Speech Act of Criticism in Kurdish: A Pragmatic Study

کرده قسەییەکانی رەخنە لە زمانی کوردی: توێژینەوەیەکی پراگماتیکیە

برهان صالح سلیمان[1]

[1] بەشی ئینگلیزی، فاکەڵتی پەروەردە، زانکۆی کۆیە، شاری کۆیە، هەرێمی کوردستان، عێراق

Corresponding author's e-mail: burhan.saleh@koyauniversity.org

پوخته

کرده قسەییەکان بەشێکی گەورە پێکدەهێنن لە زمان ، وه بنچینەیەکە لە بواری پراگماتیك، بریتیە لە بەکارهێنانی زمان بۆ جێبەجێکردنی کاروباری ژیان. ئامانج لەم توێژینەوەیە بریتیە لە گەڕان بەدوای ستراتیژەکانی کردەقسەییەکانی رەخنە لە زمانی کوردی. بۆ کۆکردنەوەی داتا و زانیاری، ١٢٠ خوێنکاری بەکەلۆریۆسی کورد، وەکو نموونەیەك هەلبژێرراون بۆ ئەم توێژینەوەیە. خوێندکارەکان پێکهاتبوون لە پسپۆڕی ورەگەز و ئاستی کۆمەڵایەتی جیاواز. داتاکان کۆکراونەتەوە لە رێگەی بەکارهێنانی ئامرازی (تاقیکرنەوەی تەواوکردنی گوتار) کە لە ١٠ سیناریۆ پێکهاتبوو. تاقیکردنەوەکە ئەنجامدراوە لە زانکۆکانی سەلاحەدین و کۆیە. دوای کۆکردنەوەی داتاکان، ستراتیژەکانی رەخنەگرتن پۆلێنکراون بە گوێرەی مۆدێلی نگوێن ٢٠٠٥. دەرئەنجامەکانی توێژینەوەکە ئەوە دەردەخەن کە کورد پێی باشتره ستراتیژە ناراستەوخۆکان بەکاربهێنێت بۆ رەخنەگرتن نەك ستراتیژە راستەوخۆکان.

الملخص

أفعال الكلام تُكَون جزءاً كبيراً من اللغة، و هي احدى اسس التداولية، هي إستخدام اللغة لأداء الأمور في الحياة. الهدف من الدراسة هو البحث في استراتيجيات فعل النقد الكلامي في اللغة الكردية. لجمع البيانات والمعلومات، تم اختيار ١٢٠ طالباً جامعياً من الكُرد كعينة للدراسة. كان الطلاب من مختلف التخصصات ومن كلا الجنسين والطبقات الاجتماعية مختلفة. و تم جمع البيانات عن طريق استخدام (اختبار استكمال الخطاب) التي تحتوي على ١٠ سيناريوهات. تم اجراء الاختبار في جامعتي صلاح الدين وكويه. بعد جمع البيانات، تم تصنيف استراتيجيات النقد من حيث نموذج نغوين في عام ٢٠٠٥. تظهر نتائج البحث ان الأكراد يفضلون استعمال استراتيجيات غير مباشرة في الكلام على استراتيجيات مباشرة.

Abstract

Speech acts composes a big part of language; it is one of the bases of pragmatics, it can be defined as the use of language to make things happen in the world. The aim of the study is to investigate the strategies of the speech act of criticism in Kurdish. One hundred twenty undergraduate native Kurdish speaking students were selected as a sample for the study. The students were of different majors, sexes and social classes. Discourse Completion Test (DCT) approach is adopted in collecting the data which has 10 scenarios. The test has been carried out at Salahaddin and Koya universities. After the data collection, strategies of criticizing have been classified in terms of Nguyen 2005 model. The results of the investigation show that Kurds would rather employ indirect strategies than direct strategies to give criticism.

Keywords: Speech acts, Criticism, Kurdish

1. Introduction

Speech act theory is the main field of study in pragmatics. It has been proposed by Austin 1962 and developed by Searle 1975. Speech acts refer to perform actions by using language (Austin: 1962). Speech acts have three components: First, locutionary which is the actual utterance represented by a sentence. Second, Illocutionary refers to the intention of the speaker in making an utterance. And the last one is Perlocutionary, it is the effect of an utterance on the hearer. In discussing speech acts. It is common that illocutionary itself is the speech act and usually classified according to their illocutionary meaning. Searle (1969) classified illocutionary act into representatives (claiming, reporting, …), commissives (promising, threatening, …), directives (commanding, requesting, …), declarations (marrying, naming…) and expressives (criticizing, apologizing, …).

Speech act shows the function of language by performing actions with language such as commanding, criticizing, announcing, sentencing, etc. Criticizing is one of the functions that can be studied in Kurdish. According to Nguyen (2005), criticism is one of the speech acts, the speaker uses it when a hearer says or does something negative on the purpose of improving the hearers' words or actions. Likewise, Tracy, et al. (1987) defines criticism as "a negative evaluation of a person or an act for which he or she is deemed responsible". They recommend that a good criticism should get a positive message across, and the critic should use a positive behavior and pleasant language. They also propose that a critic should not harm the relationship with the hearer. Similarly, Nguyen (2005) and Wierzbicka (1987) assert that criticism is aiming at expressing disagreement with what the hearer has said or done for the hearer's own good or for the benefit of the public.

The conclusion is that criticism is different from complaints, the speaker uses criticism to provide a negative response to the hearer with the intention of improving the addressee's deeds, manners, viewpoints, words, etc. There is a constructive intention behind criticism for the benefit of the hearer or the public.

It is worth mentioning that getting familiar with speech acts including criticism is useful for non-native speakers to have a happy communication. Thus, the present paper studies the strategies of criticism in Kurdish. It will aid foreigners and learners of Kurdish to be aware of using speech acts of criticism so as to be effective and constructive.

2. Literature Review

As far as literature review is concerned, there are a lot of researchers who investigates the speech act of criticism. In Some Lexical and Syntactic Features of the Language Functions of Criticizing and Refusing as Used by Students Majoring in English at the University of Jordan by Abu Taleb (1995) looks into different syntactic and lexical features of the speech acts of refusing and criticism employed by Jordanian EFL undergraduate students. The study also investigates the strategic features employed in their utterances. For collecting the data, 100 Jordanian students at the University of Jordan and 5 native speakers of American English were selected, the questionnaire consisted of 14 items. The study showed that in performing criticism and refusal the students employ simple sentences and simple verb phrase structures which is a syntactic feature. In terms of lexical features there were no specific lexemes to be used in refusal, but for criticism there were some negative adjectives. Regarding the strategic features, the study presented that different strategies have been used by the interlocutors for expressing refusal and criticism.

Nguyen (2005) in Criticizing and Responding to Criticism in a Foreign language: A study of Vietnamese learners of English investigates two speech acts: criticizing and responding to criticism employed by a group of Vietnamese EFL learners. The sample of the study consisted of 36 Vietnamese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners (12 high beginners, 12 intermediate learners, and 12 advanced learners), 12 Vietnamese native speakers and 12 Australian native speakers. The researcher used a written questionnaire and a role play to collect the data. The major findings of the study showed that the Vietnamese EFL criticized and responded to criticism in a very different way in comparison to the native speakers of English in Australia. In addition, the study showed that proficiency had little impact on the use of these two speech acts. The study also found that pragmatic transfer influenced the learners' production. The interviews with learners showed four basic resources of impact on their pragmatic decision-making, which is the insufficiency in pragmatic knowledge of second language, communication and learning transformation, difficulty in processing, and experience in learning.

Cao (2005) in A Pragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism in Primary and Junior High School Chinese

Lecturer-Student Talk investigates Chinese lecturers' way of using the strategies of speech act of criticism and the response on the part of students to this speech act. Ethnographic approach was used in collecting the data which enabled the researcher to gather spontaneous speeches. The researcher used Austin and Searle's Speech Act Theory and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Principles for the theoretical framework. The study presented remarkable results about felicity conditions in criticizing, the content of criticism, syntactic structures, linguistic features, and pragmatic functions of criticism. The study found out that the social and cultural factors influenced and played a great role in choosing the strategies of criticism.

In Pragmatic Analysis of Criticism Speech Act: a Case Study on the Sitcom Growing Pains by He (2008) made a comparison between Chinese and English in the speech act of criticism. The study presented that all types of speech acts, including criticism are affected by the culture of its people because they have certain conventions and norms. It was found that both Chinese and English speakers employ different strategies of criticism because of their diverse cultures. The study showed that Chinese people expressed criticism by using indirect strategies more than the English people, because of these reasons: First, Chinese community has a culture of maintaining a harmonic relationship among its members. Second, Chinese people express their ideas more implicitly than people in English speaking countries.

There is a study conducted by Farnia and Abdul Sattar (2015) namely A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism by Persian Native Speakers investigate the speech act of criticism in Persian among Iranian native speakers. It was conducted at Payame Noor University, the data were collected by participating 100 Persian native speakers, Discourse Evaluation Test (DET) was used as a means of data collection. In the study the coding scheme by Nguyen's (2005) was used in analyzing and categorizing the data. The results of the study showed that the extent of directness and indirectness of criticism is dependent on the speaker's power, social distance and rank. Furthermore, the study indicated that Persian speakers have tendency of using direct strategies more than indirect strategies. The study indicated that in terms of politeness among Persian speakers certain mitigating devices are used.

In conclusion, the related reviews of literature indicate that studies are ongoing about the speech act of criticism in both Western and Eastern societies. However, the researcher could not find any study that has been done about the speech act of criticism in Kurdish language. The current study focuses on criticizing strategies adopted by the native speakers of Kurdish and British English. Furthermore, the present study concentrates on the mitigating means and devices used in criticism. This study investigates the impact of power, culture and social distance on choosing strategies of criticism and mitigating devices. Thus, the present study will make attempts to bridge this gap by comparing Kurdish with British English in respect of criticizing strategies and the devices of mitigating.

3. Methods

One hundred twenty undergraduate students of Kurdish native speaker were selected as a sample for the study. The students were of different major, gender and social class. The test has been conducted at both Salahaddin and Koya universities. The researcher carried out the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) approach in collecting the data. The researcher met the participants directly and asked them to fill out the DCT. After collecting the data, the researcher codified the strategies of criticism, and employed the model proposed by Nguyen (2005).

4. Criticism Strategies

4.1 Direct Strategies

Nguyen (2005) states that "direct strategies refer to the strategies that are used explicitly to point out the problem with the hearer's choice, action, work, etc. These strategies include: negative evaluation, disapproval, identification of problem, consequences, expression of disagreement, threats, and severe criticism". Table 1 shows that the frequency of using direct strategies in Kurdish were classified from the highest to the lowest like this: consequences 87 cases recorded, makes up 7.3 %, identification of problem 82 cases, makes up 6.8%, negative evaluation 77 cases, makes up 6.4%, disapproval 72 cases, makes up 6%, expression of disagreement 59 cases, makes up 4.9%, threats 14 cases, makes up 1.2%, severe criticism 9 cases, makes up 0.8%, and statement of difficulty 8 cases, makes up 0.7%.

4.1.1 Negative Evaluation

In this strategy, the critic expresses his or her disapproval of what the hearer says or does by using evaluative adjectives with negative meaning or evaluative adjectives with positive meaning plus negation (Abdullah, 2013). The Kurdish data illustrated that this strategy was used 77 times (6.4%). The following examples on this strategy were given from the Kurdish data:

(1) تۆ بەڕاستی تەمبەڵیت. (Kurdish/ situation1)

To berastî tembeɫît.

"You are really lazy."

In this example, the speaker criticizes his/her brother for sleeping too much instead of studying. The speaker uses the negative adjective 'tembeɫ' "lazy" to negatively evaluate the behavior of his/ her brother.

4.1.2 Disapproval

The second direct strategy is 'disapproval' in which the speaker expresses his/her negative attitude towards the hearer (Tracy, Van Dusen & Robinson, 1987). In the Kurdish data there were 72 occurrences of this strategy in the responses (accounting for 6%):

(2 situation /Kurdish)   گوناهت دهگات بهم شێوهیه قسهی پێ دهڵێیت، دوایی گهورهبێت لهبیری ناکات(2)

Gunahit degat bem şêweye qseî pê delêit, dwaî geurebêt le birî nakat.

"Shame on you talking to him this way! He grows up, and will never forget it!"

In example 2, the speaker was asked to criticize his/her close friend for being rude to his/her brother. The speaker is directly criticizing his/her close friend, expressing disapproval with what the hearer has said, by using the phrase 'Gunahit degat' "shame on you". In Kurdish, this phrase is used to express disapproval, indicates that the hearer has done something wrong or prohibited. Gunahit degat has a religious background connotes that what the hearer has done is prohibited in religion.

4.1.3 Identification of problem

In this strategy, people state directly the mistakes or the problems found with the hearer's actions, work, appearance, words, etc. (Hoa, 2007). In the Kurdish data, there are 82 instances of this strategy in the responses (6.8%). Consider the example below:

(3)   دارشتنهکهت جوانه بهڵام ههندێك ههڵهی رێزمانی ههیه.(Kurdish/ Situation 10)

Dariştineket jwane bełam hendêk hełeî rêzmanî heye

"Your essay is nice, but it has some grammatical mistakes"

In example 3, the Kurdish participants identify the mistakes of their classmate's essay by stating hendêk hełeî rêzmanî heye "it has some grammatical mistakes". It can be noted that the Kudish speakers in the above example begin their criticism by mentioning the positive remarks Dariştneket jwane "nice essay"; then they state the problem.

4.1.4 Consequences

Kurds employ this strategy to tell the hearer be aware of the negative consequences of their deeds, words, behaviors, actions, etc. An example of this strategy from Kurdish data is given below:

(4)   ئهگهر ئاوا بهردهوام بیت له نههاتنه پۆل، دهرناچیت.(Kurdish / Situation 9)

Eger awa berdewambit le nehatne pol, dernaçit!

"If you keep not attending the class, you won't pass!"

In example 4, the Kurdish participant criticizes his/her classmate for being absent all the time by warning

him/her of the negative effect of his/her action. The participant warns the hearer that if he/she keeps on being absent, he/she will not pass.

4.1.5 Expression of Disagreement

In this strategy, the speaker disagrees with what the hearer has said or done. The data shows that Kurdish participants have used 59 times the expression of disagreement. The following example illustrates this strategy:

(5) Situation6/ Kurdish).ئەم وشەیە ئاوا نانووسرێت

Em wişeye awa nanûsret

"This word is not spelt this way!"

The Kurdish participant uses the strategy of disagreement to criticize the student in making mistakes in spelling by using the negative prefix na "not".

4.1.6 Statement of Difficulty

The speakers use this strategy to express how difficult it is to understand what the hearers have done or said (Farnia & Abdul Sattar, 2015). There are usually some structures like tênagem "I cannot understand" for expressing the statement of difficulty. This strategy has 8 instances (0.7 %) in the Kurdish data.

(6)   هەیە تاقیکردنەوەت سبەی و کافتریا بچیتە دەتوانیت چۆن تێناگەم Situation 1/Kurdish).من

Min tênagem çon detwanît bçîte kaftirya u sbeî taqîkirdnawat heya

"I can't understand how you can go to the café, and you have an exam tomorrow"

In example (6), the Kurdish participant criticizes his/her brother for going to the café instead of preparing for the exam and studying by using the statement of difficulty strategy. It indicates that it is difficult for the speaker to understand how his/her brother goes to the café while he has an examination for tomorrow.

4.1.7 Threats

In this strategy, the speaker tells the hearer that he/she will punish or hurt him/her if he/she does not obey something. This strategy was used 14 times (1.2%) in the Kurdish data. Consider the example below:

(7) لێتدەدەم نەبیت عاقڵ Situation 1).ئەگەر /Kurdish)

Eger 'aqił nebît letdedem

"If you don't behave well, I will hit you."

In the above example, the speaker criticizes his/her brother for not behaving well by threatening him if he does not stop doing it, the speaker will hit him. Here, the speaker uses strategy of threats to express disapproval toward the hearer's behaviour and warns him to be well-behaved.

4.1.8 Severe Criticism

Insulting a person or using vulgar language in conversation is the indication of employing the strategy of severe criticism. This strategy has been repeated 9 times, accounting for 0.8% in the Kurdish data. The example bellow illustrates the point:

(8) تۆ بێعەقڵیت! چۆن دەتوانیت بەم شێوەیە قسەی پێ بڵێیت؟(Kurdish/ situation2)

To be'eqłit! çon detwanît bem şêweye qiseî pe błeît?

"You are such a stupid person! How dare you speak to him like that?"

In response to Situation 2, the Kurdish participant criticizes the hearer for insulting his/her brother. The speaker in the above example addresses the hearer with unpleasant term which has a negative sense, To be'eqłit! "You are such a stupid person!".

4.2 Indirect Criticism

The data showed that the Kurdish participants used indirect strategies more than the direct ones, Table 1 revealed that the most frequent indirect strategy present in the Kurdish data is suggestion for change 191 tokens (accounting for 15.9%) followed by ' request for change' (187 instances, 15.6%), 'asking/presupposing' (130 instances, 10.8%), 'advice about change' (98 instances, 8.2%), 'other hints' (52 instances, 4.3%), 'indicating standard' (42 instances, 3.5%), 'demand for change' (37 instances, 3.1%), 'say nothing' (24 instances, 2%), 'correction' (16 instances, 1.3%) and 'expression of uncertainty' (15 instances, 1.3%).

4.2.1 Correction

Using this strategy, speakers provide alternatives or solutions to the hearer's choice with intention to fix errors (Cao, 2005). The Kurdish data showed that correction was recorded 16 times in the responses:

(9) باشتره وانەکانت بخوێنی نەك یاری بکەیت.(Kurdish/Situation 1)

Başțire wanekanit bixwenî nek yarî bkeît.

"You had better study rather than playing."

In example 9, the Kurdish participant, criticizes his/her brother for playing football instead of studying. He/she provides the hearer with the option of studying as an alternative for getting busy with playing football.

4.2.2 Indicating Standard

Speakers use this strategy to criticize others by referring to a rule, a proverb or a saying (Darweesh, 2011).

Table 1 revealed that the strategy of indicating standard in Kurdish was used 42 times, accounting for 3.5%:

(10) تکایە بەکارهێنانی موبایل قەدەغەیە.(Kurdish/situation 5)

Tikaye bekarhênanî mubaîl qedeẍeye.

"No cell-phone use please"

In example (10), the Kurdish speaker criticizes a hearer for using the cell-phone in the library. He/she refers to the general rule of keeping quiet in the library that phone-calls are not allowed in the library.

4.2.3 Advice about Change

In this strategy, speakers usually inform the hearers what they should to overcome a problem found in the hearers' behavior, words, etc. (Alshra', 2013). For expressing this strategy, the performative amojgarît dekem or structures with pêwîste "should" is used. Consider the example below:

(11) نووسین له وردتربیت دهکهم ئامۆژگاریت بهڵام زیرهکیت، تۆ.(Kurdish/situation 6)

To zîrekît bełam amojgarît dekem wirdtirbît la nûsîn.

"You are clever, but I advise you to be more accurate in writing."

In example 11, the Kurdish participant in situation 6, responds and criticizes the hearer for making mistakes in grammar and spelling by mentioning a positive point to zîrekît "You are clever" and the performative amo- jgarît dekem 'I advise you'.

4.2.4 Demand of Change

Nguyen (2005) states that "to demand something is to ask others to do something as a must". In Kurdish, this strategy is expressed by pêwîste "you need", or debêt "you have to", etc. Table 1 illustrates that this strategy was used 37 times accounting for 3.1%.

(12) ¬ بڕیاربدهین ئهوهی پێش بیربکهینهوه بهباشی پێویسته.(Kurdish / Situation8)

pêwîste bebaşî bîrbikeînewa pêş eweî biryarbideîn.

"We need to think very well before making any decisions!"

In example 12, the speaker criticizes the employee's quick decision for doing something by demanding him/ her to think very well before making the decision.

4.2.5 Request for change

In this strategy, the speaker usually asks the hearer to do something (Abu Taleb, 1995). Some structures like "detwanît /dekrêt…?" (Could you?) was used to express this strategy. In the Kurdish data, the strategy of re- quest for change was used 187 times, accounts for 15.6%.

(13) ؟ههڵیگریهوه فڕێتدا ئهوهی دهتوانیت بهیارمهتیت، (Kurdish/ situation 3)

Beyarmetît, detwanît eweî fřêtda hełîgryewa?

"Excuse me, could you pick up what you have dropped?"

The Kurdish speaker uses the strategy of request for change to criticize a stranger for throwing garbage on the ground. The speaker starts the request by using Beyarmetît: "excuse me", as a politeness marker then he/ she asks the hearer to pick it up.

4.2.6 Suggestion for Change

Nguyen (2005) states that "to suggest something is to put forward an idea for consideration". This strategy is usually expressed by the performative pêşnyardekem "I suggest" or structures like detwanît "you can… ", baştir debêt "it would be better", and eger "if". The analysis showed that Kurds used this strategy 191 times 15.9%:

(14)   داڕشتنەکەت جوانه بەڵام ئەگەر بکرێ هەندێك نمونەی بۆ زیاد بکەیت(Kurdish/Situation 10)

Dariştineket jwane bełam eger bkrê hendêk nmunaî bo zyad bkaît.

"Your essay is nice but if you add some examples to it."

The Kurdish participant starts criticizing a classmate's essay by giving a positive remark "your essay is nice" followed by a suggestion. The speaker employed the conditional sentence to suggest that if the hearer add some more examples, the essay will be perfect.

4.2.7 Expression of uncertainty

Speakers in this strategy express their uncertainty to raise the hearer's awareness of the inappropriateness of the hearer's actions (Purnanto & Jauhari, 2016). The Kurdish data in Table 1 illustrates that this strategy was used 15 times 1.3%.

(15)   دڵنیانیم، بەڵام ئەگەر ڕێکخەری دەنگەکان بەکاربهێنرێت باشتر دەبێت(Kurdish/Situation 4)

Diłnya nîm, bełam eger rêkxerî dengekan bekarbihênrêt baştir debêt.

"I'm not sure, but if the sound effects were used, it would be better."

The Kurdish participant criticizes the performance of a recording player indirectly by expressing his/her uncertainty about the use of sound effects if they make the play better.

4.2.8 Asking/ Presupposing

The speakers in this strategy tend to use rhetorical questions to make the hearer be aware of the inappropriateness of his or her actions (Nguyen, 2005). The Kurdish data of the study showed that the Kurds used it 130 times accounting for 10.8%.

(16)   حەزدەکەیت بەم شێوەیه مامەڵەت لەگەڵ بکرێ که تۆ لەگەڵ براکەت دەیکەیت؟(Kurdish/situation 2)

H'ezdekeît bem şêweye mamełet legeł bkrêt ke to legeł braket deîkeît?

"Would you like to be treated the way you treat your brother?"

The Kurdish participant criticizes his/her friend for mistreating his/her brother by using rhetorical questions. In such cases the speaker does not wait for an answer but informs the hearer about his/her inappropriate behaviours or expressions.

4.2.9 Say Nothing (Avoidance)

Some people are doing things instead of expressing verbal criticism. At times, Kurds think that taking action is politer and more powerful than using words. Brown and Levinson (1987) argued that "the most indirect way to be polite and indirect is by not performing an FTA (say nothing)". This strategy was used 24 times in the Kurdish data (accounting for 2%)

(17) هەڵەکانی بۆ راستدەکەمەوە و ڕەخنەی لێناگرم!(Kurdish/ situation 6).

Hełekanî bo rastdekemewe u rexneî lênagrim!

"I am correcting his mistakes and I won't criticize him!"

In example 17 the speaker criticizes his/her student for making spelling and grammatical mistakes by correcting them and saying nothing so as not to hurt the hearer's feelings.

4.2.10 Other Hints

There are some other kinds of hints in addition to the above mentioned ones serve as speech act of criticism, like implication, sarcasm, and irony (Nguyen, 2005). The Kurdish data revealed that these additional strategies were found in 52 responses (accounting for 4.3%):

(18) سبەی ئەم تۆپە دێ پرسیارەکانت بۆ وەڵام دەداتەوە، وانیە؟ (بەگاڵتەوە))(Kurdish/ Situation 1)

Sbeî em tope dê pirsyarekant bo wełamdedatewe, wanye?

"Tomorrow, this ball will answer the questions for you, right?" (Sarcastically)

In Situation 1, the response by the Kurdish participant in example 18 criticizes his/her younger brother for playing football instead of studying, using sarcasm to get an implied message across to his/her brother that he must study. In the above example, the speaker asks a question sarcastically whether the ball will answer the questions in the test, implicating that playing football is making him fail in the exam.

5. Results and discussion

The data analysis of the study shows that Kurds adopted different strategies of criticism. Through the data, the researcher found out that Kurds in performing strategies of criticism, use indirect strategies more than direct strategies. Indirect strategies were 792 items but direct strategies were 408 items (see table 1). This indicates that Kurds try to avoid face threating act, as criticism is one of them. That is why they resort to using more indirect strategies. Direct and indirect strategies have been investigated with examples, as presented in Table 1:

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Criticizing Strategies Used in Kurdish

Strategy	Kurdish	Frequency %
Direct strategies		
a. Negative evaluation	77	6.4
b. Disapproval	72	6
c. Identification of the problem	82	6.8
d. Consequences	87	7.3
e. Expression of disagreement	59	4.9
f. Statement of difficulty	8	0.7
g. Threats	14	1.2
h. Severe criticism	9	0.8
Total	408	34
Indirect strategies	Frequency	%
a. Correction	16	1.3
b. Indicating standard	42	3.5
c. Advice about change	98	8.2
d. Demand of change	37	3.1
e. Request for change	187	15.6
f. Suggestion for change	191	15.9
g. Expression of uncertainty	15	1.3
h. Asking/presupposing	130	10.8
i. Say nothing	24	2
j. Other hints	52	4.3
Total	792	66
Total of direct and indirect strategies	1200	100

6. Conclusion

The study clarified that Kurds used more indirect strategies of criticism rather than direct strategies. This indicates that the Kurds know that criticism is a face threatening act. Regarding the direct strategies, the study found out that consequences was abundantly used, whereas in terms of indirect strategies the most used strategy was suggestion for change. It can be concluded that the Kurds have manner, take others' feelings into consideration, and trying to avoid hurting them or being rude, by coating the criticism with mitigating   expressions.

References

1. Abdullah, S. S. (2013), Pragmatic Transfer in the Speech Acts of Criticizing and Responding by EFL Speakers of Colloquial Egyptian Arabic. Retrieved January 2, 2022, from http://search.mandumah.com/Record/678905.

2. Alshra', A. (2013). A Sociolinguistic Study of the Speech Act of Criticism. Unpublished MA thesis. Irbid: Yarmouk University.

3. Abu Taleb, A. (1995), Some Lexical and Syntactic Features of the Language Functions of Criticizing and Refusing as Used by Students Majoring in English at the University of Jordan. Unpublished MA Thesis, the University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.

4. Austin, J. (1962). How to do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

5. Cao, J. (2005), A Pragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism in Primary and Junior High School Chinese Lecturer-Student Talk. MA thesis, Northeast Normal University. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation.

6. Darweesh, A. D. (2011), Speech Act of Criticizing in MSA Arabic. Retrieved January 3, 2022 from http://search.mandumah.com/Record/681234

7. Farnia, M. & Abdul Sattar, H. (2015), A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Speech Act of Criticism by Persian Native Speakers. International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 2(3), 305-327.

8. He, Y. R. (2008), Pragmatic Analysis of Criticism Speech Act: a Case Study on the Sitcom Growing Pains. MA Thesis, University of science & technology Beijing. Retrieved January 4, 2022 from http://search.proquest.com/docview/187497810

9. Hoa, H. (2007). Criticizing behaviors by the Vietnamese and the American: topics, social factors and frequency. VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages, 23, 141-154.

10. Nguyen, M. (2005), Criticizing and Responding to Criticism in a Foreign language: A study of Vietnamese learners of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Auckland, Auckland. Retrieved January 2, 2022 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37984689

11. Nguyen, M. (2008), Criticizing in an L2: Pragmatic Strategies Used by Vietnamese EFL Learners. Intercultural Pragmatics, 1(5), 41-66.

12. Nguyen, M. (2013), An exploratory Study of Criticism Realization Strategies Used by NS and NNS of New Zealand English. Multilingua, 32(1), 103-130.

13. Nuryani,E. Sudartinah, T. and Kurnia, N (2016). A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Features of Criticism in Joseph Mcginty's This Means War. Sastra Inggris – Quill, 5 (2), 169 175.

14. Purnanto, D and Jauhari, E. (2016), Speech Act Criticism as a Mechanism of Social Control in the Ethnic Madurese Community. Advanced Science Letters, 22, 4112–4115.

15. Searle, J. (1969). Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

16. Tracy, K., Van Dusen, D., & Robinson, S. (1987). Good and bad criticism: a descriptive analysis. Journal of Communication, 37, 46-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460- 2466.1987.tb00982.x

17. Wierzbicka, A. (1987), English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary. Marrickville: Academic Press Australia.

18. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.