

#### University of Ilam

Faculty of Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

#### M.A. Thesis

# THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CAPITAL IN ILAMI KURDISH: A SOCIOPRAGMATIC APPROACH

BY:

ALI MANSOURI CHALANCHI

Supervisor:

REZA KHANY, Ph.D

Advisor:

MOHAMMAD BAGHER SHABANI, Ph.D

November, 2011

# In the Name of God

#### IN THE NAME OF GOD

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CAPITAL IN ILAMI KURDISH: A SOCIOPRAGMATIC APPROACH

BY

#### ALI MANSOURI CHALANCHI

#### THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (MA)

IN

TEACHING ENGLISH LANGUAGE

ILAM UNIVERSITY

ILAM

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

#### EVALUATED AND APPROVED BY THE THESIS COMMITTEE AS:

M. B. SHABANI, Ph.D., ASSIST. PROF. (ADVISOR)

CARLON M. ALIAKBARI, Ph.D., ASSIST. PROF.(EXAMINER)

...A. AZIZIFAR, Ph.D., ASSIST. PROF. (EXAMINER)

NOVEMBER, 2011

# Dedicated to my loving daughter

&

Adorable wife

#### **AKNOWLEDGMENT**

Accomplishment of this study would not have been possible without assistance and encouragement of several people. First, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Khany, my supervisor. No words can express my gratitude to him who is virtually responsible for every step of my intellectual growth during my M.A. program. His vast knowledge has inspired me. I am also grateful for his constant encouragement and insightful advice throughout my thesis. Also, I appreciate the helpful comments of Dr. Sh'abani, my advisor. I am indebted to him since he patiently assisted me and his suggestions were very beneficial for improving this thesis. In addition, I would like to make use of this opportunity to express my sincerest and heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Samaei for his constant assistance and motivation during my study. I am very thankful to my committed professor, Dr. Aliakbari who taught me to be persistent, precise, and patient in my works during my M.A. scheme.

Also, I am grateful to my dear friend, Mr. Sepidname for his assistance with statistical analysis and his interest in my work. This dissertation would not have been accomplished without the love and encouragement of my wife who helped and supported me to complete my study. I extend my gratitude to my mother and mother-in-law for their love, support, encouragement and prayers not only during the study but also throughout all my years of study. Finally, I am thankful to my brothers and sisters for their assistance, love, support and encouragement.

#### **ABSTACT**

Language as a means in creating and recreating social capital has been a topic of concern over the last few decades. Though much has been written about social capital and its related constructs very little if any has been done on how language can create trust or distrust. The purpose of this paper was then two- folds. First attention was made to give a typology of the lexical categories of oaths used by Kurdish speaking people in Ilam province to enhance trust in their social milieu and second effort was made to see how and why such categories are used and influenced by such variables as age, gender, education, place of living and job. To this end, 382 subjects received a questionnaire on different oath taking categories. The study was undertaken in two phases, First a pilot study was carried out to identify the types of oath taken by the participants. To this end, an open-ended questionnaire was administered. Second, out of the responses extracted from the pilot study, a closed-likert type questionnaire was devised and administered to the main population. To analyze the collected data, descriptive statistics and chi-square were utilized. The findings of the study revealed that there was a strong relationship between the type and frequency of the oath words and the variables under investigation, including the respondents' gender, age, and level of education, employment and place of living. Furthermore, the results showed that religious, death and family member oaths were the most frequent oath words, respectively, taken by the respondents in order to initiate and maintain trust in the interaction with other members of the community. The findings and the implication of the study are discussed and recommendations for future studies made.

**Key words**: Social Capital, Trust, Communication, Conversation Principles,

Truth- Conditionality

TITLE
DedicationI
Acknowledgment II
AbstractIII
Table of Contents
List of TablesVIII
List of FiguresXI
List of AbbreviationsXII
Chapter one: Introduction
1.1. Overview
1.2. Background to the study
1.3. Statement of the problem
1.4. Research questions
1.5. Significance of the study
1.6. Limitations of the study
1.7. Definitions of key terms
1.8. Outline and organization of the study
Chapter two: Literature review
2.1. Overview
2.2. Review of literature14
2.2.1. Communication and uncertainty reduction

TITLE	GE
2.2.2. Language and communication	. 17
2.2.3. Language and truth conditionality	. 18
2.2.4. Conversational Maxims	. 20
2.2.5. Language and society	. 22
2.2.6. Social capital	. 23
2.2.7. The manifestation of social capital in society	. 25
2.2.8. Trust in social capital	. 27
2.2.9. Language as a form of social capital	. 29
2.2.10. Trust and language	. 31
2.2.11. Oath, trust and mistrust	. 33
2.3. Related studies	. 38
Chapter three: Methodology	. 43
3.1. Overview	. 44
3.2. Research question and hypotheses	. 44
3.3. Participants	. 45
3.4. Instrumentation	. 45
3.4.1. Pilot study	. 45
3.4.2. Questionnaire	. 45
3.4.2.1. Questionnaire design	. 47
3.4.2.1.1. Prove one's right	. 47

TITLE
3.4.2.1.1.1. Prove one's right in economic situations
3.4.2.1.1.2. Prove one's right in face saving situations
3.4.2.1.1.3. Prove one's right in unintentional
behavior situations
3.4.2.1.2. Defending against one's accusation
3.4.2.1.2.1. Defending against one's accusation
in economic situations
3.4.2.1.2.2. Defending against one's accusation
in face saving situations50
3.4.2.1.2.3. Defending against one's accusation
in unintentional behavior situations
3.5. Procedure
3.6. Data collection and Data analysis
Chapter four: Results 55
4.1. Overview
4.2. Restatement of the research question
4.3. Research hypotheses
4.4. The results of the analysis of the demographic information about variables 57
4.5. The results of the analysis of the items of the questionnaire

ITLE PAGE
6. The results of the analysis of situational categories and typology 107
4.6.1. The results of the analysis of Prove one's right
4.6.2. The results from analysis of Defending against Accusation
.7. The results from analysis of religious oaths with regard to
the respondents' gender
8. The results from analysis of percentages of oath words
taken in different situations
9. The results from analysis of the respondents' response to
"Yes" and "No" with regard to variables in research hypotheses
4.9.1. The results from analysis of the respondents' response to
"Yes" and "No" with regard to their gender
4.9.2. The results from analysis of the respondents' response to
"Yes" and "No" with regard to their state of employment
4.9.3. The results from analysis of the respondents taking oath
with regard to their range of age
4.9.4. The results from analysis from the respondents taking oath
with regard to their level of education
4.9.5. The results from analysis of the respondents taking oath
with regard to their place of living

TITLE PAGE
4.9.6. The results from analysis of the respondents taking oath
with regard to their religious status
4.10. The results from analysis of research hypotheses
4.10.1. The results from analysis of relationship
between gender and typology
4.10.2. The results from analysis of relationship
between religious status and typology
4.10.3. The results from analysis of relationship
between level of education and typology
4.10.4. The results from analysis of relationship
between employment and typology
4.10.5. The results from analysis of relationship
between place of living and typology
4.10.6. The results from analysis of relationship between
age and typology
Chapter five: Discussion and conclusion
5.1. Overview
5.2. Discussion
5.3. Discussion of the results from analysis of research hypotheses
5.4. Discussion of The results of percentages of the respondents' taking oath 137

TITLE	PAGE
5.5. Discussion of the results of the situational variables and oath typology .	139
5.6. Discussion of the results of the respondents' use of taking	
religious oaths regarding their gender	140
5.7. Conclusion	141
5.8. Limitations of the study	143
5.9. Implication of the study	143
5.10. Suggestion for further research	144
References	145
Appendices	158

TITLES	PAGE
Table 3.1. The percentage of the sample population gender	53
Table 4.1. Demographic information about the participants' gender	57
Table 4.2. The percentage of the respondents' state of employment	58
Table 4.3. Statistical descriptive of the respondents' range of age	60
Table 4.4. Percentage of the respondents' level of education	61
Table 4.5. Percentage of the respondents' place of living	62
Table 4.6. Percentage of the respondents' religiousness	63
Table 4.7. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken to prove that the sold car	is perfect . 65
Table 4.8. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken to remove suspiciousness	66
Table 4.9. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken	
to prove the honesty of their words	68
Table 4.10. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken	
to prove that their claim	69
Table 4.11. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove mistrust	70
Table 4.12. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken	
to remove stealing accusation	71
Table 4.13. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove accusation of being a liar	72

TITLES	PAGE
Table 4.14. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove their claim of punctuality	74
Table 4.15. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove the accusation of being messy	76
Table 4.16. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
in a reaction to a family complaint	77
Table 4.17. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove that they've paid their debts	79
Table 4.18. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken in a situation	
being accused of doing something without permission	80
Table 4.19. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that they had true reason for not accepting an invitation .	81
Table 4.20. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to show their sincerity to their employees	82
Table 4.21. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove accusation of revealing others' secrecy	84
Table 4.22. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove accusation of not keeping promise	85

TITLES	PAGE
Table 4.23. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove accusation of scratching the neighbor's car	r 86
Table 4.24. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to remove accusation of stealing money from a frien	d 87
Table 4.25. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that they've forgot to keep their promise	88
Table 4.26. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that they don't have money to lend	90
Table 4.27. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to make others believe what they say	91
Table 4.28. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove their accuracy of claim for not being on tim	e 92
Table 4.29. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove that they've forgotten to call a friend	93
Table 4.30. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to make a friend believe they don't lie to him or to h	er 95
Table 4.31. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that changing their mind about marriage is not force:	ful96
Table 4.32.Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that you haven't lost something intentionally	97

TITLES	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 4.33.Percentages of the respondents' oath taken to prove	
that they need their car	98
Table 4.34. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that they haven't pushed others intentionally	99
Table 4.35. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken to prove	
that they are honest to their boss	101
Table 4.36. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken	
to make the police believe their words	102
Table 4.37. Percentages of the respondents' three most frequent oaths	
taken to make others believe their words	103
Table 4.38. Percentages of the respondents' three most frequent oaths	
taken to make others believe their words	104
Table 4.39. Percentages of the respondents' three most frequent oaths	
taken to make others believe their words	105
Table 4.40. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken to prove their rig	thts 107
Table 4.41. Percentages of the respondents' to defend against an accusati	on 109
Table 4.42. Percentages of the types of religious oaths	110
Table 4.43. Percentages of the gender of oaths on Imams	111
Table 4.44.Percentages of oaths taken by the respondents in different situation	s 112
Table 4.45. Percentages of the respondents' oaths in different situations	113

TITLES
Table 4.46. Percentages of the respondents' gender responses to "Yes" or "No"
Table 4.47. Statistical information about the respondents' state of employment 115
Table 4.48. Percentages of the respondents' response to
"Yes" and "No" with regard to various range of age
Table 4.49. Percentages of the respondents' level of education
Table 4.50. Percentages of the respondents' place of living
Table 4.51.Percentages of the respondents' religious status
Table 4.52. Percentages of the different types of oaths taken
by the respondents with regard to their gender
Table 4.53. Percentages of the typology of different oaths taken
by the respondents with regard to their religious status
Table 4.54. Percentages of the typology of different oaths taken
by respondents with regard to their level of education
Table 4.55. Percentages of the typology of oaths taken
by the respondents with regard to their state of employment
Table 4.56. Percentages of the typology of different oaths taken
by the respondents with regard to their place of living
Table 4.57. Percentages of typology of different oaths taken
by the respondents with regard to their age groups

# **List of Figures**

TITLES PAGE
Figure 4.1. Demographic information about the participants' gender
Figure 4.2. The percentage of the respondents' state of employment
Figure 4.3. Statistical descriptive of the respondents' range of age
Figure 4.4. Percentage of the respondents' level of education
Figure 4.5. Percentage of the respondents' place of living
Figure 4.6. Percentage of the respondents' religiousness
Figure 4.7. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken
to prove that the sold car is perfect
Figure 4.8. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken to remove suspiciousness 67
Figure 4.9. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken
to prove the honesty of their words
Figure 4. 10. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken to prove that their claim 69
Figure 4.11. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to remove mistrust
Figure 4.12. Percentage of the participants' oaths taken to remove
stealing accusation
Figure 4.13. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to remove accusation of being a liar
Figure 4.14. Percentage of the respondents' oaths to prove their claim of punctuality 74
Figure 4.15. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to remove the accusation of being messy

# **List of Figures**

TITLES
Figure 4.16. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
in a reaction to a family complaint
Figure 4.17. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to prove that they've paid their debts
Figure 4.18. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken in a situation
being accused of doing something without permission
Figure 4.19. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove that
they had true reason for not accepting an invitation
Figure 4.20. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to show their sincerity to their employees
Figure 4.21. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to remove accusation of revealing others' secrecy
Figure 4.22. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken
to remove accusation of not keeping promise
Figure 4.23. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to remove
accusation of scratching the neighbor's car
Figure 4.24. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to remove
accusation of stealing money from a friend
Figure 4.25. Percentage of the respondents' oaths to prove that
they've forgot to keep their promise89

# **List of Figures**

TITLES	PAGE
Figure 4.26. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove that	
they don't have money to lend	90
Figure 4.27. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to make others believe what they say	91
Figure 4.28. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove their accuracy of claim for not being on time	92
Figure 4.29. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove that they've forgotten to call a friend	94
Figure 4.30. Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken	
to make a friend believe they don't lie to him or to her	95
Figure 4.31. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken to prove that	
changing their mind about marriage is not forceful	96
Figure 4.32.Percentage of the respondents' oaths taken to prove that	
you haven't lost something intentionally	98
Figure 4.33. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove that they need their car	99
Figure 4.34. Percentages of the respondents' oaths taken	
to prove that they haven't pushed others intentionally	100