubt due to the fact that some designed situations may be unfamiliar to the participants, the quality response requires cultural familiarity, not situation familiarity (Lorenzo-Dus, 2001). For this reason, the DCT is still considered to be a reliable method in the research area on cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics. Thus, the DCT questionnaire was prepared for the study and was modified for naturalness and cultural familiarity with the researcher's supervisor, the researcher's colleagues and two native English speakers. The participants were given plenty of time to fill in the questionnaire at their own pace. The instrument used in this study was a (DCT). The DCT included different situations that have to do with extending offers. Eight of these DCT situations were given with regard to Kurdish and English cultures. The situations were given, and the participants were asked to make an offer using their linguistic competence. The questionnaire consists of a description of the situation and asked the participants to act as they would in a real one.

## **Model**

In this study, the strategies of offer productions were coded based on the modified version of the classification used by Barron (2003), itself is a combination of the schemas used by House and Kasper (1981) and Blum-Kulka et al. (1989). Barron (2003) schematised offer strategies into eight categories; Mood Derivable, Hedged Performative, Locution Derivable, Want Statement, Suggestory Formula, Query Preparatory, State Preparatory, and Strong Hint. In addition to the eight strategies, the imperative was added by Allami (2012) and Barron (2017). The nine strategies are also schematised into two categories based on the directness level, although Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) divided the indirect strategies

into conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect. This current study adopted two levels of directness. Direct offer strategies include Imperative, Mood Derivable, Hedged Performative, Locution Derivable, and Want Statement. On the other hand, the indirect offer includes Suggestory Formula, Query Preparatory, State Preparatory, and Strong Hint.

## **Data analysis**

The methodology applied, in this study, is a mixed approach (quantitative and qualitative) for both data collection and data analysis. On the one hand, a significant part of similarities and differences are caught on the ground of frequency in the use of offer strategies. In other words, frequency and percentage of offer strategies were displayed and tabulated using numeric values in tables and diagrams. On the other hand, the current study gets a huge support from a qualitative approach in providing and discussing the possible reasons behind the differences and similarities between the speakers and also illustrating adequate examples from the data.

## **Results**

Discussion of the results and findings focuses on answering the research questions to accept or reject the null hypothesis. The research questions and their answers are as following:

## Frequencies of overall offer strategies by Kurdish native speakers

**Table (1) Percentage and Frequency of Offer Strategies used by Kurdish Speakers.**

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
Mood derivable	38	15.8%
Hedged performatives	49	20.4%
Locution derivable	38	15%
Want statement	1	0.42%
Suggestory formula	8	3.33%
Query preparatory	64	26.7 %
State preparatory	10	4.17%
Strong hint	7	2.92%
Imperatives	27	11.3%

Table (1) shows that the most frequent strategy for making an offer by Kurdish speakers was *query preparatory* with a percentage of 26.7%. The second most frequent strategies with different percentages were *Hedged performatives*, *Mood derivable*, *Locution derivable* and *imperatives* with percentage 11.3%. The data indicated that there were few instances of *State preparatory* with percentage of 4.7% then with less percentage *suggestive formula* 3.33% and *strong hint* with the percentage of 2.92% and *want statement* with percentage 0.42%.

**Table (2) Percentage and Frequency of Offer Strategies used by English speakers.**

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
Mood derivable	32	% 13.3
Locution derivable	32	% 13.3
Hedged performatives	25	%10.4
Want statement	5	% 2.08
Suggestory formula	12	% 5
Query preparatory	88	% 36.7
State preparatory	26	% 10.8
Strong hint	6	% 2.5
Imperatives	14	% 5.83

Table (2) shows that the most frequent strategy for making an offer by English native speakers was *query preparatory* with a percentage of 36.7%. Second most used strategies with different percentages were *Mood derivable and Locution derivable State preparatory. Hedged performatives* occur in less percentage with 10.4%. The ranking was followed by *imperatives* with the percentage of 5.83%, then *suggestion formula* with a percentage of 5%. The data indicated that there was a few instances of *strong hint* with a percentage of 2.5%, and the least frequent strategy by English native speakers wanted *Statement* with a percentage of 2.08%.

**Table (3) Frequency of Direct and Indirect Strategies made by English and Kurdish Native speaker.**

<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Kurdish</b>	<b>English</b>
Direct	63.8%	45%
Conventionally Indirect	32.9%	52.5%
Non-conventionally indirect	2.92%	2.5%

From table (3) above, the data indicated that the Kurdish speaker mostly used direct strategies with a percentage of 63.8%. They use conventionally indirect strategies with percentage 32.9%, and non-conventionally indirect with the percentage of 2.92. On the contrary, the most preferred strategies for making an offer by English native speakers were indirect strategies with a percentage of 52.5% and the direct strategies only with the percentage of 45%.

**Table (4) Distribution of offer strategies based on ender by Kurdish speakers**

Strategies	Male		Female	
	FREQ	%	FREQ	%
Mood derivable	23	19.2	15	12.5
Locution derivable	20	16.7	20	16.7
Hedged performatives	28	23.3	21	17.5
Want statement	0	0	1	0.83
Suggestory formula	1	0.83	7	5.83
Query preparatory	29	24.2	32	26.7
State preparatory	4	3.33	6	5
Strong hint	3	2.5	4	3.33
Imperatives	13	10.8	14	11.7

From table(4) it was found out that Kurdish females used Query preparatory as their first most used strategy for making offers with percentage (27.7%) followed by hedged performatives (17.5%) locution derivable (16.7) and mood derivable (12.5) imperatives (11.7). Query preparatory was also first most used strategy used by males with percentage(24.2%) followed by hedged performatives (23.3) mood derivable(19.2) locution derivable(16.7) imperatives (10.8). For females, the ranking was followed by suggestive formula (5.83%) state preparatory(5%), strong hint (3.33%). For males, the ranking was followed by state preparatory (3.33), strong hint(2.5), suggestive formula (0.83). The least frequent strategy used by females was want Statement with percentage(0,83), but this strategy was not found among male Kurdish speakers.

**Table (5) Distribution of Offer strategies based on Gender by English Speakers**

Strategies	Male		Female	
	FREQ	%		FREQ
Mood derivable	22	18.3%	10	8.33%
Locution derivable	15	12.5%	17	14.2%
Hedged performatives	16	13.3%	9	7.5%
Want statement	5	4.17%	0	0%
Suggestory formula	5	4.17%	7	5.83%
Query preparatory	37	30.8%	51	42.5%
State preparatory	11	9.17%	15	12.5%
Strong hint	5	4.17%	1	0.83%
Imperatives	4	3.33%	10	8.33%

According to the obtained results, from the table(5) above, the strategies of making an offer by English males and females, concerning the first most used strategy for making the offer was query preparatory for both males(30.8%) and females with percentage (42.2%), the second most used strategy for females was Locution derivable(14,2%), followed by state preparatory(12.5), mood derivable and imperatives registered the same percentage (8.33%), hedged performative (7.5%).In contrary, the second most used strategy by males was mood derivable(18.3%) followed by hedged performative (13.3%), Locution derivable(12.5) and suggestive formula, want Statement and strong hint recorded the same frequency and percentage by males which was (4.14%). While the data showed that females used suggestive formula with percentage (5.83%).The least frequent strategy by females was strong hint with percentage (0.83), and the least frequent strategy

for males was imperatives with percentage (3.33%), want Statement is a strategy that wasn't used by females, but it was used by males.

**Table (6) Distribution of Direct and Indirect Offer Strategies Across Gender by English and Kurdish speakers.**

Strategies	English		Kurdish	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Direct	51.7%	38.3%	60%	52.25%
Conventionally in direct	44.2%	60.8%	23.6%	37.5%
Non-conventionally in direct	4.17%	0.83%	2.15%	3.33%

The data from table (6) indicated that the English female speakers used in direct strategies more than indirect. They used direct strategies with percentage (60.8%) direct strategies with percentage (38.3%) and Non-conventionally indirect with percentage (0.83%). While male English speakers used direct strategies more than indirect ones, they used direct strategies with percentage (51.7%), indirect strategies (44.2%) and they used un-conventionally indirect strategies with percentage (4.17%). On the contrary, the data confirmed that Kurdish speakers, both males and females, used direct strategies more than indirect ones. Females used direct strategies with percentage (52.2%) males (60%). However, females used indirect strategies with percentage (37.5%) males (23.6), and females used Non-conventionally indirect strategies with percentage (3.33%), males (2.14). So, Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more.

## Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the speech act of offers by Kurdish and English native speakers in various social and cultural contexts. The data was collected through DCT, which consisted of 8 situations to test the participants in realising offers strategies. The gender effect of the interlocutors, on making offers, was also tested, and the use of direct/ indirect strategies was also explored. The data, collected through the DCT questionnaire, were categorised based on Barron (2003), which modified the categorisation of cross-cultural speech act realisation in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989).

Inter-language research studies and Cross-cultural pragmatics have provided evidence that second language learners' pragmatic knowledge expressively affects their comprehension and production of pragmatic utterances in a second language (Kasper, 1992; Takahashi, 1996). As the findings reveal, regarding first research question, the most frequent strategies for making offers in Kurdish and English languages are Query preparatory; Query Preparatory strategy accentuates the loss of the speaker by maximising the benefit of the hearer, and this strategy highlights the generosity maxim proposed by (Leech, 1983).

The ranking, then, is followed by *Hedged performatives*, *Locution derivable*, *mood derivable*, with different frequency and percentages. Among the second most used strategies, for Kurdish speakers, *imperatives* recorded a high frequency mostly hedged or mitigated with various devices which minimise the face-threatening act's effect on the hearers. They adopted the direct strategy *imperatives* more than Native speakers did because Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more than indirect ones; an

*imperative* is a straightforward strategy. Compared to English speakers, imperatives have less frequency, because Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more than English speakers. That is, the speakers, when using direct strategies, used hedging devices in order to be less direct. As for English speakers, *state preparatory* also recorded high frequency. This strategy reflects the wish to be indirect and to respect the hearers' negative face, compared to Kurdish speaker's *state preparatory* has less frequency, so this similarity and differences is the sign of two different cultures.

On a scale of directness, it was found that Kurdish speakers used more direct strategies, in contrary English speakers used indirect strategy more. These results are in line with the findings of the previous study by Abu Al-Filat (2017). In his *sociopragmatic comparative study of offers between Palestinian EFL Learners and American Native Speakers of English*, he found out some similarities that both speech communities are found to utilise the preference of politeness strategy for making offer query preparatory in the form of a question, and the study also identified that English speakers used indirect strategies more than direct strategies, while Palestinian EFL used direct strategies more than indirect ones.

As far as Kurdish speakers concerned, they tend to be more direct. This is the opposite of the basic claim of Brown and Levinson (1987) which is the more indirect an utterance is, the more polite it becomes. In fact, what is polite in one language might not be so in another. So, Kurdish speakers are seen as less competent pragmatically as native speakers of English. The results also found gender effect in choosing offer strategies. In Kurdish language, as it is noted in this study, there are no significant differences between males and females among Kurdish

participants. They chose the same strategy with differences only in percentage and frequencies. This turned out to be different from English which males and females are somehow to be distinct in making offer strategies. English males seemed more direct, while females are more indirect. Besides all the facts that certain social condition demands the use of speech acts, culture has a critical role in the distinction of production and perception of certain speech acts in different situations.

Regarding face-threatening act, FTA and offer, the degree of politeness and face-saving acts are the main concerns in speech acts. Offer can face-threatening act without considering contexts, but in making an offer, speakers tried to use different strategies in order to reduce the effect of FTA. In Brown and Levinson's model, offers are potential FTAs because there is "a risk that hearer may not wish to receive such an offer" (1987, p. 39). Therefore, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), offers can be face-threatening to both the speaker and hearer. This has been rejected by researchers, though. A study by (Nwoye, 1992) in Igbo culture about request and offer, found out that they carry no sense of imposition. Koutlaki (2002) claims that offers and the reactions to them are regarded as essentially face-enhancing acts. She shows that conventional linguistic expressions of offers in the Persian speech community are best defined as enhancing the group face that is employed during informal meetings with friends and family. To be more polite, minimising potential threats to the hearer is vital for language use both as L1 and L2. The differences in selecting strategies for the speech act of offers, between Kurdish learners and native English speakers, maybe due to the transfer of politeness strategies from L1 to L2 or the developmental nature of inter-language.

Kurdish speakers seem to be pragmatically less competent in comparison to English native speakers because the Kurdish speakers, who participated in this study, have long experience in the English language. Further, Kurdish speakers in an early stage, at school, they study the English language, and they focus carefully on the grammatical concepts. Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more, and the fact that Kurdish society is collectivistic; they care about each other. This directness doesn't mean that Kurdish speakers are impolite rather; it shows closeness and connectedness, camaraderie and affiliation' (Tawalbeh & Al-Oqaily, 2012: 94); while English speakers used indirect strategies more.

This brings us to the limitation of the present study, which includes mainly the limited number of participants and situations for the test; the only instrument used for collecting data is Discourse completion Test DCT. This limitation suggests that the evidence drawn from the present study needs to be further confirmed and reinforced by more cross-sectional and longitudinal research.

## **Conclusion**

Second language learner needs to acquire a high level of pragmatic competence and proficiency than other target language speech acts in order to perform and use speech act offer successfully in L2. This study concluded that there were some similarities and differences between Kurdish and English speakers. Among all over strategies, participants used the most query preparatory strategy for making an offer, but in the level of directness English speakers used in direct strategies more while Kurdish speakers used direct strategies more. And this doesn't

mean that Kurdish people are not polite while making offering speech act because English and Kurdish language belong to two different societies and cultures.

The data also concluded that among English females and males, there was a difference in choosing a strategy for making an offer. In contrary, among Kurdish participants, there are no significant differences, so culture influences the type of strategy and speech acts that people use in communication. In this sense, the prediction that "High level of grammatical competence do not guarantee concomitantly high levels of pragmatic competence" (Bardovi-Harlig 1996.686)

### **Recommendations**

The main pedagogical implications of the study are that given the differences of adopted strategies; there are cultural differences between the two societies. For the speakers of a second language to be accurate and fluent, when using the language without pragmatic failure, learners need to know the norms of the other culture and the appropriate use of different speech acts. Further researches with different variables and methodology would complement this study. This study can perform with other languages around the world, and researchers can replicate this study with different factors such as age, social distance, and relative power and other variables.

## References

- Abu Al-Failat, M, Kh, (2017). A Comparative Pragmatic Study of "Offers" by Palestinian EFL Learners and American Native Speakers of English: Hebron University Faculty of Graduate Studies.
- Allami, H., & Montazeri, M. (2012). Iranian EFL learners' compliment responses. *System*, 40(4), 466-482.
- Almasri, S. H. (2015). A Sociopragmatic Study of the Speech act of Offering in Jordanian Arabic, (Master thesis), Yarmouk University
- Al-Qahtani, H. A. (2009). Female Use of Politeness Strategies in the Speech Act of Offering: A Contrastive Study between Spoken Saudi Arabic and Spoken British English. (Master thesis), King Saud University.1-307
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Babaie, S., & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). A Cross-Cultural Study of Offering Advice Speech Acts by Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers: Pragmatic Transfer in Focus. *English Language Teaching*, 8(6), 133-140.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R.M., (1979): *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brdovi-Hrlig, K. (1996) Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language learning* 49:677-713

- Barron, A. (2003). Acquisition in inter language pragmatics: Learning how to do thing with words in a study abroad context. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realisation patterns (CCSARP). *Applied linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). The CCSARP coding manual. In Bogardus, E. S. 1925. "Measuring Social Distances," *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9: 299–308.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1941). *Sociology*. New York: Macmillan.bridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. case of English Directive Performed by Native Japan's Speakers.
- Cerulo, K. A. (1997). "Reframing Social Concepts for a Brave New (Virtual) World," *Sociological Inquiry* 67: 1: 48–58.
- Chayko, M. (2002). *Connecting: How We Form Social Bonds and Communities in the Internet Age*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Chodorowska-Pilch, M. (2004). of politeness in Spanish. *Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish*, 123, 57.
- Chun, M. Y. (2003). Culture-Specific Concepts of Politeness for Offering Advice. *Proceedings of the 10th Pan-Pasific Association of Applied Linguistics, Japan*, 287-296.

- Chung, K. (2008). Korean English fever in the US: Temporary migrant parents' evolving beliefs about normal parenting practices and children's natural language learning. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Cortazzi, M., Jin, L., & Hinkel, E. (1999). Culture in second language teaching.
- Gainor, K. A. (2000). Including transgender issues in lesbian, gay, and bisexual psychology: Implications for clinical practice and training. In B.
- Giddens, A. (1997). Sociology. London: Polity Press.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. Philadelphia, P. A.: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jalilifar, A. 2009. Request strategies: Cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners and Australian native speakers. English Language Teaching, 2(1), 46-61
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. Second Language Research, 8, 203-231.
- Katz, J. E., and R. E. Rice. 2002. Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koutlaki, S.A., 2002. Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: tae'arof in Persian. Journal of pragmatics, 34(12), pp.1733-1756. L2 learners of English. English Language & Literature Teaching, 25(1), 123-139.

- Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.
- Leech, G.N., (1983). Principles of Pragmatics Text. London, NY: Longman.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). Pragmatic, Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyrowitz, J. (1997). "Shifting Worlds of Strangers: Medium Theory and Changes in 'Them' Versus 'Us'," Sociological Inquiry 67: 1: 59–71.
- Min, Sujung (2019). A sociopragmatic study of speech act of offers by Korean
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defence of intersubjectivity in conversation. American Journal of sociology, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.R. and Searle, J.R., 1969. Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language (Vol. 626). Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, A. J., & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in Psychology. Annual Review of Psychology, 55, 519–544.
- Suzuki, M.(2004).Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 1-19.

- Tawalbeh, A. & Al-Oqaili, E. (2012) In-directness and politeness in American English and Saudi Arabic requests: A cross-cultural comparison. *Asian Social Science*. 8(10) pp. 85-98.
- Takahashi, S., & Dufon, M. (1989). Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English Directiv Performed by Native Japanese Speakers.
- Leech, G.N., 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics Text*. London, NY: Longman.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001). Complement responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(1), 107-127.
- Wagner, L. (2012). Positive- and Negative-Politeness Strategies: Apologising in the Speech Community of Cuernavaca, Mexico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 27, 93-109.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1987). *English speech act verbs*. Semantic Dictionary. Sydney.

## پوخته:

ئامانچ لەم لیکۆلینەوهیە ئەوهیە که جیاوازی و لیکچوونەکانی نیوان زمانی کوردی و زمانی ئینگلیزی بدۆزیتەوه له کرده قسهییەکانی پیشکەشکردن دا لەنیو دهقه کۆمهلیهتییه جیاوازهکانهوه. ئەو لیکۆلینەوهیە ههستاوه به بهکارهینانی (تاقیکردنهوهی ووتاری تهواوکاری) که پیکدیت له ههشت حالهت که داریژراوه بو دهرهینانی جیاوازییهکان له کرده قسهییەکانی پیشکەشکردنی له نیوان بهشداربووان. ئەو لیکۆلینەوهیە , به شیوهیهکی دیاری کراو ههولێ دۆزینهوهی ئەوهی داوه که ئایا هیچ گواستنهوهیهکی کرداری ههیه. ههروهها لیکۆلینەوهکه ههولێ دۆزینهوهی کرده قسهییە راستهوخۆ و ناراستهوخۆکانی ستراتییژی پیشکەشکردنی داوه له ههردوو زمانهکهدا. راپرسی DCT له نیوان ۳۰ نیر و می ی قسهکهری کوردی و ۳۰ نیر و می ی قسهکهری ئینگلیزی ئەنجام دراوه. ئەم لیکۆلینەوهیە پشتی بهستوو به پۆلین کردنی کرده قسهییەکانی بارۆن ( ۲۰۰۳ ) وهک چوارچێوهیهکی بیهردۆزی. لیکۆلینەوهکه دهریخستوو که بهشداربووان له ههردوو زمانی کوردی و ئینگلیزی ستراتییژی جیاوازیان بهکارهیناوه, وه ئەو ستراتیییانە که زیاتر بهکارهینراون بریتین له زانینی پیشوهختهی ئامادهکراو, داریژراوهی میزاجی, داریژراوهی شوین, دهورهدانی کارامهیی . قسهکهره کوردهکان به زۆری ستراتییژی راستهوخویان بهکاردههینا له کاتیکدا قسهکهره ئینگلیزهکان به زۆری ستراتییژی ناراستهوخویان بهکاردههینا. هۆکاری جیندهری هیچ کاریگهریهکی دیاری کراوی نهبوو له نیو بهشداربووه کوردهکان له کاتیکدا کاریگهریهکی دیاری کرده سهر بهشداربووه ئینگلیزهکان. بهشداربووه مییه ئینگلیزهکان زیاتر ستراتییژی ناراستهوخویان بهکاردههینا له کاتیکدا بهشداربووه نیره ئینگلیزهکان ستراتییژی راستهوخویان بهکاردههینا. ئەو لیکۆلینەوهیە ئەوهی

دهر خستوهه كه قسه كه ره كورده كان كه متر كارامهن له روى  
به رجه سته كردنى كرده پراگماتيكييه كان به به راورد له گهل قسه كه ره  
ئینگلیزیه ره سهنه كان.

**ووشه كلیلیه كان :** قسه كردنى كردارى , كارایی , خستنه پروو, جیندر

## ملخص:

الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو اكتشاف الاختلافات و التشابهات بين اللغة الانكليزية و اللغة الكوردية بحيث أن إتقان اللغة يقدم الاستراتيجيات في نواحي الاجتماعية مختلفة. أن هذه الدراسة قامت باستخدام ( اختبار الخطاب التكميلي) الذي يتكون من ثمانية حالات صممت لأستخلاص الأختلافات في تقديم العروض بين المشاركين. أن الدراسة, بشكلٍ مُحدد, حاولت أن تكتشف فيما إذا كان هناك أي تنقلات عملية. كما أنها أيضاً فحصت معرفة الصراحة /عدم الصراحة في ملاحظة استراتيجية العرض في كلتا اللغتين. دارَ اختبار DCT بين ٣٠ ذكر و أنثى المتحدث باللغة الكوردية و ٣٠ ذكر و أنثى المتحدث باللغة الانكليزية . الدراسة تبنت تصنيف أداء الكلامي لبارون (٢٠٠٣) كأطار نظري. أستنتجت الدراسة أن المشاركين من الكورد و الأنكليز أستخدموا استراتيجيات عروض مختلفة , و الاستراتيجيات الاكثر استخداماً هي الأستعلام التحضيري, المشتق المزاجي, المشتق الموضوعي, التحوط الأدائي. المتحدثون بالكوردية أستخدموا الاستراتيجيات المباشرة أما المتحدثون بالانكليزية أستخدموا الأستراتيجيات الغير مباشرة أكثر. العامل الجيندري لم يكن له أيته تأثير واضحة بين المشاركين الكورد, بينما أثرت بشكلٍ واضح على المشاركين الانكليز.المشاركون الأنكليز من الأناث أستخدمن الأستراتيجيات الغير المباشرة أكثر أمما المشاركون من الذكور أستخدموا الاستراتيجيات المباشرة أكثر. هذه الدراسة كشفت أيضاً أن المتحدثون بلكوردية بدؤوا عملياً أقل كفاءةً من المواطنون المتحدثون بالانكليزية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الأداء الكلامي , العملي, العرض , الجيندر

