A Socio-pragmatic Study of External Request Modification in Kurdish Language

Salar Faeq Majeed[1], Baida'a Abdul Kareem Rasheed[2]

1 College of Science, University of Garmian
2 Department of English Language, College of Languages and Human sciences, University of Garmian

Abstract

the main aim of this study is to figure out whether Kurdish male and female subjects use external modification devices in request with similar percentage. Moreover, this study is an attempt to find out the effect of social factors such as the social status of participants, and the social distance between the subjects on the choice of a certain external modification device than the other. Discourse completion Tests (DCTs) which consisted of (12) situations are employed to elicit the data from 40 Kurdish participants. The translated version of the questionnaire employed in this study, which was translated by the researches to Kurdish Language, is adopted from Reiter(2000). The participants were postgraduate and undergraduate Kurdish students at the University of Garmian which consisted of 10 female and 10 male undergraduate students and 10 male and 10 female postgraduate students.

The responses are categorized and analysed within the coding scheme developed by Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989). The result revealed that Kurdish female participants use most of the chosen external modification more than Kurdish Male ones. Regarding the effect of social variables, it has been shown that both Kurdish men and women inclined toward using more external modification in situations where they had less dominant role than the requesters. Moreover, both Kurdish men and women were found to incline towards using the external modification with their request when they addressed strangers. Limitations and implications are highlighted

Introduction

One of the main concern in the field of pragmatics and politeness is to explore how native speakers of a particular speech community and how non- native English learners produce request speech act and other speech acts in a first and second/foreign language (L2) (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984; Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Trosborg 1995; Hassall 2003).

Concerning various aspects of request, a plethora of studies has thus far been conducted by researchers in diverse languages (Walters 1979; Blum-Kulka, 1987 on Hebrew and American English; Blum- Kulka etal 1989 on German, Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and Argentine Spanish; Sifianou

1992 on Greek and British English; Wierbzicka 2003 on Polish, and Félix-Brasdefer 2005 on Mexican Spanish, to name only a few). These studies emphasized the fact that requestive speech act is worthy of further investigation and focus.

Moreover, a large number of studies have been conducted focusing on the modification tools used to soften a speech act (Blum-Kulka, et al., 1989; Holmes 1984). As a result, a greater attention has been paid to figure out which linguistics devices non-native speakers employ to soften the force of the speech act, and the reason behind the non-native speaker's deviation behavior from the norm and

mitigating devices being used by native speakers (Trosborg 1995; Hassall 2001; Schauer 2004). Thus, different researchers attempted examining the structure and the functions of request modifications within the request sequence (Faerch and Kasper 1989; House and Kasper 1981; Trosborg 1995; Hassall 2001; Al-Ali and Alawneh 2010). Most of these studies were conducted within the interlanguage pragmatics context, exploring how second language learners use request modifications in the target language.

In addition, there has been a huge increase in a number of different research investigating the effect of different factors such as social variables, gender, education, on the types and frequency of request modifying devices. The fact that result in increasing interest, in different research dealing with cross-cultural communication, in finding out the differences and similarities with regard to mitigating devices used by speakers from different language communities while making request (Abdolrezapour & Eslami-Rasekh 2012; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008) and refusal (Abdolrezapour & Vahid Dastjerdi 2013).

However, despite the fact that there are plethora of studies examining different aspects related to the production of modification devices by speakers of different languages, to the researchers knowledge no studies have actually addressed the modification strategies, specifically the external modifications, being produced by Kurdish speakers to soften the request in different situations. The rationale for the present study also lies in the shortage of studies examining the effect of gender variable on the production of external modification tools in Kurdish language as a native language

Request modifiers in Kurdish language have not yet been reported in any previous studies. By examining this under-researched language, the aim is to expand the range of languages under inquiry and contribute to the existing pragmatic literature. In addition, this study focuses on addressing the effect of social variables on the male and female choice of certain external modification devices (supportive moves).

A. Rationale

The previous studies which have been conducted on request speech act in Kurdish language, so far addressed the request strategies within the head act

(the main utterance in the request sequence that can convey the request act by itself) in terms of the degree of directness or indirectness. Despite the fact that several studies have dealt with request speech act in Kurdish language such as the one by Alzeebaree, & Yavuz (2017), and Hamad (2016), however, there is a lack of scholarly literature on Kurdish Language in general and on request modifications in particular. As a result, conducting a significant study as mentioned will contribute to filling the literature gap in this area.

This study investigates the use of external mitigating devices, which are also called supportive moves, which are employed by male and female to mitigate the imposition force of requests and the impact of the linguistic and cultural parameters on this use

.

B. Aims of the Study

The primary objective of this paper is to explore the differences and similarities between the male and female Kurdish speakers in terms of the semantic formulae and frequencies of external request mitigating devices that they use in everyday communication. It is also an attempt to explore the effect of situational factors on the realization patterns of request modification produced by male and female speakers; therefore, it can contribute to the understanding of request realization in Kurdish culture, the situational and sociocultural parameters that influence this realization. In addition, this study particularly aims to 1. Identify the types of external request mitigating devices used Kurdish men and women. 2. Explore whether or not male and female interlocutors use similar or different mitigating devices when they perform requests; 3. Highlight the influence of social power, social distance and request imposition on the utilization of external request mitigating devices by male and female speakers.

C. Research Questions

The following enquiries are introduced for investigation in this study.

1. Do male and female Kurdish speakers vary in their use of external request mitigating devices?

2. How do the social variables of power and social distance influence the use of external mitigating devices produced by male and female requests?

Previous Studies on Request Speech Act and Request Modifications

Since the late 1970s, the notion of mitigation has been introduced, when the concept of illocutionary act was operationalized in discourse analysis. Fraser (1990) introduced this term to refer to those linguistics terms used by speakers to save themselves against interactional risks. Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]) view mitigation as a synonym of politeness and it is the center of Goffman's (1967) notion of face and Leech's (1983) maxims of politeness, in particular, the Tact Maxim. Holmes (1984) considered mitigation as a way to reducing the effect of a certain speech act when it is expected to be viewed as a negative act.

Request modifications are defined by Reiter (2000) as the integral tools that can be attached to the request head act. Moreover, as stated by Trosborg (1995) request modification devices are considered as either the softening or upgrading tools that can be employed to either upgrade or soften the effect of the requester requesting behavior. Request modifications are divided by House and Kasper (1981) into two types; "downgraders" and "upgraders" (p. 166).

Upgraders consist of the devices that increase or amplify the request force, while downgraders, which are the main focus of investigation of the current study, include all devices which are employed to lessen or mitigate the illocutionary force of the request. However, it is worth mentioning upgraders and syntactic downgraders are beyond the scope of this study.

Downgraders are categorized according to their position in the request utterance, by those scholars such as Blum-kulka et al. (1989); Faerch and Kasper (1989); Trosborg (1995); Sifianou(1999) whose main interest was investigating downgraders in to two different categories which are internal and external downgraders.

Internal modifiers defined by Blum-Kulka (1989) as "elements within the request utterance proper (linked to the head act), the presence of which is not essential for the utterance to be potentially understood as a request (P. 60)." Blum-Kulka et al (1989) classified internal downgraders into two main types; the first type comprises the lexical/phrasal downgraders that are also used within the request head act to mitigate its imposition, such as the marker please, understaters, downtoners, etc, and the second type comprises syntactic downgraders, such as interrogative, conditional, negative structures and aspect markings that are employed to soften the imposition force of the request. However, internal modification will not be addressed in this study.

As regards the second category of downgraders - the external mitigating devices which will be the main focus of this study, it is considered as not having any effect on the utterance employed for realizing the act, but rather the context in which it is embedded, and thus indirectly modifies the illocutionary force. External modification might function as either a softener or upgrader, mitigating or emphasizing the force of the whole request. However, it is worth mentioning that the present paper will only examine those external modifiers whose function is to soften the request.

External modification devices has been described by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984, p. 201) as the supportive moves that are "localized not within the "Head act" but within its immediate context", and indirectly modify the illocutionary force (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). Supportive moves, such as justifications and explanations of various kinds, e.g. I missed the previous lecture, would you give me your notes?), can be located either before or after the head act (Edmondson 1981; Faerch and Kasper 1989).

The modification of a speech act has become the focus of a number of studies (Blum-Kulka, et al. 1989; Holmes 1984). This area of research has become of central importance in cross-cultural and interlanguage studies with the aim of identifying the appropriate norm of using language in communication, as a number of studies have pointed to the existing cross-cultural differences with regard to using mitigation devices in a number of speech acts such as request. The first study conducted in this aspect is the Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) which is a well-known project that explored request and apology across a number of languages, and native and non-native varieties, including American English, Australian English, British English, Canadian French, German and Hebrew. Many investigation has been conducted following the CCSARP, such as the one by Abdolrezapour & Eslami-Rasekh (2012); Economidou-Kogetsidis (2008); Schauer 2004) adopting the CCSARP coding scheme in their investigation of patterns of the speech

acts of request across languages and cultures. In addition, there are several studies that have examined the use of modifications by language learners compared to that of native speakers (House and Kasper 1987; Blum-Kulka 1989; Trosborg 1995; Hassall 2001; Schauer 2004; Woodfield 2006).

Furthermore, various studies such as the one by Abdul Sattar and Maryam Farnia (2014); Aldhulaee (2011); Al-Ali and Alawneh (2010); Al-Ali and Sahawneh, (2008); Abdul Sattar, Lah and Suleiman (2009) have examined the use of request modifications in Arabic cultures. The focus of these studies was mainly on the internal and external request modifiers employed by Arab ESL/EFL learners when they interact in English.

Further, numerous cross-gender and cross-cultural studies on this speech act (Abdolrezapour & Eslami-Rasekh 2012; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008; Reiter et al 2005) have been developed examining the effect of gender on the request modification performance.

Despite the fact that there is no enough evidence about the men and women behaviour in all cultures regarding the use of certain strategy to mitigate the force of their speech acts, however, as claimed by Mills (2003) "decisions about what is appropriate or not are decided upon strategically within the parameters of the community of practice" (p.235).

Different attempts have been made to find the effect of gender on the performance of different speech acts and most have found that female speakers do use more positive politeness strategies than males in the context under investigation (e.g. Baxter 2000; Mikako 2005).

With regard to request speech act, various studies have been conducted exploring the differences in male and female performing behavior. It has been found out that female speech "sounds much more 'polite' than men's" because of the greater use of compounded requests and the use of features such as tag questions " (Lakoff 1973) (p. 56).

Moreover, in an investigation on the request for information produced by male and female Canadian speakers by Macaulay (2001), similar results to previous results were achieved; it appeared that Canadian male speakers employed less indirect request for information than the female interviewers did. However, in a recent study by Ishikawa (2013), he claimed that women of his study are less polite than men, as the male subjects in his study tended to use direct requests more.

Similarly, in an Arabic context, in a study that examined polite request strategies as used by male speakers of Yemani Arabic in the same gender and cross gender investigation, higher tendency towards the use of direct strategies has been observed in male to male interactions (Marrani and Sazalies 2010).

A similar result has been achieved in a study conducted by Alzeebaree and Yavuz (2017) investigating the request and apology strategies used by Kurdish EFL undergraduate students, the findings of his study revealed that the female subjects had more polite requestive behavior than males as women showed higher tendency to use inexplicit and indirect strategies than male speakers (who employed more explicit and direct strategies of request).

Another trend of studies has focused on figuring out the impact of some contextual factors such as power and social distance on direct and indirect request and softener devices in different cultures. In a study by Wolfson (1989), the results indicated that the social distance and power relation between the speakers do have an effect on the requestive form produced. Moreover, he claimed that people vary their requests between direct and indirect strategies depending on different factors such as power relations, social distance, and cultural values, in order to diminish the potential damage on addresse's face in interactions, In a cross-cultural study by Abdul Sattar and Farnia (2014) examining the differences and similarities with regards to the realization of request external modifications by Malay and Iraqi, the findings showed that grounders are the most common external modifier used by the subjects. However, both Iraqis and Malays differed in their perception of the situational factors.

With respects to effect of social variable on the male and female requesting behavior in Arabic context, in a study by Al-Ammar (2000) who has explored the linguistic strategies and realizations of request behavior among a number of Saudi female in spoken English and Arabic English, the result showed that requestive behavior of interlocutors differed according to the social situations. Moreover, the result revealed that there is a relationship between the use of direct strategies and social distance and power.

 A similar result has been reached at in an investigation by Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh (2012), in their study on the effect of social variables of power, distance and the rank of imposition on the request speech act, that there is a positive correlation between the power of the requestee and imposition of the request and the degree of mitigation devices in the Iranian culture as opposed to Americans who appeared to consider themselves at the same social level with the addressee and no one is viewed as having dominant power than the other individuals. In another study on refusal speech act, Abdolrezapour and Vahid Dastjerdi (2013) found that social variables such as social power and social distance has an effect on the way Iranians used mitigation devices when refusing while Americans' refusals did not change considerably with regard to social variables.

Methodology

A. Participants

 The participants of the study consisted of ten male and 10 female Kurdish speakers, whose native language is Sorani Kurdish. The age of the subjects ranged from eighteen to thirty years old. They were post and undergraduate students studying at different universities to obtain either bachelors' or masters' degrees. The participants were chosen as the target population in order to ensure as much homogeneity as possible in terms of educational background, social class and their possible future occupation.

B. Instrument

Discourse Completion Task (DCT) is employed as the main tool to collect the required data. DCT is defined as a "questionnaire containing a set of very briefly described situations designed to elicit a particular speech act" (Varghese & Billmyer 1996, p. 40). There are several reasons for employing such tool as collecting tool in current study. First, it allows the researchers, in a short period of time, to collect large amount of data. Second, such tool as described by Ellis (1994), is "a controlled method… {which} provide information about the kinds of semantic formulas that learners use to realize different illocutionary acts, and reveal the social factors that learners think are important for speech act performance" (p. 164).

The DCT employed in this study is a modified version adopted first by Reiter (2000). It consists of 12 situations (see Figure 1: Appendix 1) and a short questionnaire about sex, age, and educational background of the participants. The situations vary according to a number of social variables such as: 1) the social power between the speakers, 2) the social distance between the speakers, and 3) the relative social dominance of the participants. Each situation is followed by a blank space in which the participants were asked to write a request accordingly. The items of the DCT were in English and were translated into Kurdish Language.

The 12 aforementioned situations were categorized into three classifications in terms of the absence or presence of the social variables of power (P) and distance (D) between interlocutors as follows:

Table 1: DCT Categories according to the social power variable

Situations with S<H P-	S>H P+	S=H
S1: Borrow book from a professor	S3: Employees as new trainee to cover the telephone	S4:Ask friend to ask someone for directions
S2: Time off errand	S7: Cancel vacation	S5: Ask for a lift
S6: Borrow car	S8: Type letter	S9: borrow a house
		S10 switch seats
S11: Ask for money	S12: Borrow computer	

Table 2: DCT Categories according to the social distance (SD)

-SD= the relationship is close between interlocutors	+SD = the relationship is far between interlocutors
S2	S1
S4	S3
S6	S5
S7	S10
S8	S11
S9	S12

C. The Classification of External Mitigating Devices (Supportive Moves)

As the main objective of this study is to identify the external softeners, therefore, the analysis of this modification will be done first. To be able to identify the external mitigating devices in the request utterance(s), it is necessary to identify the request

	Definition	Example
Alerter:, such as „excuse me", „hey", „sir", „hi", „David", „you", etc, e.g.,	the element that the speaker uses to attract the hearer's attention or to alert him/her to receiving the request	Excuse me mate, can I borrow your notes for a short time?
Greeting alerter	Initial communications	Hello
Address alerter	Addresses hearer by name, title, or other term expressing social standing	Ahmed, brother, teacher and doctor
Endearment term	The speaker addresses the hearer by using endearment words	e.g.“Mate",“My precious brother".
Grounder	The speaker gives reasons, explanations, or justifications for his/her request.	*I forgot my notebook*. Can I borrow yours?
Disarmer	The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise.	*I know you are very busy,* but could you help me to answer these questions?
Imposition minimizer	The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the hearer by his request.	Would you give me a lift? *But only if you are going my way.*
Preparatory	The speaker prepares the hearer for ensuing request by announcing that he/she will make a request by asking the potential availability of the hearer or by asking for the hearer's permission to make the request	*I'd like to ask you something*. Can you lend me some money?
Getting a pre-commitment	The speaker tries to get the hearer's promise in advance before he/she issues a request to avoid refusal	*Would you do me a favour?* Can you tell me the direction to the airport?
Apology	The speaker apologises for making the request and for the imposition that the request might have on the hearer.	*I'm very sorry*, but I want to borrow your book for a short time.
Appreciation	The speaker expresses his/her appreciation for the hearer's compliance with the request before or after it is performed.	*Thanks for your nice food*. Can you give the bill, pleas
Promise of Reward	The requester can announce a reward for the fulfilment of the request,	Can you clean the room today? *I'll do it when it is your turn.*

head act first. Then through the examination of the structure of the head act the external mitigating devices will be identified through analyzing the external elements that are added outside the head act. For example: Dear teacher, I need a book to finish my paper, I went to library but it was closed I missed class yesterday. And you are the only one who has this source. Could I borrow your book for short period of time? I promise I return it soon.

The example shows that the request sequence may include several strategies including alerters, such as address terms (teacher), proposed supportive moves (I need a book to finish my paper, I went to library but it was closed. And you are the only one who has this source), the request proper, or Head act (could I borrow your book), optionally elaborated with pre-supportive moves (I need a book to finish my paper, I went to library but it was closed. And you are the only one who has this source) and post-supportive move (I promise to return them by tomorrow). However, in the present study, the focus will be only on external modifications.

The categorization scheme employed in this study, for classifying external mitigating devices is based primarily on the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) see table (3). Because aggravating supportive moves (threats and insults) did not appear in the study, only mitigating supportive moves were addressed. It is worth mentioning that in this study the three types of preparators are categorized as one category (Preparatory), which include three elements: 1. Preparing the speech act, e.g., there is something I want you to do for me. 2. Checking availability, e.g., are you doing anything at the moment? 3. Getting a pre-commitment, e.g., can you do me a favour?

Table (3) below illustrates the final taxonomy of external modifications used (following Blum-Kulka et al., 1989 classification): however, it is worth mentioning that, in the category given, below only those strategies produced in this study are highlighted

Table 3: External Request Modifications Categories Used in the Study

Results

In order to identify whether Kurdish men and women in this study have used different or similar types of mitigating devices in each situation, the qualitative method is being followed. These differences were pointed out by examining the types and functions of the mitigating devices

The final coding revealed that the study participants used 8 supportive moves: Preparators, grounders, disarmers, promises of reward, imposition minimizers, expressions of appreciation, and apologies. Another type of external modifying device observed in the study is the use of precursors or alerters. These are external elements whose function is to draw the addressee's attention to the request. On the whole, four different kinds of alerters were detected in our data: (a) titles, (b) formulaic greetings, (c) endearment term, and (d) address term What it is interesting in this study is that some modifiers were produced by

participants which were not introduced in Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) coding manual. They could be classified as appreciation, apology, alerters (endearment term, official term of address). All of the new strategies which emerged in the study are considered as supportive moves (see Table 4).

Table 4: Overall Use of the External Modification Devices by Kurdish Male and Female Speakers

Strategies	Male		Female	
	F	%	F	%
Grounder	48	8.0%	64	10.6%
Preparatory	29	4.8%	23	3.8%
Cost minimizer	10	1.7%	15	2.5%
Disarmer	9	1.5%	12	2.0%
Appreciations "supas"=thanks	11	1.8%	35	5.8%
Apology "bbora" =sorry	10	1.7%	14	2.3%
Formulaic greeting "slaw"= hello	38	6.3%	45	7.5%
Endearment Term "gyan" =dear	10	1.7%	24	4.0%
Official address term "barez"= respectable	20	3.3%	37	6.1%
Social address term "hawre"=friend	13	2.2%	15	2.5%
Role address term "barewbar"= boss	8	1.3%	6	1.0%
Role address term "mamosta"= teacher	8	1.3%	10	1.7%
Alerter total		16.1		22.8% total
be zahmat	12	2.0%	6	1.0%
azet nabe	11	1.8%	6	1.0%
ba ark nabe	120	3.3%	24	4.0%
Promise of Reward	4	0.7%	0	0%
Im you're your neighbour	2	0.3%	0	0%
checking availability	3	0.5%	0	0%
	266	44.2%	336	55.8%

As regards the main goal of the study, overall, the result shows that Kurdish female speakers tended to use these external modifications (Alerter 22.8%, grounder 10.6%, appreciation5.8%, imposition minimizer 2.5%, and apology 2.3% disarmer 2.0%) with higher rate than the male speakers did who used (alerters 16.1%, grounder 8.0%, appreciation 1.8%, cost minimizers 1.7%, apology 1.7%, and disarmer 1.5%). However, as it is observed from the table (4), preparatory is favoured more by male 5.3% speakers than females who employed is around 3.8%.

Alerters/ precursors, which are described as external elements whose purpose are to draw the addressee's attention to the, constitute the first most preferred external modification by both males and females. Further, as the table (5) indicates female speakers used all types of alerters, except one type, the official address term "boss", with higher frequency than male subjects did. On the whole, five different types of precursors have been detected in the data such as (a) address terms, (b) formulaic greetings, (c) endearment term and (d). Examples and the percentages of type can be seen in table (5)

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage of Kurdish Male and Female Use of Alerters

Alerter Types	Male		Female	
	F	%	F	%
Formulaic greeting Ex: (Slaw)= Hello	38	6.3%	45	7.5%
Endearment term Ex: (gyan)=dear	10	1.7%	24	4.0%

Address term Ex: (barez)= respectable	20	3.3%	37	6.1%
Address term Ex: (Hawre) =friend	13	2.2%	15	2.5%
Official address term Ex:(janabi barewbar)= boss	8	1.3%	6	1.0%
teacher	8	1.3%	10	1.7%
Total		16.1		22.8%

As it is noticed from the table (4), grounder is the second most frequent external modifier among male and female responses. It occurred across the twelve situations with different frequencies in female data. In situation four, however, grounder did not produced by males.

Despite the fact that preparatory is found to be the third most desired external softener by male speakers which accounted for 5.3%, however, female participants instead favored the use of appreciation around 3.7%. Similar to the above mentioned external modification devices, instances of appreciation was favored more by female subjects. It appeared in 35 instances provided by women compared to 10 times occurrence in men responses. Examples of appreciation in Kurdish data such as "supas"= thanks or "zor supast akam,"I would be very thankful" can be found below in Ex 3.

Examples of the all discussed modification devices are found below

Examples

Ex 1:

ببوره دەتوانم داوایەکت لێ بکەم، چەند شتێکم هەیە دەمەوێ بیگوازمەوه پێویستم به ئۆتۆمبێله، دەتوانی هاوکاریم بکەی؟

Bbora (apology) datwanim dawaykt le bikam (preparatory), chand shtekm haya damawe begwzmawa , I need a car, can you help me?

Sorry (apology) can I ask for something (preparatory) I have some stuff which I need to move them by car can you help me?

Ex 2 :

سڵاو جەنابی بەرێوەبەر ببوره کاتتان لێئەگرم، بەڵام داوایەکم له بەرێزتان هەیه گەر بکری، ئەمرۆ زۆر پێویستم به برێک پاره هەیه، ناتوانم له کەسی داوا بکەم، یارمەتیم بدەن به برێک پاره وەك قەرز دواتر ئێوه له موچەکەمی ببرن.

Hello Sir boss sorry (apology) for taking your time(disarmer) but I have a request from your highness(preparatory) if it is possible, I do really

need some amount of money I can't ask anybody help me with some amount of money as a loan you can take it later from my salary(cost minimizer).

Ex 3 :

مامۆستا به داوا لێبوردنەوه من زور له پێش دەرگای کتێبخانه وەستام کتێبخانەکه داخرا بوو بەڵام کەس لەوەی نەبوو مەمنونت دەبم ئەگەر کتێبەکەی خۆتم بدەیتێ سوپاس بۆ هاوکاریکردنت.

Mamosta (address tem) ba dawae lebordnawa(apology) min zor la pesh dargae ktebxanae wistam , ktebxana dakhrabw kas lawe nabw (gounder), mamnunt dabm agr ktebkae xod bmdaete, supas bo hawkaret(appreciation)

Teacher(address term) with my apology(apology) I waited for so long in front of library but it was closed and there was no one there(grounder) I would be grateful can you give me your book thanks (appreciation)for your help

As we can see from table (4), external request modifications of disarmer, imposition minimizers and apology are the least preferred utterances among male and female speakers. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier they occurred with higher percentage in females data than males. Examples of apology such as "bbora" (Iam sorry) or "ba dawae lebordnaw" (with my apology), imposition minimizer and disarmer can be found below in Ex 4.

Having a closer look at the use of each one of the devices, it can be noticed that there is a very low incidence of disarmers in both male and female responses; they were used only in four situations, namely situation 1 by both male and female and in 7, and 8 by male and 3, 6 by female. It would appear that both male and female speakers employed the highest number of disarmers in those situations where there was social status difference between the participants.

Having a look at table (4), It is interesting to find that Kurdish male and female participants extensively used some formuliac expressions such as "ba ark nabe"(I'm not ordering you), "be zahmat" (if it doesn't cause any pressure on you) and "azet nabe" (it doesn't bother you) to minimize the imposition of the request. Unlike other types of external modifiers as table (4) illustrates, Kurdish male subjects employed such devices more than female interlocutors did. Examples of these types of minimizers can be seen below in boldface.

Ex4:

ببوره مامۆستا زۆر پێویستیم به سەرچاوەیەك هەیه و کتێبخانه داخراوه، هەروەها کاتم زۆر کەم بەدەستەوه ماوه. بەئەرك نەبێ دەتوانیت ئەو سەرچاوەیەم بدەیتێ، لەکورترین کاتدا بۆتی دەهێنمەوه، سوپاست دەکەم.

.

Bbora mamosta pewstm ba sarchawek haya w

Strategies	Male S>H P+	Female S>H P+	Male Equal S=H	Female Equal S=H	Male Lower S<H P-	Female Lower S<H P-
Grounder	16(11.4 %)	18 (12.9%)	7(4.8%)	15(10.3%)	25 (8.5%)	31(10.5%)
Preparatory	1(0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	12 (8.2%)	11 (7.5%)	16 (5.4%)	11(3.7%)
Cost Minimizer	2(1.4%)	6 (4.3%)	0		8 (2.7%)	9(3.1%)
Appreciation/ Thank	3(2.1%)	7 (5%)	2 (1.4%)	10 (6.9%)	6 (2.0%)	18(6.1%)
Disarmer	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)	0	2 (1.4%)	7 (2.4%)	8(2.7%)
Apology "sorry"	3 (2.1%)	6 (4.3%)	3(2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	4 (1.4%)	7(2.4%)

ktebkhana dakhrawa, harwaha katm kam ba dastmaw mawa, ba ark nabe harchande kare bareztan nya, datwanit aw sarchawaym bdaete, la korttren katda bote dahenmaw, supast dakam.

Hello , sorry (apology)teacher (address term)I need this source and the library is closed and I don't have enough time(grounder) , I'm not ordering you (formulaic minimizer) even I know it is not your highness job(disarmer)can you lend me that source. I will bring it back to you so soon (cost minimizer). Thank you (appreciation)

Ex 5:

سڵاو مامۆستا گیان من بۆ توێژینەوەکەم پێویستم بە کتێبێکە بەڵام کاتم کەمە و کتێبخانەش داخراوە، ئەتوانی یارمەتیم بدیت. بێزەحمەت ئەو کتێبەم پێ بدەی بۆ ئەوەی توێژینەوەکەم تەواو بکەم.

Slaw(greeting) mamosta(address term) gyan(endearment term) mn bw twezhenawakam pewstm ba

ktebeka, balam katm kama w ktebkhana dakhrawa(grounder), atwani yarmatem bdaet(preparatory), be zahmat (formulaic minimiser), aw ktebam pe bda bo awe twezhenawakam tawaw bikam

Hello (greeting) dear (endearment term) teacher(address term), I need a book for my research paper and I have got little time to submit and the library is closed(grounder), can you help me?(preparatory) If it doesn't causes pressure on you (formulaic minimiser), give me that book so I can finish my research paper.

Regarding the effect of social power on the use of external modifications, from table (6) below, it can be observed that the subjects in both groups adopt similar strategies in making request to their superiors. The most common mitigating devices used by both male and female speakers are alerters, grounders, cost minimizers, disarmers, appreciation, and apology, preparatory. Nevertheless, it is interesting to find that female Kurdish speakers inclined to use these strategies with higher percentage than male speakers did. Female's use of grounder accounted for (10.5%), and for appreciation (6.1%), cost minimizer (3.1%), apology (2.7%), disarmer (2.4%) of females' total responses to high rank addresses while males' use of grounder accounted for (8.5%), cost minimizer (2.7%), disarmer (2.4%), and appreciation (2.0%). However, it necessary to note that male subjects used the preparatory device with higher percentage than female speakers did. 16 Instances of preparatory device were used by male speakers as compared to only 11 instances by female subjects.

Alerters						
Greeting "Hello"	13 (9.3%)	14 (10.0%)	8 (5.5%)	6 (4.1%)	17 (5.8%)	25 (8.5%)
Endearmet term "dear"	2(1.4%)	6 (4.3%)	2 (1.4%)	8 (5.5%)	6 (2.0%)	10 (3.4%)
Official address term "barez"	5(3.6%)	9 (6.4%)	6 (4.1%)	9 (6.2%)	9 (3.1%)	19 (6.5%)
Role address term "boss"					7 (2.4%)	6 (2.0%)
Social address term "friend"			9 (6.2%)	9 (6.2%)		
Role address term "teacher"			0		8 (2.7%)	10 (3.4%)
be zahmat	5 (3.6%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.4%)	4 (2.7%)	2 (0.7%)	1(0.3%)
ba ark nabe	6 (4.3%)	12 (8.6%)	7 (4.8%)	5 (3.4%)	7 (2.4%)	7(2.4%)
azet nabe			2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (1.4%)	4 (1.4%)
how are you				1 (0.7%)		2(0.7%)
	58 (41.4%)	82 (58.6%)	63 (43.2%)	83 (56.8%)	126 (42.9%)	168(57.1%)

Table 6: Frequency and Percentage of Kurdish male and female speakers use of the external modification devices in relation to social power

Comparing the use of alerters across the three power relation situations by both male and females, as table (6) shows, similar to the above mentioned external modifiers, two types of alerter namely formulaic greeting "hello", endearment term "dear", and official address term "barez" are detected with high percentage in both males' and females' requests in situations where the requesters had less dominant status than the addresses.

However, a more detailed consideration of the data in table (6) shows that some kinds of alerter such as the social address tem "friend", role address term "teacher", and "boss" are situation specifics as for instance social address term "friend" occurred only in both male and female data and with similar frequency (6.2%) in situations where there is equal power relationship between the interlocutors (S=H), while, role address terms such as "boss" and "teacher" are detected with similar percentages in both male and female data only in situations where the requesters are inferior to the addresses.

Concerning, the occurrence of formulaic minimizer in relation to the social power factor, having a detailed look at the total percentage of the three of them, it appears that it occurred in male data in situations where both the requester and the hearer are equal (S=H) (9.6%) as compared to their occurrence in women data. Female subjects, however, employed them with higher frequency about (9.3%) in situations where they happened to be superior to the addressee (S>H P+).

With respect to the effect of social distance on the frequency of external modifications by male and female participants, as table (7) shows, in a remote social distance situations (+SD), these devices such as grounder, apology, cost minimizer, disarmer, preparatory, appreciation and some of the alerter types such as greeting, official address term "barez", role address term such as "barewbar"=boss and role address term "mamosta" were observed in responses provided by both male and female participants. However, as table (7) illustrates, there are differences in the number of times with which each device employed by male and female subjects. Female participants employed these devices (grounder, appreciation, cost minimizer, and disarmer and some of the aleter types namely endearment term "dear", and official address term "barez") with a higher percentage than male speakers did. Male speakers, on the other hand, tended to use these devices (preparatory and apology) with a higher frequency than male subjects. Preparatory and apology occurred with (5.6 %), (2.0%) in male responses, as compared to (3.2 %), (1.8%) in female responses.

As opposed to male and females orientation in situations where there is a remote social distance between interlocutors, in a close social distance situations (-SD), the high percentage of devices used delivered by male subjects. Both male and female participants used these strategies: grounder, preparatory, cost minimizer, appreciation disarmer, apology, and these alerters (such as official address term "boss", social address term "friend", official address term "barez", endearment term "dear", formulaic greeting "hello") in the close social distance situations. However, as mentioned earlier men issued these strategies with higher rate than female speakers except for two modifications namely appreciation and endearment term "dear" which were delivered with higher percentage by women than men did. It is interesting to note that ''friend'' is used only in close social distance situations and with nearly similar frequency by both male and female participants and ''teacher'' found with similar frequencies in only remote social distance situations.

As far as the use of formulaic minimizers concerned in relation to the social distance variable, overall, male participants utilize them with higher frequency in both cases in situations where there is remote social distance between the interlocutors (+SD) and in situations where the interlocutors are intimate and familiar with each other(-SD). Overall male participants issued them with (7.5%) in remote social distance situations and around (11.5%) in responses given in close social distance situations.

Discussion

The findings of the current study come in agreement with the previous studies (Hassall 2001; House & Kasper 1987; Trosborg 1995), as both men and women speakers used grounders (giving reasons, explanations, and justifications in requests more than any other supportive moves.

Comparing the responses provided by both male and female across the 12 situations. Generally, Kurdish female speakers issued external modifiers more frequently than male speakers did. Thus, it could be claimed that women tended to be cooperative and stress the affective function of the language than male did.

This could be explained in the light of Kurdish

female's extensive use of grounder across the twelve situations and most surprisingly in S4 where no justification is required. Therefore, it could be claimed that Kurdish female speakers attempted to show and maintain cooperation with their addresses by justifying and giving reasons with the aim of diminishing the effect of their request on the addressee

Moreover, the extensive use of apology and appreciation by women could be attributed to the fact that women use the external modification as negative politeness strategy which put emphasis on minimizing the imposition of the request on the listener (Tannen 1999)

As far as the effect of gender on the production ad frequency of modification devices concerned, as mentioned earlier female subjects employed the discussed external modification devices except for two devices namely (preparatory and promise of reward) with more frequency than the male speakers did.

Furthermore, a deeper analysis of the types and the frequency of the alerters used by women subjects such as the endearment term namely "gyan"= my dear and address term "barez" or "janab" as respectable or your highness, reveals that women employed these formulaic expression more than men did.

These mitigating devices are described as in-group identity or involvement markers and they are used normally as a face redressing devices. These expressions are considered as politeness marker as described by El-Shazly's (1993) and Aloui's (2011). Moreover, it could be argued that these expressions as claimed El-Shazly's (1993) and Aloui's (2011) are used by women as they expect their request to be viewed as polite and comply with the socially and culturally established norm.

As regards the second research questions of whether social power and social distance are the motivating factor behind the differences and similarities in the use of external modifications by both Kurdish men and women, it appears that, in Kurdish culture, social power and distance are influential factors in determining the amount of mitigation involved in a request act in any situation.

Since the external modifier (grounder) found to be the most frequent example of modifier which was used with higher frequency than other supportive moves by both group in situations where they are happened to be subordinate, thus, it could be claimed that the social power variable do have an influence on Kurdish male and female responses. By examining

closely the situation 1, 2, 6, and 12 in which grounder are used; the effect of the unequal social power on participants' relation could be observed. Grounder is highly employed by both male and female in S1 (book).

Social power here functioned as a motivating agent which pushed the speakers in in less dominate position to use this device extensively in order to mitigate the force of their request directed to high rank addresses. This comes in line with what Aldhulaee (2011) suggests that using external modifications with a high percentage, when making a request to someone with a higher status, is as an attempt by requesters to manage the face rapport.

It is worth mentioning that instances of the mentioned external modification devices provided by women in superior positions are higher than those given by men. This is in line with the Schiffrin, Deborah & Heidi (2003 p.549) argumentation that "more females use polite linguistic forms than males in everyday interaction because they are more likely to be in lower-status positions."

This could be justified in the light of what Holmes (1993) claimed that women usually incline towards using linguistic devices that place emphasis on solidarity more often than men do. They attempt to emphasize the affective functions of the language, as opposed to men who were found orienting to use language devices that will stress the power and status. Moreover, it could be argued that women subjects in this respect attempted to be more polite by overusing the external modifications. This could be associated to Scollon and Scollon (1995) demonstration who described the devices which are used in situations where the speakers deemed to be in a lower position than the addressees, as independence strategies, as they help to minimize threat or to show respect to the interlocutor

Since both male and female subjects used almost all the external modifications in situations where they are inferiors , it can be claimed that Kurdish culture as Iraqi culture can be considered as one of the cultures in which the hierarchical relationships and the mutual obligation are basic characteristics of the cultural system (DeCapua and Wintergerst 2004). Hierarchical relationships are stressed within Kurdish culture as other Iraq within the family network and in institutional and educational organizations. Respect and deference have to be shown to those who are dominant to them in institutions, parents or even elder siblings. When issuing a request to someone with a higher social status or role, Kurdish requesters similar to the Iraqi requester is expected to show

deference through justifying and mitigating his/her request.

Thus, this finding is in agreement to the result reported by Abdul Sattar et al. (2009) that in Iraqi culture "making a request to someone in authority may impose heavier psychological burdens than making a request to someone of a lower status" (p. 64). In this respect, the findings support Brown's and Levinson's (1987), Economidou Kogetsidis's (2008) and Nikula's (1996) argumentation that the rank of imposition of the request and social power of the addressee are determining factors in using mitigation devices.

A further analysis of the data revealed that, as explained earlier there appeared to be differences in terms of the effect of social distance on women and men selection and frequency of modification devices. The male participants of the study used these modification devices (grounder, apology, disarmer, imposition minimizer, appreciation, preparatory, and alerters) with a higher rate in situations where they issued their request to friends or the people with whom they have close relationship. Conversely, women subjects favored to use (disarmer, appreciation, imposition minimizer, and some of the alerter types in situations in which there were a remote social distance between the interlocutors.

It could be argued that women's extensive use of most of the softening devices in situations where they deemed to be subordinate and have remote social distance, they attempt to show more respect by showing their awareness of the imposition that their request might have on the addressee. This is in conformity with Abdul Sattar and Farina (2014) claim that the use of modification strategy, in situations where the requester has less authority and in remote social distance with the addressees could function as a way of redressing the face-threatening act of request. Thus, the use of apology as a mitigation device would mitigate the interaction and manage the face rapport. In addition, it could be argued that women subjects attempted to maintain the positive face of the requestees.

However, females' interlocutors employed these mitigations such as (apology, preparatory and grounder) with higher frequency in situations in which the addressee is of a close social distance. This shows that women tend to show cooperativeness, and attempt to emphasise involvement as noted by Economidou-Kogetsidis (2008) who claims that external modifications can function as a positive politeness strategy emphasizing closeness and involvement.

This could be clarified by women's use of these mitigations such as preparatory in situation 9 (when asking to borrow a friend house) with higher rate than other situations in which this device is used. This stands in contrast to men orientation who employed preparatory as a negative politeness strategy to minimize the face-threatening effect of the request and as a way to show consideration for the addressee when requesting a professor who is superior and hold distant relationship with the requester.

It is interesting to note that besides the minimizers used by both males and females to mitigate the tangible cost of requests in time, effort or possession, they also used these formulaic utterances such as "ba ark nabe" azet nabe" and "be zahmat" as imposition minimizers to soften the moral cost of their requests (the threat that the request may have on the requestees negative or positive face. Both men and women used them with somehow similar frequency in all situations regardless of the power relation factor.

As far as the effect of social power and social distance on these formulaic minimizers concerned, instances of the three of them are found in situations where there are equal and unequal social relationships between the interlocutors. However, with regards to the effect of social distance on the use and frequency of formulaic minimisers by both men and women, men issued them and with high frequency (see table 7) in situations where the interlocutors are intimate or familiar with each other, while women employed them in situations where the requesters and adressees are stranger. These formulaic minimisers as explained by Al-Ageel (2016) were used to function as both saving face through mitigating the force of the request showing solidarity or a higher degree of politeness to the hearer, which was also referred to by Hemereshid Meruf (2013). The researchers, here tend to classify these formulaic minimizer as a kind of apologizing or "strategic disarmer" based on Trosborg's (1995: 384) description of apology as "strategic disarmers" and identifying its function that is used to as opening to face threatening act to apologize for bringing troubles, disturbing or interrupting the hearers that the speaker's request causes.

Conclusion

The present paper is a socio-pragmatic research focusing on the type and the frequency of the external modifying strategies used by male and female Kurdish university students by studying 1.the similarities and differences between the responses

provided by male and female participants and 2. The differences and similarities between men's and women's selection of supportive moves in relation to social power and social distance. The results obtained in this study would contribute to enhancing our understanding of the way these Kurdish male and female speakers modify their requests in different contexts and in different situations.

Having examined the similarities and differences between Kurdish males and females in terms of types and the frequency of mitigations provided, the findings showed that there are differences between Kurdish females and males in the rate of frequencies of the external modification devices. Females inclined to use most of the external modifying devices such as alerters, grounder, disarmer, and apology and cost minimizer with high percentage than males do. This is coinciding with the previous studies (Cameron, 2000, and Mills, 2003) that claim that females are more likely to employ mitigating devices than males.

The data also showed that the social variables namely power status; social distance had an impact on the frequency and the situations in which the external modifying devices are used.

The impact of power status, for instance, was apparent in the use of most of external modifying strategies by both Kurdish men and women in situations where the requesters had less dominant role than the addresses. This is attributed to the fact that the Kurdish culture follows the hierarchal system and the speakers in such are expected to show respect and higher level of politeness to their dominant. This also become apparent by both male and female Kurdish speakers' extensive inclination towards the use of formulaic minimisers such as "ba ark nabe" (I'm not ordering you).

Moreover, from examining the differences and similarities of the rating of external modifiers in relation to the effect of social distance, it become evident that there are differences in Kurdish male and female tendencies. Kurdish female participants tend to use most of the supportive moves in situations where they had to address their request to strangers or people whom they are not familiar with, as compared to male subjects who incline to use them frequently when addressing friends.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the results of this paper are based on limited amount of data collected from small number of participants. Moreover in this study, gender is taken as the main variable to gain an insight of Kurdish speakers'

tendencies' to use certain modifying devices. Further, another limitation of the study which explains the reason why the result of this study cannot be generalized is that , only one tool of data collection(namely discourse completion task) is employed. Although, it cannot be denied that DCTs do not yield data which reflects a real life situation, however, DCT can still be used as an instrument to assess how a particular speech act might be employed. Further study that takes in to account the mentioned limitations needs to be conducted to be able to generalize and obtain more reliable result. However, it is hoped that this study would contribute to the literature as it helps and gives an insight about the cultural values and norms of Kurdish culture. Moreover, the findings may be beneficial for those who want learn Kurdish language and it helps in avoiding communication breakdowns by having familiarity with the selection of appropriate request external modification devices in various situations and in different context. In addition, the results of this study can be used as base by those researchers who attempt to find out the commonality in different language from the cross-cultural perspective.

References

1. Al-Ali, M. N. & Sahawneh, M. (2008) 'An investigation into the generic features of English requestive e-mail messages, Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) & Professional Communication, 8 (2): 40- 65

2. Al-Ali, M. & Alawneh, R. (2010). Linguistic mitigating devices in American and Jordanian students' requests. Intercultural Pragmatics, 7(2), pp. 311-339. Retrieved 23 Mar. 2019, from doi:10.1515/iprg.2010.014.

3. Abdolrezapour, Parisa & Eslami-Rasekh, Abbass. (2012). The effect of using mitigation devices on request compliance in Persian and American English. Discourse Studies - DISCOURSE STUD. 14. 145-163. 10.1177/1461445611433789.

4. Abdul Sattar, Hiba & che lah, Salasiah & Rozina, Raja. (2009). Iraqi Postgraduates' production and perception of requests: A pilot study. International Journal of Language, Society and culture (University of Tasmania – Australia). 29. 56-70.

5. Abdolrezapour, p & Vahid Dastjerdi H, (2013). Examining mitigation in refusals: A cross-cultural study of Iranian and American speech communities, Sociolinguistic Studies, Vol 6, No 3 (2012), DOI: 10.1558/sols.v6i3.519.

6. Alzeebaree, Y., Yavuz, M. A. (2017). Realization of the Speech Acts of Request and Apology by Middle Eastern EFL Learners. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(11), 7313-7327. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/79603.

7. Aldhulaee, Mohammed. (2011). Request mitigating devices in Australian English and Iraqi Arabic : a

comparative study. Master of TESOL thesis, Deakin University.

8. Baxter, J. (2000). The Joys and Justice of Housework. Sociology, 34(4), 609–631. https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038500000389.

9. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

10. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

11. Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). Applied Linguistics, 5, 196-213.

12. Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different?. Journal of Pragmatics. 11. 131-146. 10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5.

13. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

14. Edmondson, R. & Wörner, M. (1981), Theology and Rhetoric. New Blackfriars, 62: 379-387. doi:10.1111/j.1741-2005.1981.tb03304.x

15. Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2008). Internal and external mitigation in interlanguage request production: The case of Greek learners of English. Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 4(1), pp. 111-137. Retrieved 23 Mar. 2019, from doi:10.1515/PR.2008.005

16. Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), Cross-cultural pragmatics (pp. 221-247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

17. Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2005. La mitigación en el discurso oral de mexicanos y aprendices de español como lengua extranjera. Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso en cortesía en español, ed. by Diana Bravo and Antonio Briz, 285-299. Spain: Ariel.

18. Fraser, B. (1990) Perspectives on Politeness. Journal of Pragmatics, 14, 219-236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N.

19. Farnia Maryam, Sohrabie .Akbar, Abdul Sattar Hiba (2014), A pragmatic analysis of speech act of suggestion among Iranian native speakers of Farsi,Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL). V.2, Issue 2 Pages 48-61.

20. Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour. Garden City, New York: Anchor.

21. Hemrashid Meruf Abdul Wahid, Aram.(2012). Politenessin Kurdish Language: Sulaimanyah, La Rya publication.

22. Hassall, T. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL,) 39, 259-283.

23. Holmes, V. M. (1984). Sentence Planning in a Story Continuation Task. Language and Speech, 27(2), 115–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/002383098402700202.

24. House, J. and Kasper, G. (1981) Polietness Markers in Engllish and German. In: Coulmas, F., Ed., Conversational Routine, Mouton, The Hague.

25. House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Loerscher & R. Schulze (Eds.), Perspectives on language in performance (pp. 1250–1288). Tuebingen: Narr.

26. Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. Paper from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

27. Leech, G. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. London: Longman.

28. Macaulay, R. (2001), Oratio Obliqua, Oratio Recta: An Essay on Metarepresentation. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 11: 307-309. doi:10.1525/jlin.2001.11.2.307

29. Reiter Márquez,(2000) Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies, John Benjamins.

30. Sara Mills (2003). Gender and politeness. Cambridge, Cambridge UniversityPress. 270 pp., ISBN Hb 0 521 81084 1.

31. Sifianou, M. (1999), Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: a cross-cultural perspective, Clarendon Press, isbn: 9780198239727.

32. Schauer, E. Neuner, F., Elbert, T., Ertl, V., Onyut, L. P., Odenwald, M., & Schauer, M. (2004). Narrative Exposure Therapy in Children: A Case Study. Intervention: International Journal of Mental Health, Psychosocial Work & Counselling in Areas of Armed Conflict, 2(1), 18-18.

33. Trosborg, A. (1995). Interlanguage pragmatics. Requests, complaints and apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

34. Wierzbicka, A, (2003), Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction, Mouton de Gruyter

35. Woodfield, R., & Earl-Novell, S. (2006). An assessment of the extent to which subject variation in relation to the award of first class degree between the arts and sciences can explain the 'gender gap'. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27(3), 355-372.

36. Yahya Mohammed Ali Al-Marrani, Azimah Binti Sazalie, (2010), polite request strategies by male speakers of Yemeni Arabic in male-male interaction and male-female interaction, The International Journal of Language Society and Culture.

Appendix 1
Figure 1:

Situation	Social power	Social distance
Borrow book	S < H	+SD
Time-off errands	S < H	-SD
Cover the telephone	S > H	+SD
Ask for directions	S = H	-SD
Ask for a lift	S = H	+SD
Borrow car	S < H	-SD
Cancel vacation	S > H	-SD
Type letter	S > H	-SD
Borrow house	S = H	-SD
Switch seats	S = H	+SD
Ask for money	S < H	+SD
Borrow computer	S > H	+SD

Appendix 2: Questionnaire --English Version
Instructions:

You will be asked to read brief situations; you will have to act as you would in an actual situation. Do not think too much and try to be as spontaneous as possible. This questionnaire will be used for research purposes only. Thank you for your cooperation.

Name: (optional):   Age: Major:

SEX: M   F

Situation 1: You are a university student. You need to get the book from the library to finish your assignment on time. The library is closed and there is only one person you know who has the book you need, one of your lecturers. On the way to his/her office you meet him/her in the hallway. What do you say?

Situation 2: You need to run few errands down town. You think that will take you an hour. You go to your manager/ess's office at work with whom you get on well and ask him/her to cover for you. What do you say?

Situation3: You have been an employee of a company for some time now. One of your duties is to answer the telephone. You go to the desk of new trainee and ask him/her to answer the telephone while you pop out for a few minutes to get some things. What do you say to him/her?

Situation4: You are in your car with a friend. You are driving. You both need to go to X Street. Your friend was given a map with directions which s/he gave to you just before leaving the house. You are now lost. You suddenly see a pedestrian at the end of the road. You ask your friend to ask the pedestrian for directions. What do you say to your friend?

Situation5: You ask neighbor you do not know very well to help you move some things out of your apartment with his/her car since you have not got a car and you have not got anyone else to ask since everyone you know appears to be on a holiday and you have no money either to hire someone who can help or to arrange transport. You see your neighbor on the street. What do you say to him/her?

Situation6: Your car has just broken down and you need to collect someone from the airport urgently and there is no other means of getting there other than by car. You go to your manager/ess's office at work, with whom you get on well, and ask him/her for his/her car. What do you say to him/her?

Situation7: You have been put in charge of a very important project at work. Your colleague has already booked a ticket to go on a holiday. You realize you will be needing all members of the staff to finish the project on time and thus you ask him/her to stay. You ask him/her to come to your office to break the news. What do you say to him/her?

Situation8: You have been put in charge of new project at work. You go to the desk of your colleague of yours to ask him/her to type a few letters for you. What do you say to him/her?

Situation9: A friend of yours has a house in countryside. You want to go on a holiday somewhere relaxing for a week and you know nobody is going to be in the house for at least two weeks. You meet your friend in a pub and ask him/her to stay in his/her country house for a week. What do you say to him/her?

Situation10: You are on a bus with a child. There are plenty of seats on the bus but there are not any for two people together. You ask a passenger who is sitting on his/her own on a two-seater to change seats with you so that you can sit next to the child. What do you say to him/her?

Situation11: You have received a lot of house bills which are due for payment. You have not got any money. You cannot ask your friends for money since you have got a reputation of never paying back. The company where you work will not give you a cash advance since the last time you asked for one they said that would be the last time. You desperately need to pay these bills otherwise you will not have any electricity, gas or telephone. You go to the office of the recently appointed manager/ess and ask him/her for the money. What do you say to him/her?

Situation12: You have been working for a company for some time now. One of the new trainees has brought his/her new brand laptop to work. You ask him/her to use it for a while. What do you say to him/her?

Appendix 3: Modified Kurdish version of the situations

ئێمە وەكو توێذەر ھەستاوین بە ئەنجامدانی توێذینەوەیەك لەسەر ئێمە وەكو توێژەر ھەستاوین به ئەنجامدانی توێژینەوەیەك لەسەر
ئەم راپرسییە بۆكاری توێژینەوەی زانستییە و ناسنامەی بەشداربوان ئاشكرا ناكرێن

تەمەن
ڕەگەز
پیشە

ھەڵوێستی یەكەم: تو خوێندكاری (زانكۆ/ خوێندنی باڵا)ی، پێویستیت بە كتێبێكە لە كتێبخانە بۆ تەواوكردنی توێژینەوەكەت كە پێویستە
لە كاتی دیاریكراوی خۆیدا رادەستی بكەیت، بەڵام كتێبخانەكە داخراوە سەرچاوەكە تەنها لای یەكێك لە مامۆستاكانت دەستدەكەوێت
لەوكاتەشدا مامۆستاكەت لە ڕێگای كتێبخانە ببینی چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

ھەڵوێستی دووەم: تو پێویستیت بە یەك كاتژمێر ھەیە بۆ ئەوەی چەند ئەركێك لە دەرەوی شار ئەنجام بدەیت، دەچیت بۆ لای بەرپرسی
كارەكەت (بۆ زانیاری پەیوەندیەكی زۆر باشتان ھەیە) بۆ ئەوەی داوای لێ بكەیت لە كاتی چونت ئەو شوێنی تۆ بگرێتەوە، چی پێ
دەڵێیت؟

ھەڵوێستی سێیەم: تو بۆ ماوەیەكە كارمەندی لە كۆمپانیایەك، یەكێك لە ئەركەكانت ئەوەیە وڵامی پەیوەندییەكان بدەیتەوە، كاتێك

دەتەویت بۆ چەند خولەکێك بچیتە دەرەوە بۆ هێنانی هەندێك پێداویستی، بۆ ئەوەی داوا لە فەرمانبەرێکی تازە ماشقپێکراوی کۆمپانیاکە بکەیت لەو کاتەی کە دەچیتە دەرەوە شوێنی تۆ بگرێتەوە، چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی چوارەم: شۆفێری ئۆتۆمبێلەکەت دەکەیت و هاورێیەکت لەگەڵدایە، بۆ شەقامێك دەرۆن و رێگاکەتان لێ ونبووە، لە پرێکدا کەسێکی پیادەتان بینی، داوا لە هاورێکەت دەکەیت پرسیار لەو کەسە بکات سەبارەت بە ئاراستەی شەقامەکە. چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی پێنجەم: پێویستیت بەوەیە هەندێ کەلوپەل لە ماڵکەت بگوازیتەوە بەڵام ئامادەکاریت بۆ ئەو مەبەستە نەکردوە و هەموو هاورێکانت دوورن، پارشت نییە تاوەکو ئۆتۆمبیلێك بە کرێ بگریت، یەکێك لەدراوسێکانت دەبینی کە ئۆتۆمبیلی پێیە بەڵام (بەباشی نایناسیت) بۆ ئەوەی داوی لێبکەیت شمەکەکانت بۆ بگوازیتەوە چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی شەشەم: ئۆتۆمبیلەکەت پەکی کەوتووە و ئەبێ کەسێك لە فرۆکەخانە بهێنیتەوە، هیچ هۆیەکی تری گواستنەوە بۆ فرۆکەخانە نییە جگە لە ئۆتۆمبیلی تایبەت نەبیت، بچیتە نووسینگەی بەرپرسی کارمکەت کەپەیوەندیەکی زۆر باشتان هەیە، بۆ ئەوەی داوای لێبکەیت ئۆتۆمبیلەکەیت بداتێ چی پێدەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی حەوتەم: وەك بەرپرسی پرۆژەیەکی گرنگ دامەزراوی، یەکێك لە هاورێکانت لە پرۆژمکە بەمەبەستی بەسەربردنی کاتی پشوو تکتی فرۆکەی بریوە، لە کاتێکدا تۆ پێویستیت بە سەرجەم کارمەندەکانە بۆ ئەوەی پرۆژمکە لە کاتی دیاریکراوی خۆیدا تەواو بکرێت، بانگت کرد بۆ ئەوەی داوای لێبکەیت گەشتەکەی هەڵبوەشێنینتەوە. چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی هەشتەم: وەك بەرپرسی پرۆژەیەك دانەراویت، بچیتە لای یەکێك لە کارمەندەکانی کارمکەت بۆ ئەوەی داوای لێ بکەیت چەند نامەیەکت بۆ چاپ بکات چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی نۆیەم: هاورێکەت خانوویەکی لە لادێ هەیە تۆش دەتەوێ بۆ ماوەی یەك هەفتە بچیتە گەشت، ئەشزانی خانوەکەی بۆ ماوەی دوو هەفتە بەتاڵ ئەبیت، ئەتەویت لەو ماوەیە لە خانوەکەی ئەو مۆڵەتەکەت بەسەربەری، هاورێکەت لە زانکو ببینی چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی دەیەم: تۆ و هاورێیەکت لەناو پاسێکدان دوو کورسی بەتاڵتان بەتەنیشت یەکەوە دەست نەکەوت بەڵام کورسی بەتاڵی تاك زۆرە، ئەتەوێ داوا لە یەکێك لە سەرنشینەکان بکەیت کە بەتەنها دانیشتووە شوێنەکەی خۆی بگۆرێ بۆ ئەوەی تۆ و هاورێکەت لەتەنیشت یەکەوە دانیشن ، جی بەو کەسە دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی یانزەیەم: چەند پسولەیەکی قەرزت لەسەر کۆبووەتەوە و پارەت نییە بیدەیتەوە، ناشتەوێ لەهاورێکانت داوای پارەبکەیت، چونکە ئەزانن قەرزبکەیت نادەیتەوە، کۆمپانیاکەشت قەرزت ناداتێ، چوونکە پێشتر قەرزت وەرگرتووە. زۆر پێویستیت بە پارەیە بۆ ئەوەی پارە پسوولەی کارەباکەت بدەیت، چوونکە لە ماوەیەکی کورتدا ئەو پارەیە رادەست نەکەیت هێلی کارەباکەت دەبرن. ئەتەوێ بچیت بۆ لای بەرێوبەری کارمکەت کە تازە دامەزراوە بۆ ئەوەی داوای پارەی لێ بکەیت. چی پێ دەڵێیت؟

هەڵوێستی دوانزەیەم: ماوەیەکی زۆر لە کۆمپانیایەك کاردەکەیت، یەکێك لە فەرمانبەرە نوێیەکان لاپتۆپێکی تایبەت بەخۆی پێیە، ئەتەوێ داوای لێ بکەیت بۆ ماوەیەکی کورت لاپتۆپەکەی ئەو بەکاربهێنیت، چی پێدەڵێیت؟

The researchers named above have briefed me to my satisfaction on the research for which I have volunteered.   I also understand that my rights to anonymity and confidentiality will be respected.

Participant's Signature
Please Print
 Date

	Male +SD (remote)	%	Female +SD (remote)	%	Male -SD (close)	%	Female –SD (close)	%
Grounder	24	7.0%	31	9.1%	40	9.8%	33	8.1%
Apology "sorry"	7	2.0%	6	1.8%	12	2.9%	8	2.0%
Cost minimizer	6	1.8%	10	2.9%	9	2.2%	5	1.2%
Disarmer	5	1.5%	9	2.6%	6	1.5%	3	0.7%
Appreciation "thank"	7	2.0%	23	6.7%	11	2.7%	12	2.9%
Preparatory	19	5.6%	11	3.2%	37	9.0%	12	2.9%
Promise of Reward	2	0.6%	1	0.3%	2	0.5%	2	0.5%
Alerters								
Social address term "friend"	0	0%	0	0%	13	3.2%	11	2.7%
Official address term "barez"	15	4.4%	23	6.7%	27	6.6%	14	3.4%
Endearment term "dear"	6	1.8%	14	4.1%	7	1.7%	10	2.4%
Greeting "Hello"	24	7.0%	24	7.0%	42	10.3%	21	5.1%
Role address term "Boss"	4	1.2%	4	1.2%	8	2.0%	2	0.5%
Role address term "Teacher"	10	2.9%	10	2.9%	0	0%	0	0%
Formulaic Minimizer								
ba ark nabe	12	3.5%	11	3.2%	22	5.4%	13	3.2%
azet nabe	7	2.0%	4	1.2%	12	2.9%	2	0.5%
be zahmat	7	2.0%	6	1.8%	13	3.2%	0	0%
Total formulaic Minimizers	26	7.5%	22	6.2%	47	11.5%	15	3.7%
Overall	155	45.3%	187	54.7%	261	63.8%	148	36.2%

Table 7: Kurdish Male and Female Use of External Modification Devices in Relation to Social Distance