

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF KURDISH LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE IN THE USE OF COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT RESPONSES
WITH REFERENCE TO PROFICIENCY LEVEL**

MASTER THESIS

BRWA OTHMAN OMER

NICOSIA

December, 2015

NEAREAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF KURDISH LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE USE OF COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT
RESPONSES WITH REFERENCE TO PROFICIENCY LEVEL**

MASTER THESIS

BRWA OTHMAN OMER

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mohammed Hossein Keshavarz

NICOSIA

December, 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Prof. Dr. Orhan Çiftçi

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis submitted by Brwa Othman Omer, titled “Pragmatic Transfer of Kurdish EFL Learners in the Use of Compliments and Compliment Responses with Reference to Proficiency Level”, and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Mohammed Hossein Keshavarz

Supervisor

Examining committee members

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nurdan Atamtürk

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all the information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all the materials and results that are not original to this study.

Name, middle and last name: Brwa Othman Omer

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Mohammed Hossein Keshavarz who helped me get through stressful and difficult times with his priceless feedback and comments during learning and writing this master thesis. He was always of great support to me. I would also like to thank the staff and professors of English Department at Near East University who also contributed to this thesis in different ways. Much gratitude is also due to Komar University of Science and Technology's staff and teachers who helped me during the data collection phase. Many thanks are also due to those who participated in this study. If it weren't for them none of this would have happened.

I would also like to thank my wife, Saya Jalal Mohammed, who supported me from the very first days of my studies. Last but not least, many thanks go to my parents, Othman Omer Said and Zhyan Ahmed Qadir for their support that made this goal of mine much easier to achieve.

ABSTRACT

Pragmatic Transfer of Kurdish EFL Learners in the Use of Compliments and Compliment Responses with Reference to Proficiency Level

Brwa Othman Omer

MA Programme in English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Professor Mohammed Hossein Keshavarz

This study investigated pragmatic transfer of Sorani Kurdish EFL learners with reference to their proficiency level. Three groups participated in this study namely a group of native speakers of Kurdish, and two groups of high and low proficient EFL learners of English. An open-ended discourse completion task (hereinafter DCT) was used to collect the necessary data followed by retrospective interviews to get a more in-depth understanding with respect to the participants choices. The DCT to elicit data on compliments was devised which contained ten hypothetical situations requiring the respondent to provide a compliment to each of the scenarios. The other DCT which was specific to compliment responses was adopted from Sharifian (2008) and was also modified in terms of content in order to avoid cultural misunderstanding. It also consisted of ten hypothetical situations to elicit compliment responses. Moreover, Herbert's (1986, as cited in Yousefvand, 2010) taxonomy of compliment responses was adopted to compare it to both the Kurdish and the interlingual data. Further, for the compliments the syntactic patterns in Manes and Wolfson's (1981, as cited in Jin-Pei, 2013) was adopted to be compared with the interlingual data. The compliments were analyzed in terms of directness strategies and syntactic patterns proposed by Manes and Wolfson (1981), and the compliment responses were analyzed using Herbert's (1986) taxonomy. The results of the quantitative data demonstrated that both EFL groups were similar to American native speakers in the use of compliments and compliment responses. In the use of compliments, the Kurdish interlingual data and the American baseline data showed that the majority of the compliments were expressed using direct strategies while in the Kurdish baseline data there was not much difference between the two strategies (i.e. direct and indirect). In addition, the syntactic structure of the compliments showed great similarity to the American compliments. Moreover, the compliment responses of the Kurdish and American baseline data were very similar to each other in terms of agreement response types. As for the other two categories namely, non-agreement and other

interpretation, they were different from each other. The interlingual data of both high and low proficient groups especially in the agreement category response types were similar to the English baseline data in which the majority of the participants provided responses that fell under the agreement response type category. The other two categories, namely non-agreement and other interpretation showed a little discrepancy from both Kurdish and English baseline data being divided into the two new added categories of *offer* and *formulaic expressions* in different proportions. However, the qualitative analysis of the data indicated that in some cases both high and low participants transferred the norms of their mother language and culture to the use of compliments and compliment responses. This was mainly evident in the two response types of *offer* and *formulaic expression* that were added to the compliment response taxonomy. Furthermore, the analysis of the interviews revealed that the response type of *offer* is a norm in the Kurdish culture, therefore complimented items such as possessions are offered to the complimenter. Moreover, the use of fixed expressions like “*Mashalla*” before complimenting on something in the Kurdish culture is a way of indicating that the complimenter has no bad intention. Further, the complimentee would feel more secured that he/she is protected from the evil eye. In addition, instances in which a compliment-giver would wish the complimentee to have better things along with giving a compliment was evidence of transfer as it was also exhibited in the interlingual data.

Key Words: Pragmatic Transfer, Language Proficiency, Compliment and compliment response strategies, English as a foreign language.

ÖZ

Kürt Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenenlerin Yeterlilik Seviyesine Göre Övgü Kullanımında ve Övgüye Yanıt Vermede Yaptıkları Pragmatik Transfer

Brwa Othman Omer

İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışman: Profesör Mohammed Hossein Keshavarz

Bu çalışma, Sorani Kürt Yabancı Olarak İngilizce öğrenenlerin yeterlilik seviyelerine göre yaptıkları pragmatik transferi araştırmıştır. Bu çalışmada üç grup şöyle ki, ana dili Kürtçe olan bir grup, ve Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce öğrenen yeterlilik seviyeleri yüksek ve düşük olan iki grup yer almıştır. Ucu açık söylem tamamlama görevi (bundan böyle STG) gerekli veriyi toplamak üzere kullanılmış ve ardından geçmişe yönelik mülakatlar katılımcıların seçimlerine istinaden daha geniş çaplı bir anlayış elde etmek için kullanılmıştır. Övgüler üzerine veri elde edecek, cevap veren kişinin her bir senaryoya bir övgü belirtmesini gerektiren on varsayımsal durum içeren STG planlanmıştır. Övgü yanıtlarına özgü olan diğer STG Sharifian'dan (2008) benimsenmiştir ve ayrıca kültürel yanlış anlaşılardan kaçınmak için içerik açısından değiştirilmiştir. Ayrıca, övgü yanıtları elde etmek için on varsayımsal durumdan oluşmuştur. Dahası, Herbert'in (1986, Yousefvand'da bahsedildiği gibi, 2010) övgü yanıtları sınıflandırması hem Kürtçe hem de dillerarası veri ile karşılaştırmak için benimsenmiştir. Daha sonra, övgüler için Manes ve Wolfson'un (1981, Jin-Pei'de bahsedildiği gibi, 2013) sözdizimsel örnekleri dillerarası veri ile karşılaştırılmak için benimsenmiştir. Övgüler, Manes ve Wolfson (1981) tarafından sunulan doğruluk stratejileri ve sözdizimsel örnekler açısından analiz edilmiştir, ve övgü yanıtları Herbert'in (1986) sınıflandırması kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Nicel verilerin sonuçları ispatlamıştır ki her iki Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce öğrenen grup da Amerikan anadil konuşurlarına övgü kullanımı ve övgüye yanıt verme açısından benzerdir. Övgü kullanımında, Kürtçe dillerarası verileri ve Amerikan temel verileri göstermiştir ki övgülerin büyük bir kısmı doğruluk stratejileri kullanılarak ifade edilirken Kürtçe temel verilerinde iki strateji arasında pek fazla farklılık yoktu (ör. doğrudan ve dolaylı olarak). Ek olarak, övgülerin sözdizimsel yapısı Amerikan övgülerine oldukça benzer özellik göstermiştir. Dahası, Kürtçe ve Amerikan temel verilerinin övgü yanıtları anlaşma yanıt türleri açısından birbirlerine çok benzerdi. Diğer iki kategori için şöyle ki, anlaşmazlık ve diğer yorum için, birbirlerinden farklı oldukları

belirtmiştir. Hem yüksek hem düşük yeterlilik grubunun dillerarası verileri özellikle anlaşma kategorisi yanıt türlerinde katılımcıların çoğunluğunun anlaşma yanıt türü kategorisi altına yerleşen yanıtlar verdiği İngiliz temel verilerine benzerdi. Diğer iki kategori ise şöyle ki, anlaşmazlık ve diğer yorum, farklı orantılarda yeni eklenmiş *sunma* ve *formüsel ifadeler* diye iki kategoriye ayrılmakta olan hem Kürtçe hem de İngilizce temel verilerinden biraz farklılık göstermiştir. Ancak, verilerin nitel analizi şunu belirtmiştir ki bazı durumlarda hem yüksek hem de düşük katılımcılar kendi ana dillerinin ve kültürlerinin normlarını övgü kullanımı ve övgüye yanıt vermeye transfer etmiştir. Bu, övgü yanıt sınıflandırılmasına eklenmiş olan iki yanıt türü olan *sunma* ve *formüsel ifadeler*’de başlıca kanıttı. Dahası, mülakatların analizleri açıklığa kavuşturmuştur ki *sunma* yanıt türü Kürt kültüründe bir normdur, bu nedenle mal mülk gibi övülmüş unsurlar övgü yapan kişilere sunulur. Ayrıca, Kürt kültüründe birşey üzerine övgüde bulunmadan önce “*Mashalla*” gibi sabit ifadeler övgü yapan kişinin kötü bir niyeti olmadığını bir belirtme şeklidir. Dahası, övgüyü alan kişi kendinin nazardan korunduğunu düşünerek daha güvenli hisseder. Ek olarak, övgüde bulunmayla birlikte övgü yapan kişinin övgüyü alan kişinin daha iyi şeylere sahip olmasını dilediği örnekler, dillerarası verilerde de sergilendiği üzere transferin kanıtıydı.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Pragmatik Transfer, Dil Yeterliliği, Övgü ve övgüye yanıt stratejileri, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences.....	3
DECLARATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
ÖZ.....	8
LIST OF TABLES.....	12
LIST OF APPENDICES	13
LIST OF ABBREVIATION	14
CHAPTER I.....	15
Introduction	15
Statement of the Problem and Significance of the Study.....	16
Aim of the study.....	17
Research Questions:	17
Definition of Key Terms	18
Limitations and Delimitations	20
CHAPTER II	21
Literature Review.....	21
Language Transfer.....	21
Cultural Background and Pragmatic Transfer	21
Pragmatic Transfer and Speech Acts with Reference to Proficiency Level.....	28
The Speech Act of Refusal.....	28
The Speech Act of Compliments and Compliment responses.....	30

	11
CHAPTER III	33
Methodology.....	33
Design.....	33
Participants	33
Instruments.....	34
Reliability and validity	36
Data Collection Procedure	37
Data Analysis.....	37
Ethical Considerations.....	38
CHAPTER IV	39
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	39
The Use of Compliments and Compliment Responses by Kurdish EFL learners and Kurdish Native Speakers.....	39
Compliments Used by Native Speakers of Kurdish and EFL Learners.....	39
Compliment Responses Used by Kurdish Native Speakers.....	46
The Use of Compliment responses by Kurdish EFL learners.....	55
CHAPTER V	67
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	67
Overview	67
Conclusions	67
Pedagogical implications.....	71
Limitations and suggestions for further research.....	71
References:.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Compliment Strategies in Kurdish.....	41
2. Compliment Strategies by Low Proficiency Group and the American Baseline Data.....	42
3. Compliment Strategies by High Proficiency Group and the American Baseline Data.....	42
4. Compliment Strategies in High and Low Proficient Data.....	42
5. Distribution of Syntactic Patterns in American English.....	43
6. Distribution of Syntactic Patterns in Compliments Used by Kurdish EFL Learners (High and Low proficient participants).....	44
7. Compliment Response Types and Frequencies in Kurdish.....	54
8. Frequency of Compliment Response Types in English.....	63
9. Frequency and Percentages of Compliment Response Types (High and low Proficient Participants).....	64

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	English DCT on Compliments by Kurdish EFL Learners.....	76
APPENDIX B	English DCT on Compliment Responses by Kurdish EFL Learners.....	79
APPENDIX C	Kurdish Baseline DCT on Compliments.....	82
APPENDIX D	Kurdish Baseline DCT on Compliment Responses.....	86

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

DCT: Discourse Completion Task

NSE: Native Speakers of English

NSK: Native Speakers of Kurdish

NNES: Non-native English Speakers

CHAPTER I

Introduction

An English speaker might encounter people from other non-English speaking countries and hear a grammatically correct sentence and still get confused about the meaning of the sentence. This indicates that even with complete awareness about the rules of grammar of the second language it might be relatively difficult to establish a proper conversation with an English native speaker. According to Hymes (as cited in Amaya, 2008), the difficulty of establishing this proper conversation is due to the lack of the speakers' pragmatic knowledge of L2. Therefore, Kurdish (Sorani) speakers of English, like other EFL learners might not be able to establish this conversation because of the lack of their pragmatic competence. You might come across a Kurdish (Sorani) speaker of English and hear the phrase "*on/over my eyes*" which is a translation of "*Serçawm*" in Kurdish and it is a frequently used one in response to thanking and greetings. This phrase, however, would certainly sound out of place to a native English speaker as well as other non-native speakers of English who do not have the same cultural background. In my experience as a teacher I have encountered students with no pragmatic awareness, which makes it difficult for them to properly convey their messages. For example, in writing, I have seen the sentence "*I went to iron play*", which is the exact word to word translation of the sentence "I went to the gym". So, imagine yourselves as a native speaker of English hearing or reading that sentence. The provision of pragmatic knowledge might be a useful endeavor to raise pragmatic awareness and help non-native speakers of English engage in appropriate and smooth conversations. This is evidenced in studies on the role of instruction on pragmatic awareness. (see Pitarch & Soler, 2010; Silva, 2003). There are other studies that encourage the provision of pragmatic input along with grammar of L2 in order to make

students aware about deviation from norms of L2 (see Amaya, 2008). Compliments and compliment responses have been largely relied upon as a tool to extract data for investigating pragmatic transfer or failure (Matsuura, 2004; Ren & Gao, 2012; Tran, 2010). Similarly, the focus of this research will be on Kurdish speakers' pragmatic transfer using compliments and compliment responses to get data on pragmatic transfer. A hypothetical situation for this is when a Kurdish speaker, in response to a compliment such as "*you are beautiful/handsome*", would say "*your eyes are beautiful*"!, as the Kurdish response for this is "tʃæwt dʒwænə". The reason for choosing to respond in this way is because the Kurdish speaker transfers the norms of his/her native tongue and they are unaware of English pragmatic norms. The idea for conducting this research has come from the very limited number of empirical research on Kurdish language, especially Sorani dialect which is mainly spoken in the two provinces of Sulaimanyah and Erbil. Moreover, as a secondary aim, the research is being carried out hoping to provide pragmatic input and pedagogical implications for Kurdish instructors to implement in order to raise the awareness of Kurdish speakers of English about the importance of pragmatic knowledge.

Statement of the Problem and Significance of the Study

The focus of this study is on investigating the occurrence of pragmatic transfer by Kurdish speakers of English with respect to their proficiency level of English. The aforementioned points on pragmatic transfer and Kurdish (Sorani) speakers of English clearly indicate that Kurdish speakers, like other non-native speakers of English, might face challenges making swift decisions while communicating with native speakers of English because of their lack of knowledge about the English language norms.

Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to investigate pragmatic transfer of Kurdish EFL learners with reference to proficiency level. More specifically, it aims to find out probable similarities and differences between high and low proficient learners in the realization of English compliments and compliment responses. Further, it tends to find out how Kurdish native speakers produce compliments and compliment responses in their mother tongue. Another purpose of the study is compare the use of compliments and compliment responses by Kurdish and American native speakers in two sets of baseline data.

Research Questions:

This study intended to answer the following questions:

1. How do Kurdish native speakers produce compliments and compliment responses in Kurdish?
2. Are Kurdish native speakers different from English native speakers in producing the speech acts of compliments and compliment responses?
3. How do Kurdish native speakers produce compliments and compliment responses in English?
4. Does proficiency level affect pragmatic transfer of Kurdish EFL learners in the use of English compliments and compliment responses?
5. Do Kurdish EFL learners transfer the norms of their native language and culture to the use of compliments and compliment responses?

Definition of Key Terms

Language Transfer: According to Odlin (as cited in Cortes, 2005) language transfer is the influence coming from the similarities and differences between the mother tongue and the second language that has been acquired before.

Pragmatic Transfer: According to Kasper (1992), pragmatic transfer is the influence of first language pragmatic knowledge of the learners on the second language in terms of understanding, production and learning.

Compliments: “Complimenting is one of the most important discursive strategies interlocutors use to negotiate interpersonal meaning and to build and sustain rapport and solidarity among the interactants” (Jin Pei, 2013, p. 26).

Compliment response strategies: The definitions of the following terms are taken from Yousefvand (2010, p. 99-100), except the last one, offer, which was defined as a result of the findings of this research.

1. Appreciation Token: A verbal acceptance of a compliment, acceptance not being semantically fitted to the specifics of that compliment.

E.g. Thanks

2. Comment Acceptance: The addressee accepts the complimentary force by means of a response semantically fitted to the compliment.

E.g. Blue is my favorite color too.

3. Praise Upgrade: The addressee accepts the compliment and asserts that the compliment force is insufficient.

E.g. I'm always beautiful.

4. Comment History: The addressee, although agreeing with the complimentary force, does not accept the praise personally; rather, he or she impersonalizes the complimentary force by giving (maybe irrelevant) impersonal details.

E.g. Yes, I bought it from Kish.

5. Reassignment: The addressee agrees with the compliment, but the complimentary force is transferred to some third person or to the object complimented itself.

E.g. this is my sister's taste.

6. Return: The praise is shifted to the addresser/complimenter.

E.g. Your name is nice, too. (So is yours)

7. Scale Down: The force of the compliment is minimized or scaled down by the addressee.

E.g. It isn't that way, it's really quite old.

8. Question: The addressee might want an expansion or repetition of the original compliment or question the sincerity of the compliment.

E.g. Really?

9. Disagreement: The addressee directly disagrees with addresser's assertion.

E.g. No, not at all.

10. Qualification: The addressee may choose not to accept the full complimentary force offered by qualifying that praise, usually by employing but, yet, etc.

E.g. Yes, but I like pink more.

11. No Acknowledgement: The addressee gives no indication of having heard the compliment; that is, he or she employs the conversational turn to do something other than responding to the compliment offered, e.g., shifts the topic.

E.g. [Silence].

12. Request Interpretation: The addressee interprets the compliment as a request rather than a simple compliment.

E.g. Do you want me to give it to you?

13. Formulaic Expression: Addressee shows his or her modesty by using a set of prefabricated utterances.

E.g. Your eyes are beautiful and they see everything beautiful.

14. Offer: The addressee offers the complimented item to show generosity or politeness.

E.g. You can take it, I mean it.

Limitations and Delimitations

One of the limitations of this study is related to data collection procedures, and more specifically to the DCT. The responses collected through the DCT might not be as real as face to face communication. Despite the fact that DCTs are not as real face to face communication, they are still one of the most frequently used ways to elicit data by researchers as they save a lot of time and accumulate relatively large data. Furthermore, with the small population of the study, generalizations might be relatively limited. However, even with the small population, the study will still have pedagogical implications for instructors to rely upon.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Language Transfer

Language Transfer is one of the most researched topics across cultures. According to Odlin (as cited in Cortes et al., 2005), language transfer is the influence coming from the similarities and differences between the mother tongue and a language that has been acquired before. The influence that has been claimed by Odlin seems to create problems for interlocutors of both languages. There exist many studies on different aspects of language transfer aiming to identify these similarities and differences in order to minimize the risk of having misunderstanding and communication breakdown (Dickinson, McCabe, Chiarelli & Wolf, 2004; Heidrick, 2006; Isurin, 2005). Moreover, pragmatic transfer has been the subject of research as part of cross-cultural studies. The section below is a review of the literature on pragmatic transfer across languages.

Cultural Background and Pragmatic Transfer

According to Kasper et al. (1992), pragmatic transfer is the influence of first language pragmatic knowledge of the learners on the second language in terms of understanding, production and learning. This use of L1 pragmatic knowledge would then cause misunderstanding between both interlocutors of the source and the target language. Decapua and Olshtain (as cited in Keshavarz et al., 2006) claim that native speakers might regard a language learner who makes a pragmatic error as offensive or disrespectful. There have been studies previously conducted on pragmatic transfer with reference to level of proficiency of the target language. Many studies on pragmatic

transfer concluded that the low proficiency of the target language results in pragmatic transfer (Aijuan, 2010). On the contrary, Keshavarz et al. (2006) suggest that even with high proficiency level of English, a learner is still subject to pragmatic transfer.

Pragmatic transfer seems to be one of the disciplines that has shifted the attention of many researchers across different cultures. This attention shift aims to compare and contrast pairs of languages envisaging that second language speakers will better understand the norms of the target language and culture. Consequently, speech acts have not been out of the scope of these interdisciplinary studies. More specifically, pragmatic transfer, in relation to compliments and compliment responses, has been within the studies that have been carried out previously.

Al Falasi (2007) carried out a study on Emarati (female) learners of English intending to find out whether the learners of English transfer the norms of Arabic into English. He used a Discourse completion test, putting learners into situations where they ought to respond to compliments. The results of the study showed that the learners sometimes transferred the norms of their language (Arabic) into English. They thought that the norms of their language were global and therefore they transferred them into English when they responded to compliments. Sharifian (2008) investigated the relationship between speech acts and cultural conceptualizations. He looked at the degree to which Persian speakers of English use the cultural schema of *Shekasteh-nafsi* (modesty) in responding to compliments. This schema fosters the negation and downplaying compliments. The results of the research showed that the compliment responses were represented by different degrees of the cultural schema of *Shekasteh-nafsi*. In the same line with this study, Beuzeville and Motaghi-Tabari (2012) conducted a study on Persians living in Australia who have been exposed to the culture for a short while and Persians living in Iran. They wanted to find out how the Iranians' exposure to

Australian culture affected the way they answered compliments. The difference between Iranians living in Australia and those living in Iran was another question of their research. The results of the research were that, the choices of Persian interlocutors residing in Iran and those living in Australia differed. Those living in Iran were more likely to use response strategies that are influenced by the norms of their language. They also found out that Iranians living in Australia tended to produce responses similar to the ones of Australians and this result tells us that exposure to the new target culture is helpful in improving pragmatic competence.

Yousefvand (2010) also set out a study on compliment response strategies across gender in Persian. The objective of the study was to examine the differences between males and females when responding to a compliment. She used a DCT to collect the data from 30 participants who were majoring in English-Persian translation. The results of the study indicated that there was a significant difference in the rate of acceptance between males and females. Females preferred to accept compliments more than the male participants. Furthermore, the results showed that modesty is an essential component of the Persian culture that reflected in the use of compliments.

Another study by Farenkia (2013) investigated compliment strategies by Cameroonian and Canadian university students. The study investigated differences and similarities between the two groups with reference to move structure and head act strategies. It further investigated the use of supportive moves with lexical and stylistic devices. The study was carried out among 50 students and the results showed that there was a difference between the two groups in terms of head act strategies and that is, Cameroonians used single heads more. On the other hand, Canadians tended to use multiple heads. Furthermore, the findings indicated that Cameroonians used more indirect compliments than the Canadian students. In line with this study, Yu (2005)

investigated the complimenting act of American speakers of English and Chinese native speakers. The data were collected by means of ethnographic observation which took a period of two years. The data were analyzed in terms of directness strategies and it turned out that both the Americans and Chinese favored direct compliments over indirect strategies which was the most frequent in the data. However, the Chinese had a little higher tendency than Americans in using indirect strategies.

In his research, Cheung (2009) investigated the notion of politeness between Americans and Chinese. The data for this research were elicited from a scene of a movie titled "The Joy Luck Club". The findings of this study indicated that politeness strategies differ from culture to culture. In other words, what is be polite in a culture might be impolite in another. The consequences of politeness strategy use might not turn out to be as pleasant as one might expect as these different strategies may lead to misunderstandings between interlocutors.

Al-khateeb (2009) carried out a study attempting to investigate the differences in the ways people use "thank you" as a compliment response in relation to different cultural backgrounds, level of evaluation, specializations and gender. The findings indicated that the Arabic participants showed significant differences in using the speech act due to the differences in cultural background, specializations and level of evaluation. However, the differences in gender were not as much as they were in the other investigated areas.

Bu (2010) conducted a study on persuasion strategies by Chinese learners of English. The study was carried out with 30 subjects and they were divided on three groups, ten for each. The groups consisted of native English speakers, native Chinese speakers and Chinese learners of English. The aim of the study was to see if there is evidence of pragmatic transfer when Chinese learners of English use persuasion

strategies. The results of the study showed that when Chinese students use these strategies, they transfer the norms of their language to some degree.

Another study was carried out by Abdul Sattar, Che Lah and Raja Sulieman (2011) which attempted to investigate the how Malay university students perform refusals in the case of occurring a request. The study was conducted with 40 Malay students and the data were collected through DCTs containing 4 items with different variables such as relative power and social distance. The findings of the study indicated that there were different ways of refusals, however, the cultural norms of the source language affected the choice of the participants. Yamagashira (2000) also conducted a similar study on Japanese and Americans to examine the occurrence of pragmatic transfer while performing the refusal speech act. 17 participants, 9 Japanese and 8 Americans, participated in this study. The researcher found out that Japanese Speakers of English transferred the norms of their language especially with higher status people. However, the evidence of pragmatic transfer was less in other situations and especially when the interlocutors had equal status.

In a study conducted by Fukasawa (2011), the relationship between time spent outside classroom in an ESL environment and the development of pragmatic competence was examined. The study was done on seven students who spent 5 months in the United States of America. The researcher collected data before and after the stay in the U.S and the results showed that students with longer hours of exposure to the culture had a wider variety of expressing compliment responses that before their stay abroad.

Cai (2012) carried out a study on compliment response strategies. The study was done with 123 Chinese college students (58 males and 65 females). A DCT was used as means to collect data for the study. The researcher classified the DCT into different

groups in terms of social status. The findings suggested that the Chinese participants are more likely to accept compliments rather than rejection. He further argues that the western culture has an impact in that as Chinese people were hesitant in accepting compliments before.

A study carried out by Jin-Pey et al. (2013) on Philippine English with reference to compliments and compliment responses. The study was done on 30 college students and used a DCT to collect the data. The data collected by the researcher were compared to English data and it turned out that Pilipinos accept compliments and their compliments were as formulaic as the English ones. However, when using compliments, unlike Americans who use both adjectives and verbs, they favor adjectives to express their compliments.

Karimnia and Afghari (2011) published a study on compliment responses in Persian and English. They tended to investigate the applicability of a universal model of politeness. The data were elicited from recordings from Persian and English TV channels. The results of the study indicated that a universal model of politeness is inapplicable in that Persians use different politeness strategies and culture has a great impact on that.

In another study by Fitri, Indravani and Soemantri (2014), pragmatic transfer was investigated in conversations between American and Indonesian speakers of English with reference to agreement types. The data were collected from face to face interactions between the participants. The findings showed that Americans used comment acceptance more and the strategies used by Indonesians were comment acceptance and appreciation token. The researcher claims that there was evidence of pragmatic transfer. Also, there is cultural understanding from the part of Indonesian speakers as their use of comment acceptance is similar to those of the Americans.

Ebadi and Salman (2015) investigated the use of compliments by Iraqi EFL learners focusing on different genders. For their study, 100 (50 males and 50 females) Iraqi undergraduate students were recruited to investigate the difference in CR strategy use. A DCT was used as a means to collect the data. The results of the study showed the influence of gender, also the female participants transferred the norms of their language and used more formulaic expressions and questions than their male counterparts when using compliment responses.

Yarahmadi and Fathi (2015) also investigated the complaint strategies used by Iranian EFL learners with reference to pragmatic transfer. Three groups of participants took part in the study, namely Persian native speakers, Australian native speakers of English and a group of Persian EFL learners. A DCT was used to collect the data. The analysis of the data showed that the Iranian EFL learners displayed signs of pragmatic transfer in the use of complaint strategies as their responses were closer to the Persian baseline data rather than the English data. Similar to this study, Tabatabaei (2015) set out a study on the realization of complaint strategies expressed by Persian and English native speakers. The data were collected by means of a DCT and the results showed that both Persian and English native speakers are different in their expression of complaints. Persians use explicit strategies whereas English native speakers use implicit strategies. The researcher also concluded that, in order to avoid intercultural miscommunication, awareness of the differences of the two languages would help.

Mofidi and Shoushtari (2012) carried out a study on complaint strategies among Iranian EFL and ESL students to investigate pragmatic competence in relation to exposure to English and duration of stay in English speaking countries. Four groups of participants took part in the study namely, English native speakers, Persian native speakers and two other groups of EFL and ESL learners. A DCT was used to collect the

data. The results of the study indicated no significant correlation between the time spent in English speaking countries and exposure to English with pragmatic competence.

Abed (2011) set out a study investigating pragmatic transfer of Iraqi EFL refusals. The study was carried out among three groups of participants who were Iraqi native speakers of Arabic, American native speakers of English and Iraqi EFL learners. The data were collected through a DCT considering the social status of the interlocutors. The findings showed that, despite having some similarities Iraqi EFL learners' responses were different from those of native English speakers in that IEFL learners make refusals with care and are more cautious. This result was similar between the male and female participants.

Pragmatic Transfer and Speech Acts with Reference to Proficiency Level

Regardless of the speech act chosen to elicit data, other studies have been done to investigate pragmatic transfer with reference to proficiency level. In this section below some studies have been reviewed about pragmatic transfer and other speech acts with reference to proficiency level.

The Speech Act of Refusal. Keshavarz et al. (2006) conducted a study aiming to find out whether pragmatic transfer is exhibited in different proficiency levels of English by Iranian EFL learners while performing the speech act of refusal, as well as finding out how pragmatic transfer is related to proficiency level of English. A hundred and eighty-eight participants took part in this study, in which 22 participants were beginners, 43 were intermediate level, and 46 were advanced learners. Additionally, 37 native speakers of American English from Washington DC participated. The results

suggested that pragmatic transfer occurred when Iranian EFL learners used strategies and for refusals and the content of the semantic formulas resembled those of the native language speakers. Keshavarz also found out that their findings were in support of some other previously done studies stating that, even with high proficient learners of English, there were still elements of the source language being transferred into the target language.

Hashemian (2012) carried out a study investigating differences and pragmatic transfer in English and Persian refusals. The study also investigated the relationship between proficiency level and pragmatic transfer while performing the speech act of refusal. A group of English native speakers and a group of Persian native speaker along with two other groups of high and low proficient participants participated in the study. The refusal strategies used by the participants were of three types namely, direct, indirect and adjuncts. The findings showed that in the use of direct strategies there was not much difference between the PNS and ENS. More importantly, the results showed that there was evidence of pragmatic transfer in both high and low proficient participants. Nevertheless, there were more transfer in the data elicited from the low proficient participants.

A study was carried out by wannaruk (2008) which dealt with pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals. The study was done among 120 participants, Native speakers of English (NSE) and Thai learners of English of which the NNS were categorized according to proficiency level. The data were collected through a DCT which contained four different acts and they were invitations, suggestions, offers and requests. The results showed that there were more similarities between NSE and NNS, however, there can still be misunderstanding situations. For example, the researcher says that Thai learners express gratitude less frequently and it might lead to pragmatic failure.

Therefore, it is suggested that students should be exposed not only to grammatical rules, but also to sociocultural norms of the language.

The Speech Act of Compliments and Compliment responses. Ren and Gao (2012) have done a similar study on Chinese students aiming to examine negative transfer by Chinese learners while using complimentary speech acts. They also wanted to find out whether their hypothesis about the correlation between English proficiency level and negative transfer would be true. They conducted the study between two groups, each containing 30 students, one group majoring in English and the other majoring in animation and photography. They found out that students with low English proficiency tended transfer more negatively than the other group due to being unaware of the target culture.

In a similar study to that of Ren and Gao, Aijuan, (2010) conducted a research on Chinese EFL learners' behavior regarding compliment responses. The study was done to investigate the issue of "borrowing transfer" as he calls it, with reference to pragmatics. Similarly, he chose participants of two groups, one majoring in English and the other was a non-English major. The results of the study also revealed that students with longer and more intense background of English tend to transfer less than those studying non-English majors. This result shows that the English major group is more aware about target language pragmatics.

Phoocharoensil, (2012) carried out a research on compliment responses used by Thai EFL learners. The research was done to see whether Thai English learners' proficiency of English has anything to do with transfer from their native language norms. The researcher chose four groups of participants: native speakers of American English, Thai native speakers, High and low proficiency Thai EFL learners. The result

of the research showed that, unlike learners with low proficiency level of English, the participants with high proficiency level of English produced more target-like compliment responses.

Bebee and Takahashi (1986) published a study in which they aimed to investigate language transfer in different contexts and according to different proficiency levels (high and low). The participants of the study were recruited from Japan and the United States of America. 80 participants took part in this study, native speakers of English who were from America and native speakers of Japanese from Japan and non-native speakers of English from the U.S. The reason for these different groups was to investigate language transfer in EFL and ESL contexts. The studies most controversial hypothesis was that high proficient non-native speakers of English would transfer more than the low proficient which was contrary to the views in the literature. The basis for this hypothesis was that high proficient speakers of English do not have limitations in terms of linguistic ability, therefore they can translate anything they want to say. Their findings showed that both groups of high and low proficient students showed transfer and also there were transfer in both EFL and ESL contexts.

Monjezi (2014) also investigated the influence of gender and proficiency level on the production and choice of compliment topics and compliment response strategies. The study was carried out with Iranian EFL learners who were made into two groups based on the results of a test. The findings of the study suggested that both gender and proficiency level influenced the way they initiated their compliments and also responding to them. However, the influence of gender was greater than that of proficiency level.

The pioneering researcher who first investigated compliment responses was Pomerantz. She claimed that Americans confront two problems when compliments and

these are to agree with the complimenter and not to express praise upgrade. She realized that the receivers of the compliments deal with these situations in different ways; (A) Acceptance, (B) Rejection and (C) avoiding self-praise (Pomerantz as cited in Yousefvand et al., 2010).

Herbert (as cited in Al Falasi, 2007) reviewed Pomerantz's and collected a corpus of more than a thousand compliment responses and it turned out that only 36.35% were considered acceptance. After the revision, he came up with the following taxonomy.

Compliment response strategies

Example

A. Agreement

I. Acceptances

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Appreciation Token | Thanks; Thank you; (Smile) |
| 2. Comment Acceptance | Thanks; It's my favorite too. |
| 3. Praise Upgrade | brings out the blue in my eyes, doesn't it? |
| II. Comment History | I bought it for the trip to Arizona. |

III. Transfers

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Reassignment | My brother gave it to me. |
| 2. Return | So's yours. |

B. Non-agreement

I. Scale Down

It's really quite old.

II. Question

Do you really think so?

III. Non-acceptances

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Disagreement | I hate it. |
| 2. Qualification | It's alright, but Len's is nicer. |
| IV. No Acknowledgment | (silence) |

C. Other Interpretations

I. Request

You wanna borrow this one too?

Herbert's Taxonomy of Compliment responses (Herbert 1986, p. 79; as cited in Al Falasi 2007, p. 32)

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Design

This study used both a qualitative and a quantitative design, using a discourse completion task as well as interviews to elicit in-depth information about the participants' compliment behavior and compliment responses. The interviews were unstructured as answers for certain questions led to other unstructured questions to obtain further insight regarding the participants' choices.

Participants

Ninety Kurdish EFL learners (all Sorani speakers, a dialect mainly spoken in the two provinces of Sulaimanyah and Erbil) participated in this study. The participants were chosen from one of the universities in the city of Sulaimanyah among non-enrolled students who were taking a foundation year studying English. The target sample were 90 students (thirty for each group); however, considering the mortality rate, five extra students were recruited for each group. The participants, who provided the interlingual data, were divided into two groups based on their English proficiency level. For this purpose, they took a placement test based on which the two groups of high and low proficient participants were formed. There were also thirty native Kurdish students who participated in the study to get Kurdish baseline data. They were recruited from the same university studying a pre-academic year of English.

Instruments

For the English proficiency test, I relied on online Oxford placement test to determine the level of the students, which was taken in January. The test consists of two different parts; English Usage and listening. The way this test works is that it assesses the ability of the student and gives questions according to previously answered questions. In other words, if a student gets a question right it presents a slightly more difficult question, and if he/she gets one wrong, it lowers the level and gives an easier one in order to determine the level of the student. For the purpose of this research only the two upper levels were chosen namely levels three and four. Level three being considered as low proficient and level four were high proficient. Furthermore, two DCTs were used to elicit the data. One of them was devised to help elicit data on compliments. The items in this DCT (see appendix A) were compliments on possession, skill, idea and kinship. The participants were required to give compliments to the given situations. Each of the two DCTs comprised ten items each with a blank choice for the participants to express their own compliment/compliment responses without any limitations. The DCTs were also piloted first to examine their reliability. Part one of the DCTs was about background information, including name, which was optional, gender, age, ethnicity and first language of the participants. It also asked the participants whether they lived in an English-speaking country.

A Discourse Completion Task was also adopted and adapted used by Sharifian (2008) (see appendix B) which consisted of ten hypothetical situations of given compliments. The study was carried out with Persian speakers of English to investigate pragmatic transfer. However, its content was slightly changed with regard to the situations to eliminate the possibility of any cultural misunderstanding. The topics of this DCT were possession and ability/skill. It also had an item on sister. The grammatical structure of most of the items were as follows:

NP-intensifier-ADJ. Your car is very nice.

However, only two of the items were different from the above structure and they were:

Congratulations! You have done a great job.

I appreciate the fact that you work very hard here.

Moreover, the collection of the data were followed by retrospective interviews with ten of the high and low proficient participants. Each interview lasted about 20 to 25 minutes. The participants were asked questions about their responses and they led to other questions as they started to explain their choices.

Additionally, the English baseline data were taken from Manes and Wolfson (1981) who collected a corpus of 686 compliments and through an ethnographic method. They noted down compliments that they heard in daily life situations. This was used to analyze the interlingual data to see similarities and differences between the two types of data, namely American English and Kurdish EFL learners of English. The rationale for choosing American data was because of unavailability of a complete set of data on compliments and compliment responses in British English. Further, the Kurdish baseline data were collected through using DCTs from Kurdish native speakers who were recruited from non-enrolled university students. These DCTs were translated versions of the English DCTs and which were back-translated by a university teacher named Mr. Ihsan Ali who taught English as a foreign language. The data were coded and translated into English by the researcher himself and later analyzed according to directness strategies using Yu (2005) whose data were on American English speakers and they were also analyzed in terms of directness and indirectness strategies.

As for the compliment responses English baseline data, Herbert's (as cited in Yousefvand, 2010) taxonomy was used to analyze the interlingual data. Herbert's data ended up creating three main categories which contained twelve types of compliment responses.

Reliability and validity

For the purpose of reliability, the data were given to another person who was an MA student and knowledgeable about this topic. She coded all the data for both compliments and compliment responses and she came up with a very similar result with only 1.2% difference in the Kurdish baseline data for compliments in terms of directness strategies, 1.3% difference in the high proficient data and 3.1% in the low proficient data. In other words, there was about 98% agreement in both of the Kurdish and interlingual data regarding the compliments in the analyses done by the researcher and the other rater. Moreover, the compliments were also analyzed in terms of syntactic structure bearing very similar results to that of the researcher. The only difference was in patterns one and two in both the high and low proficient data and patterns four and five in the low proficient data. As for the compliment responses, the data were coded by the other rater and the researcher according to Herbert's taxonomy. The other rater analyzed the Kurdish baseline data in which the agreement response types weighted 65.9%, non-agreement 9.7% and other interpretation including formulaic expression and offer weighted 24.2%. Thus, the differences were between the first and the last category response types namely agreement and other interpretation. Furthermore, the interlingual data analysis done by the other rater showed similarity as well. The differences only emerged in small proportions. The high proficient data analysis showed that agreement response types weighted 74%, non-agreement 15.2% and other interpretation including

the two added response types weighted 9.6%. On the other hand, the low proficient data analysis done by the other rater showed that agreement response types weighted 74.2%, non-agreement response types weighted 18.5% and other interpretation including formulaic expression and offer weighted 6.8%. In this way it was known that reliability was achieved in the analysis of the data.

Data Collection Procedure

An open-ended English discourse completion task (DCT) was distributed to each group of high and low proficient participants. The same English DCT, which was translated into Kurdish (see appendix C & D) and then back-translated by a university English instructor (Mr. Ihsan Ali), was given to the Kurdish participants. This provided the researcher with baseline data for Kurdish. The compliment DCTs were administered first then after a two-week interval the compliment response DCTs were distributed in order to avoid practice effect. The participants were put in hypothetical situations and were asked to react to the situations as if they were in the given circumstances provided in the DCTs. Students with low proficiency level of English were helped by providing them with explanations to words and expressions that were thought to be difficult for them in the DCTs. Furthermore, the DCTs were piloted before collecting the actual data to determine their feasibility and appropriateness. Following the distribution of the DCTs, there were unstructured interviews with ten participants of each group which lasted 20-25 minutes each. The purpose of the interviews was to get an in-depth insight into why they chose to respond in the way they did.

Data Analysis

After collecting the DCTs, participants' responses of the Kurdish DCTs were analyzed and the responses of students with low and high proficiency levels were

analyzed separately to compare with those of Kurdish native speakers and American natives. After that, the responses were analyzed in order to categorize them. The responses of the two groups (high and low proficiency) were compared with each other and with those of the Americans. Once the categorization of the responses was finished, unstructured interviews were done after the collection of the DCTs. The interviews were then analyzed and related to the responses of the DCT items. Finally, both of these types of responses were analyzed and compared to see which group transferred the norms of Kurdish into English most.

Ethical Considerations

Firstly, issues such as confidentiality have been discussed with the participants. They have been reassured that everything about them will be confidential. The participants were given the complete freedom to take part in the research. They were also asked to participate according to their schedules not the researcher's.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Use of Compliments and Compliment Responses by Kurdish EFL learners and Kurdish Native Speakers

Compliments Used by Native Speakers of Kurdish and EFL Learners.

As mentioned before, the compliment DCT contained 10 hypothetical situations related to three different topics namely possession, appearance and skill and one scenario that was about one's fiancé. The responses to the items were generally long and detailed which presumably is because of the ceremonious nature of the Kurdish culture. The items related to possession were 1 and 5. Item two was about a kin, which was about one's sister and it was paid special attention to as it highlights a cultural feature. These items contained both direct and indirect compliment clauses (shown in table 1) such as *very nice, beautiful, wow these are nice* often followed by a question like *where did you get them? How did you get that? How much did it cost you?* Sometimes the compliments were followed by wishes such as, *"I wish you have better things"*. The fact that these compliments are followed by wishes should not be skipped over easily. They complimenter may want to tell the complimentee that he/she is sincere about it. In other words, the complimenter may be worried that the complimentee would think that he/she is jealous of them. However, with regard to Item 2, there was only 3 direct compliments such as *"Your fiancé is handsome/beautiful"*, all the other participants replied indirectly with expressions like *"I wish you have a long life together"*. This may tell us that it is not acceptable to compliment on someone's wife, sister and/or fiancé. However, according to some of the participants interviewed in this

study, it might be okay to compliment someone's fiancé/ sister/wife if the relationship is an intimate one.

Items 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 were categorized under *skill*. These responses mostly started with the expression *well done!* Or expressing surprise in an indirect way such as “*You should be a singer*”. They were also followed by questions and wishes. The questions included *how did you learn that?*, “*How did you do that?*” or “*Can you teach me how to do that?*” In some cases the informant asked for help like in the case of item three saying “*can you help me learn English?*” Or in item four saying “*can you help me make that dish?*”.

The remaining two Items (i.e., 9 and 10) were about *appearance* and ideas. Item 9, was about *idea* and it was mostly responded with some kind of formulaic expression, such as “*well done or good idea*” followed by offering help to implement the idea saying “*I can help you implement your idea if you want*”. The last item, 10, was about *appearance* and most of the participants answered with, *nice, beautiful or it becomes you*. These were followed by questions such as “*where did you have your hair cut?*” “*How much did you pay for it?*” These questions that follow the compliments may serve as a sign of showing sincerity. This might be specific to the Kurdish culture as it is not common in the western culture.

The Kurdish data were analyzed in terms of *directness* and *indirectness* strategies (Shown in Table 1 below). Out of 328 compliment clauses 179 clauses were direct compliments which makes up 54.5%. The rest of the compliments which made up 45.4% used indirect strategies. As can be observed, there is not much difference in the Kurdish baseline data in terms of strategy use. This data will be compared to American native speakers in terms of strategy use and syntactic patterns. The table below shows

the frequencies and percentages of the strategies used by Kurdish native speakers. This will later be discussed in relation to the English and inter-lingual data.

Table 1

Compliment Strategies in Kurdish

	No.	%
Direct compliment clauses	179	54.5
Indirect compliment clauses	149	45.4
Total	328	100

Yu et al. (2005) conducted a study about Chinese and American compliments and found out that in the majority of the cases, unlike the Kurdish participants, Americans use direct strategies to give compliments. The data demonstrated that 91.1% of the compliments were expressed directly which is way more than the Kurdish participants responses which made up 54.5%. However, only a small proportion, compared to the direct compliments, were indirect strategies which made up 8.9% (Table 2). This is also contrary to the Kurdish baseline data which was 45.4% (shown in Table 1).

As shown in Table 2 and 3, the inter-lingual data were analyzed using the same classification of strategies and it showed that both the high and low proficient Kurdish EFL learners, like their American counterparts, used direct strategies when giving compliments in English. The low proficient participants used direct strategies in 87.3% of the cases, similarly, the Americans' direct strategies made up 91.1%. Moreover, the high proficient participants also used direct strategies in the majority of the cases comprising 72.4%, except the difference with the American data was a little higher than that of the low proficient participants.

Table 2

Compliment strategies in Low Proficient Data and American English

Compliment Strategies	Low Proficient		American	
	No.	%	No.	%
Direct strategies	208	73.4	719	91.1
Indirect Strategies	75	26.5	70	8.9

Table 3

Compliment strategies in High Proficient Data and American English

Compliment Strategies	High Proficient		American	
	No.	%	No.	%
Direct strategies	171	72.4	719	91.1
Indirect Strategies	65	27.5	70	8.9

Table 4

Compliment strategies in High and Low Proficient Data

Compliment Strategies	Low Proficient		High Proficient	
	No.	%	No.	%
Direct strategies	208	73.4	171	72.4
Indirect Strategies	75	26.5	65	27.5

A study by Manes and Wolfson (1981) (as cited in Jin-Pei, 2013), who collected a corpus of 686 compliments, showed that most of the compliments given in American English are formulaic and they fall into the following syntactic patterns. As shown in table 4, the majority of the compliments belong to the first syntactic pattern use which is 53.6%. The second and the third patterns come next and the rest of the compliments are distributed over the other patterns but only in small portions.

Table 5

Distribution of syntactic patterns in American English.

Syntactic Patterns of Compliments	Example	Percentage
1. NP is/looks (really) ADJ.	Your hair looks nice.	53.6%
2. I (really) like/love NP	I love your hair.	16.1%
3. PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP	This was really a great meal.	14.9%
4. You V (a) (really) ADJ NP	You did a good job.	3.3%
5. You V (NP) (really) ADV	You really handled that situation well.	2.7%
6. You have (a) (really) ADJ NP!	You have such beautiful hair!	2.4%
7. What (a) ADJ NP!	What a lovely baby you have!	1.6%
8. ADJ NP!	Nice game!	1.6%
9. Isn't NP ADJ!	Isn't your ring beautiful!	1.0%
10. Other	Cool	2.8%

Table 6

Distribution of syntactic patterns in compliments used by Kurdish EFL learners (High and Low proficient participants).

Syntactic Patterns of Compliments	Example	percentage	
		Low	High
1- NP is/looks (really) ADJ.	Your hair looks nice.	50.4%	43.7%
2- I (really) like/love NP	I love your hair.	5.4%	7.0%
3- PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP	This was really a great meal.	10.1%	9.1%
4- You V (a) (really) ADJ NP	You did a good job.	4.3%	2.5%
5- You V (NP) (really) ADV	You really handled that situation well.	1.9%	4.1%
6- You have (a) (really) ADJ NP!	You have such beautiful hair!	6.6%	4.5%
7- What (a) ADJ NP!	What a lovely baby you have!	1.9%	1.25%
8- ADJ NP!	Nice game!	6.6%	9.5%
9- Isn't NP ADJ!	Isn't your ring beautiful!	0%	0%
10- Other	Cool	9.0%	19.1%

As shown in Table 6, the compliments fell mostly under pattern one which is very similar to the American baseline data (shown in Table 5). This is in line with Jen-Pei et al. (2013) findings whose data were on Philipinos and turned out that most of the compliments given by both Philipinos and Americans were under the first syntactic pattern. However, no example of pattern 9 was found in the data, instead, a new pattern emerged in the low proficient data that was not used in the American baseline data namely (*That is the most ADJ NP I have ever V.*). There were 8 cases that fell under this category. Examples include like “*that was the most delicious food I have ever eaten*”, “*This is the best food I have ever eaten in my life*” and “*I have never had an employee*

like you” As we see in the table above, 9.0% of the compliments belong to pattern 10 as they couldn’t be referred to any other structure. There were some compliments that resembled the Kurdish ones in terms of meaning. It could be inferred that they were translations of the Kurdish versions. When someone buys a new house or a car, in Kurdish, the norm is to wish that person to have better things so there were examples like, *“I wish you have better things”* and *“I wish you live a happy and healthy life in it”*. In addition, there were other examples of implicit compliments expressed in questions. For instance, Item three, which was about speaking English well, most participants expressed their responses in question forms such as *“wow, how did you learn English? Could you teach me?”*. There were also instances like *“I wish I had a voice like this”* and *“I want to eat my fingers too”* which means that the food was really delicious.

However, high proficient data indicated that there were more structures that fell under pattern 10, comprising 19.1%. In item 2, which was describing one’s fiancé, most of the participants avoided complimenting the person in the picture, instead they wished the complimentee a happy life. Therefore, there were examples like *“You guys suit each other, wish you a happy life”*. Commonly, in the Kurdish culture, in such situations it is customary to wish the person to have a good life. However, in this item, there could be variation based on different genders. The interviewees claimed that it is sometimes okay for a girl to compliment on her friends fiancé but maybe not for males. One of the male participants said *“it depends on how he pays the compliment”*. However, these results reject the findings of Kim (2003) who set out his study on Japanese and Korean EFL learners and concluded that there were only four major compliment structures in the data namely, *“NP is (intensifier) ADJ”*, *“NP looks/seems (intensifier) ADJ”*, *“I (intensifier) like/love NP”* and *“How ADJ!”*

In the responses of both high and low proficient participants, there were cases in which the participant made use of the expression “*Mashalla*”. According to the interviews done with some of the participants, people use this expression to show that they have no bad intention or they are not jealous about the thing they are complimenting. In fact, this thought is generalized on appearance, possession and skills as well. According to the religion of Islam, this expression protects you from the evil eye. Therefore, people use it before complimenting on an item.

Compliment Responses Used by Kurdish Native Speakers.

Both the Kurdish baseline data and the inter-lingual data were coded and analyzed using Herbert’s taxonomy (as cited in Yousefvand, 2010). However, due to cultural differences, there was need to add two more categories to the taxonomy and these are *offer* and *formulaic expressions* (shown in Table 6). Offering a complimented item, such as possessions, to the complimenter in the Kurdish culture is an important sign of politeness or generosity and the scenarios that required *offer* did not really fit into any of Herbert’s category, therefore it was added to the taxonomy as a separate CR strategy. Another category which was added to the taxonomy is *formulaic expressions*. This is also in line with Yousefvand et al. (2010) findings in which she added formulaic expressions as a separate category stating that these expressions are from the speaker’s culture and it saves them from the dilemma of self-praise. However, In Kurdish I have found out that *formulaic expressions* are culturally bound expressions that might only make sense in the source language and may have different functions in English, thus it was also treated as a separate CR strategy. The other responses of the compliments were categorized and analyzed according to Herbert’s taxonomy (shown in table 6 below).

The responses of each item will separately be analyzed below and then they will be summarized in a table (Table 6).

Item 1: You have just graduated from high school and have received a prize for being the top graduate. One of your former teachers is very happy to hear the good news and congratulates you on your achievement as follows:

- A. Congratulations! You have done a great job. Well done!.
- B. You say:

The responses to scenario one were of two types. 15 of the participants replied with an *appreciation token* such as “*Thanks dear teacher*”, and the rest of the participants reassigned the compliment to the complimenter (their teacher) expressing it in different ways such as “*if it wasn’t for you I wouldn’t have gotten this*”, “*it was because of your effort I achieved this*”. However, most of them expressed the reassignment saying “*This was all because of you*”. To respond to such compliments in the Kurdish culture, especially given by a teacher, parents or an elderly, it would be appropriate to reassign the success or achievement to the complimenter otherwise the complimentee may appear inconsiderate or they might be considered arrogant. This was accentuated by the interviews conducted with the participants.

Item 2: You have invited a friend for dinner. He/she is very impressed by your food and has enjoyed it a lot. S/he compliments you saying:

- A. The food was really great!
- B. You say:

Most of the complimentees, that comprised 23, replied with a Kurdish formulaic expression which is used after eating. They said “*Noshi gyant be*” which is closely translated into “*hope you have enjoyed it!*”. Only three participants accepted the

compliment by replying with a praise upgrade, of which one was a combination of the Kurdish *formulaic expression* “*Noshi gyant bet*” and *praise upgrade* “*Everything I do makes people amazed!*” and the other two said “*of course, anything I make tastes amazing*”. This response might have come from the complimentee’s thinking that there is some kind of informality between the guest and him/herself, otherwise it would not be appropriate to respond in such a way if the relationship is not an intimate one. One of the participants offered to invite the complimenter again and one case of *scale down* in which the participant said “*It is not worthy of you*”, which is again very common in Kurdish to respond to such compliments. One participant reassigned the skill to her mother saying “*My mother is a very good cook*”.

Item 3: suppose you have a break between your lectures and you want to go to the cafeteria with a friend of yours. When you enter the cafeteria you come across your sister and you superficially introduce your friend and sister just saying their names, i.e. your friend does not know she is your sister. When she leaves, your friend compliments her and saying:

A. She was beautiful!

B. You say:

In this scenario, the participants’ responses varied according to gender. All the females accepted the compliment in different ways. Seven of them responded reassigning the beauty to themselves saying “*Of course she is beautiful, because she is my sister*”. Some of these responses were followed by laughter “*haha...*” which might indicate that it is a joke. 4 of them replied with a Kurdish *formulaic expression* “*Chawt jwana*” which is “*your eyes are nice*” usually expressed when someone compliments on the beauty of a possession or someone you know (e.g. sister, child..etc.). 2 of the female participants did not acknowledge the compliment and only said “*she is my sister*”.

However, this was different for the male participants. Twelve of them scaled the compliment down which was expressed in different ways. These responses included “*have some manners, she is my sister*”, “*you idiot, she is my sister*” and “*don’t you have sisters and mother*”. The latter is usually said by the complimentee in such cases implying that it would not feel right if he/she said something like that to the complimenter. This means that the complimentee wouldn’t want him to compliment on his sister. Further, three of them chose not to say anything which can be classified as no acknowledgment in the taxonomy. One participant replied with *question* saying “*really? She is my sister!*” and one other replied with an *appreciation token*. The interviews revealed that a situation like this in which someone compliments on your sister depends on the degree of intimacy and the way he says the compliment. If the person senses that the compliment-giver has some intention behind the compliment, then it is not okay. However, if there is no intention and the compliment is an innocent one, then it is fine.

Item 4: You have bought a new pair of jeans, and you wear it for the first day of university after summer break. You meet your classmate and s/he says:

- A. Your jeans are very nice!
- B. You say:

The majority of the participants, 17 of them, responded with offering the pair of jeans, saying “*Thanks, you can have them*”. This was either done directly such as “*you can have it*” which might sound kind of weird for someone to offer you their pair of jeans. Some others still offered the jeans but expressed it in a different way such as “*I will bring it to you later if you want*”. However, among the offers, one of them was a combination the Kurdish formulaic expression “*Your eyes are nice*” and offering the item at the same time. This was also classified as *offer*. Offering a complimented item in the Kurdish culture is very common which is why most of them offered the

complimenter to take the jeans. Five of them replied to the compliment saying “*Thanks, your eyes are nice*” which is a formulaic expression used when someone or someone’s possession, children are complimented. Four of them answered with an *appreciation token* “*Thank you*” and one of them replied with a *question*. There were also two cases of *comment acceptance* saying “*It’s new*”.

Item 5: You have recently built a house. You have built it yourself with a very nice design. Your friend pays you a visit and says:

A. Your house is excellent!

B. You say:

In this item 11 of the participants replied with the *formulaic expression* “*Nukshet le bet*” which translates into “*hope you have it/the same to you too*”. Again, it is customary to wish the same for the complimenter to have the same when your possession such as cars, houses and etc. are complimented. There was one case of another Kurdish formulaic expression which was “*Your eyes are nice/beautiful*”. Moreover, five of them replied only with an *appreciation token* “*Thanks/ thanks much*” and six of them replied with *comment history* saying “*I got really tired with it*”. There were four cases of *comment acceptance* “*Thanks, I designed it myself or I got the design from the internet*”. There was only one case of *praise upgrade* which was “*Of course, I am an engineer*”. The case in which the complimentee replied with *praise upgrade* is not acceptable in such cases unless the two people have a socially intimate relationship. In this case the complimentee would otherwise be perceived as a show off.

Item 6: You have bought a new American car. You go to university and see one of your friends in the car park. He/she compliments your car and says:

A. it is a very nice car!

B. You say:

The analysis of this scenario showed that 12 of the subjects accepted the compliment replying with an *appreciation token* “Thank you” and also eight others replied with the Kurdish *formulaic expression* saying “Hope you have the same too”, which is explained in the previous item that it is a norm to wish the person the same thing when complimenting on possession. One participant replied with another *formulaic expression* which was “Your eyes are nice” There were two cases of *comment history* stating “thanks, I bought it recently”. The other responses varied and they contained two cases of interpreting the compliment as *request* stating “Do you want me to take you for a ride? And “Thanks, I paid a lot for it, do you want to try it?”. In addition, there was only one case of *reassignment* saying “This is not mine, it is God-given”. This type of response has a religious root as the belief is that everything you have, have been granted by God. There was also two cases of *comment acceptance* saying “Thanks, a lot of people say that and it burns a lot of fuel” and also a case of *praise upgrade* “Yes, that is why I bought it” which may sound rude in case of responding to formal acquaintances.

Item 7: You have presented a subject in the class and it seems that everyone likes the subject. One of your friends comes and says:

A. The information was really good and beneficial.

B. You say:

Among the responses, seven respondents answered with an *appreciation token* “Thanks much”. However, 14 of them replied with *comment acceptance* “Thanks, I hope it was useful for everyone”. Two of them answered with *question* saying “Really? Was it?” which is a sign showing uncertainty which is normal amongst students. Three others

replied with *comment history* stating “*I got really tired with it*” and “*Thanks, I read a lot of books about it.*”. Other responses included 2 cases of *praise upgrade* “*Of course I am always like this*” which shows that the complimentee considered the complimenter a close friend, otherwise it is not nice to respond in such a way. One respondent replied with “*Thanks for listening, I hope it is worthy of your compliment*” which can function as *scale down*. There was one *formulaic expression* which was “*I am at your service*”.

Item 8: It has been a week since you have started your new job. You work hard to satisfy your boss and sometimes stay late to finish your tasks. Your boss realizes that you stay late. S/he comes to you to show his/her appreciation for what you do and says:

- A. I know you work very hard here, I appreciate it!
- B. You say:

Eighteen participants replied to this item with *comment acceptance* stating “*Thanks, I am only doing my job*”. There were also four informants who answered with only an *appreciation token* “*Thanks*”. Moreover, four of them replied with “*Thanks, I hope I have satisfied you*” which can also function as *comment acceptance*. There was also a case where the subject asked for extra money. This is not really customary in the Kurdish culture, however, the respondent might have thought that there is some intimacy between him/her and the boss and could jokingly say that.

Item 9: you have received a gift as you were one of the top students of your college. Your mom tells you:

Congratulations! I am proud of you!

You say:

Fifteen of the informants reassigned their success to their mother saying “*Thanks very much mom, this was all because of you*”. There were four cases who answered with an *appreciation token* “*Thank you!*” which sounds a little cold for a mother-son relationship in the Kurdish culture. Three of the participants returned the compliment to the complimentee by saying “*I am proud of a mother like you*”. Other responses were “*I will always try to make you proud*” or “*I kiss your hands dear mother*” which is a sign of respect to kiss the hands of the elderly in such cases in the Kurdish culture. In addition, there was only one case of reassigning the compliment to God saying “*Thanks to God*” and a case of *comment acceptance* stating “*Thanks dear mother, I am glad that you are happy*”.

Item 10: Assume that your instructor hands you a paragraph and asks you to write on the board five minutes before s/he comes to class and the lecture starts. While writing, one of your classmates notices that your handwriting is very nice and compliments your handwriting saying:

- A. Your handwriting is really nice!
- B. You would say:

Sixteen of the participants accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* saying “*Thanks or Thanks a lot*”. On the contrary, four of them scaled it down and stated “*I don’t think it is nice or I wrote it very slowly otherwise it is not nice*”. There were two cases of the Kurdish *formulaic expression* “*Your eyes are nice*”. Other responses included a case of *comment history* such as “*Thanks much, I have been to a calligraphy course*”, and a *praise upgrade* stating “*Thanks, it is genetics*”, and one question like “*Really, is it nice?*”. There was only a case of returning the compliment saying “*Thanks, so is yours*”. In this case we see that the complimentee may have thought that there is an obligation to return the compliment even though the

complimenter's handwriting is not included in the hypothetical situation. Furthermore, one participant replied with sort of a joke saying "*Thanks, my handwriting is nice even when I type on computers*" which can be considered as comment acceptance. There were also two other cases of comment acceptance which was expressed as "*Thanks, I like this handwriting*".

As mentioned above, the table below (Table 6) summarizes the Kurdish baseline data in terms compliment response frequency.

Table 7
Compliment Response types and frequencies in Kurdish

CR strategies	Frequency	Percentage
A. Agreement		
I. Acceptances		
1. Appreciation token	68	23.8
2. Comment acceptance	48	16.8
3. Praise upgrade	8	2.8
Sub-total	124	43.4
I. Non-acceptance		
1. Comment history	12	4.2
2. Reassignment	41	14.3
3. Return	4	1.4
Sub-total	57	20
Totals	181	63.3
B. Non-agreement		
1. Scale down	18	6.3
2. Question	5	1.7
3. Disagreement	0	0.0
4. Qualification	0	0.0
5. No acknowledgment	5	1.7
Totals	28	9.7

C. Other interpretation		
1. Request	2	0.7
2. Formulaic Expressions	56	19.6
3. Offer	18	6.3
Total	76	26.6

The data in table 7 show that the majority of the data, comprising 63.3%, were distributed on the agreements response types. This means that Kurdish speakers tend to agree with compliments more than the other types in the other two categories. Non-agreement response types made up 9.7% and other interpretation including the two added types, *formulaic expression* and *offer*, comprising 26.6%. Later on, these results will be discussed with respect to the English and inter-lingual data. This finding is in contrast with Ebadi and Salman et al. (2015) findings in which only 38% of his data, which were elicited from Iraqi Arabic speakers, were agreements. Moreover, 13% were non-agreements and 49% were other interpretations including *formulaic expressions*. Moreover, the findings of this study is similar to that of Razmjoo, Barabadi and Arfa (2013) who set out their study to investigate compliment response speech act in Persian. Their results showed that the majority of the compliments were agreement and also they further discuss making offer, which was found to be one of the response types added to the taxonomy in this research, is a way of making “Ta’aruf” which is a key feature of the Iranian culture.

The Use of Compliment responses by Kurdish EFL learners

To avoid redundancy, I will not write the items here again, I will just mention the number of the items. Hence, the reader can refer to the items above in the Kurdish data or in the appendix. Herbert’s taxonomy is also used to analyze the data.

Item 1:

In this item, 16 of the low proficient participants reassigned their success to their teacher and this was mostly expressed in phrases like this “*Thanks much, this was all because of you*”. The interviewees asserted that it would be polite to reassign your success to your teacher. In addition, 17 of them accepted the compliment with an appreciation token such as “*Thanks or Thank you so much, I appreciate it*”. One participant replied with a comment history saying “*Thanks much, I did study hard for the exams*”, and one other said “*Thank you so much, I am really happy that you are glad*”. However, 12 of the high proficient participants also reassigned the compliment to the complimenter and 21 of them accepted the compliment with an appreciation token.

Item 2:

On the one hand, only five of the participants accepted the compliment expressing it in an *appreciation token* “*Thank you*”. Moreover, eight of them said “*Thank you, I hope you enjoyed it*” which is an equivalent of the Kurdish expression “*Noshi gyant be*” usually used after having meals. There were six cases of “*Thanks, I am happy you say that*”. Further, five of them answered with a *question* saying either “*really?*” or “*do you like it?*” and in two cases followed by “*I am glad you enjoyed it*”. There were four cases of offering the meal again mostly saying “*you can come and have it again, this is not the last time*”. Additionally, two participants replied with “*It is nothing for you*”. There was only one case of *praise upgrade* and one other reassigned the skill to her mother. On the other hand, 10 of the high proficient students expressed happiness that they guest enjoyed the food saying “*I am glad you liked/loved it*”. Seven replied with the Kurdish formulaic expression “*Noshi gyant be*” which translates into “*I hope you enjoyed it*”. Interestingly, there were three cases of the use of the French formulaic expression “*bone appetite*”. The participants might have been unable to find a

close English expression to the Kurdish expression “*Noshi gyant be*”, so they chose this French one which is very close to the Kurdish expression except the French expression is used before meals. There were five participants who accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token*. Other replies were offering the recipe, one *praise upgrade* and two *questions*.

Item 3:

In this item the responses were divided by gender. Three of the female participants responded to the compliment with *comment acceptance* followed by acknowledging that the person the complimenter was introduced to, was their sister. Four of them reassigned the beauty of their sister to themselves saying “*Yes, she is my sister that is why (haha)*”. Moreover, two of them replied with a *question* followed by acknowledging the fact that she was their sister and one participant responded with *praise upgrade* saying “*Yea, she is my sister*”. On the other hand, five of the low proficient participants answered with an *appreciation token*. Two of them reassigned the beauty to themselves. In addition, four of them replied with *comment acceptance* and five others only acknowledged the fact that she was their sister saying “*she was my sister*”. This might indicate that the complimentee does not want the complimenter to comment any further. Further, three of them did not accept the compliment saying either “*Hey, she was my sister*” or “*Hold your tongue*”. One male participant answered with a *question*.

Whereas, the high proficient participants differed to some extent from the low proficient participants especially the male subjects. Six of the female participants reassigned the beauty of their sister to themselves (with a smile). Four of them replied with *comment acceptance*. Two scaled it down and one used the Kurdish formulaic expression “*Your eyes are beautiful*”. Eleven of the male participants did not accept the

compliment and warned the complimenter saying “*Hold your tongue or hey, she is my sister*”. Two of them said “*just like your sister*” with a smile thinking that they would offend the complimentee because they were offended by the compliment. Only one participant reassigned the beauty to himself saying, “*Because she is my sister*”.

Item 4:

Fourteen of the low proficient students replied with an *appreciation token* followed by offering the complimented item. As a native speaker of Kurdish, I have found this offering of complimented items as a norm of the Kurdish culture. This was also emphasized by the interviewees as well. Some of them said that it is nice to offer the complimented item. Nine of them replied with an *appreciation token* only. Moreover, five of them answered with *comment history* mostly expressing it like “*Thanks, I bought it yesterday*”. There was two cases of *praise upgrade* and one case of *question* stating “*oh really, thanks a lot*”. One of the respondents offered to show the complimenter the place where s/he bought the jeans. This shows that the complimentee wants to avoid the compliment by bringing irrelevant information. In addition, two of the participants reassigned the compliment to the complimenter’s eyes saying “*Thanks, your eyes are nice*”. Which is a Kurdish formulaic expression illustrating that the complimenter’s eyes are nice that is why they see things beautifully. On the other hand, 15 of the high proficient students replied only with an *appreciation token*. Seven of them offered the complimented item. Furthermore, there were three cases of *comment acceptance* and there were three cases of *question* followed by a comment like “*Really? It is also cheap*”. There was also one case of returning saying “*Thanks, yours is nice too*”.

Item 5:

The responses among the low proficient participants varied. Seven of them replied hoping that the complimentee would have a house like that one day expressing it mostly as follows “*Thanks, I hope you have a better one/ the same*”. Ten of the participants used *comment acceptance* such as “*Thanks, It made me tired or it is my design*”. Another six accepted the compliment using an *appreciation token* or “*That is very kind of you*”. Further, two of them reassigned the compliment to God saying, “*It made me tired, thank God I finished*” and another two offered help if the complimentee wants to build a house. Other responses varied and they contained a *question*, and a couple of *praise upgrade* saying “*Yes it is, I must be a designer*”.

The high proficient participants differed in replying to this scenario. Ten of them accepted the compliment by saying “*Thank you so much*”. In nine cases the subjects replied with a *comment acceptance* mostly saying “*Thanks, It is my design*”. Four of them hoped the complimentee to have a better house expressing it in the Kurdish formulaic expression “*Nuxshat le bet*”. Other responses contained one case of *praise upgrade* and a case of *scale down*. Two subjects replied with a *question* saying “*Really, is it?*”

Item 6:

In this item six of the low proficient students wished the complimenter to have a car as well. Three of the participants answered with *comment history* like “*Thanks, I bought it in America*” and five others accepted the compliment expressing it with only an *appreciation token* saying either “*Thanks or thank you very much*”. In addition, five of the complimentees offered the complimenter to drive the car. The rest of the participants provided multiple responses and among them were two cases of *praise upgrade* and three cases of returning the compliment to the complimenter’s eyes saying

“*Your eyes are nice*”, also one case of returning the compliment saying “*Yours is nice too*”. In addition, there were two cases of *praise upgrade* followed by *appreciation tokens*. Other responses included *question* followed by a comment such as “*oh yea! I really like American cars*”. A respondent replied saying “*Yes, I really enjoy driving it*” and another responded saying, “*I really worked hard for it*”. However, 12 of the high proficient participants expressed acceptance with an *appreciation token* saying “*Thank you*”. Two of them responded with *comment acceptance*, and two others said “*Thanks, I am glad you like it*”. Two others offered the complimenter to try the car. One complimentee wished that the complimenter would have the same and there were also three cases of *question* followed by an *appreciation token* such as “*Really? Thanks*”. One respondent said “*God save my life*” which I think it is meant to be saving him from the evil eye. There were other responses such as “*Thanks, your eyes are nice*” and one case of return saying “*Your car is nice too*”.

Item 7:

In this item, seven of the participants replied with a *question* followed by different comments. The comments varied from accepting the compliment to returning it. In one case, the subject replied with a *question* followed by “*I hope so*”. Moreover, six of the participants accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* followed by “*I hope it is useful for all*”. Five of them replied with an *appreciation token* and three of them only said “*I am happy to hear that*”. Other respondents provided different responses. Two of them responded with “*I am happy you liked it*” and two others replied with “*Thank you I did a lot of research about the information before*”. Some other responses included “*It should be, I tried a lot or I got some of these from a book, I will bring it to you if you want*”. One respondent reassigned the compliment to the complimenter saying “*I wouldn't have done it if it wasn't for your help*”. However, eight

of the high proficient participants accepted the compliment and five of them expressed gladness that the presentation was useful. In addition, four of the participants accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* followed by a phrase such as “*I am happy you liked it*”. Moreover, four of the participants replied with a *question* such as “*Really or was it?*” followed by different phrases like “*I hope so or I researched a lot*”. Other responses included two cases of *comment history* like “*Thanks, I researched a lot*”, and other responses like “*Thanks for listening, hope you got some information, Thanks, I hope so, and what about the performance*”

Item 8:

In this item 14 of the low proficient participants did not accept the compliment and replied with “*It is my job or I am just doing my job*”. Six of them replied with “*Thanks for your appreciation or I am happy to hear that*”. Additionally, three participants express acceptance with either “*Thank you boss or thank you that is very kind of you*”. Two others replied with *comment acceptance* saying “*It is my pleasure, thank you*”. Other responses include “*I enjoy my job*” and “*Thank you, I am going to work harder*”. On the other hand eight of the high proficient participants accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* and nine of them refused to accept the compliment and said “*No need sir, it is my duty*”. Moreover, five of the participants replied with *comment acceptance* such as “*Thanks, I am happy with my job*”. Other responses included “*It is my pleasure or I will do my best*”

Item 9:

Among the low proficient participants 15 of them reassigned their success to their mother expressing it mostly as follows: “*Thanks mom, it was all because of you or*

you are behind my success". Six of the compliments accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* and among them eight replied with *return* by saying "You are the best or you are my life". The other participants returned the compliments to their mother saying "I am proud of you too".

However, among the high proficient participants 12 of them reassigned the compliment to their mother and almost all of them expressed it as followed: "It is all because of your support". Moreover, 10 of them accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token* and five of them returned the compliment saying "I must be proud because I have a mother like you". Other responses included "Thanks, you are a great mother and I will always make you proud".

Item 10:

The low proficient participants provided various responses. Among them, eight participants replied with *comment history* mostly expressing it as follows: "Thanks, I have practiced a lot". Furthermore, five respondents expressed uncertainty through *question* followed by different phrases such as "Really? Thanks a lot dear or really? I don't think so or just really". 12 other low proficient participants answered with an *appreciation token* and among them one was followed by the phrase "That is very kind of you". Among the others one stated "Thanks, glad to hear that" and one said "Many people tell me that". On the other hand 12 of the high proficient participants accepted the compliment with an *appreciation token*. There were three cases of *question* and two cases of returning the compliment to the complimenter's eyes with the use of the Kurdish formulaic expression "Your eyes are nice". One respondent disagreed with the compliment saying "Not really, not good enough". One other respondent responded with *comment acceptance* and another with *comment history*.

To compare the inter-lingual data with Herbert's data in American English, both of them will be presented in tables to see similarities and differences between them.

Table 8

Frequency of compliment response types in English (Herbert, 1986, p. 79; as cited in Yousefvand, 2010, p. 101)

CR strategies	Occurrences	Percentage
A. Agreement		
II. Acceptances		
1. Appreciation token	312	29.4
2. Comment acceptance	70	6.6
3. Praise upgrade	4	.4
III. Non-acceptance		
1. Comment history	205	19.3
2. Reassignment	32	3.0
3. Return	77	7.3
B. Non-agreement		
1. Scale down	48	4.5
2. Question	70	6.6
3. Disagreement	53	5.0
4. Qualification	100	10.0
5. No acknowledgment	54	5.1
C. Other interpretation		
1. Request	31	2.9
Total	1062	100.1

Table 9

Frequency and percentages of compliment response types (High and low proficient participants)

CR strategies	No.		%	
	High	Low	High	Low
A. Agreement				
I. Acceptances				
1. Appreciation token	108	76	43.2	26.2
2. Comment acceptance	34	49	13.6	16.8
3. Praise upgrade	3	12	1.2	4.1
II. Non-acceptance				
1. Comment history	3	23	1.2	7.9
2. Reassignment	32	42	12.8	14.4
3. Return	7	15	2.8	5.1
B. Non-agreement				
1. Scale down	6	16	2.4	5.5
2. Question	21	21	8.4	7.2
3. Disagreement	0	0	.0	0.0
4. Qualification	9	14	3.6	4.8
5. No acknowledgment	0	0	.0	0.0
C. Other interpretation				
1. Request	0	0	.0	0.0
2. Formulaic Expressions	18	10	7.2	3.4
3. Offer	9	12	3.6	4.1
Total	250	290	100	100

The result of Herbert's (1990) study showed that agreement in American native speakers' English comprised the majority of the data which was 66%. Among these, appreciation token made up 29.4%, comment acceptance was 6.6%, praise upgrade was 0.4%, comment history was 19.3%, reassignment was 3% and return was 7.3%. Moreover, the data consisted of 31.2% non-agreement and 2.9% other interpretation. By looking at the Kurdish data, one can see a clear demonstration that both the Kurdish and

the American data are similar with regard to the agreement category. Both speakers of Kurdish and American English tend to accept compliments in comparison to the other two categories. This is in line with the findings of Cai et al. (2012) who set out a study on Chinese college students and concluded that the participants preferred to accept compliments in the majority of the cases comprising 72.3%. However, there were major differences in non-agreement and other interpretation used by native speakers of Kurdish and native speakers of English. The Kurdish baseline data showed that only 9.7% of the data were distributed on the non-agreement category response types and 26.6% was other interpretation including *offer* and *formulaic expressions* which shows a great deal of difference compared to the English data. As mentioned earlier, the response type of offer arose due to incorporating the norms of the Kurdish culture. The interviewees stated that an offer happens when the complimentee really means giving the complimented item to the compliment-giver. Otherwise, the response would be an appreciation token.

The data collected from the high proficient participants showed that the frequency of agreement response types was the most frequent comprising 74.8%. Among these, appreciation token made up 43.2%, comment acceptance was 13.6%, praise upgrade was 1.2%, comment history was 1.2, reassignment was 12.8% and return was 2.8%. Furthermore, the non-agreement response types made up 14.4% with scale down comprising 2.4%, question 8.4% and qualification 3.6%. The category of other interpretation which includes offer and formulaic expressions comprised 10.8%. This is similar to phocharoinsele et al. (2012) in which the high proficient Thai speakers of English accepted the compliments in the majority of the cases which made up 75%.

On the other hand, the data elicited from the low proficient participants indicated that agreement response types was the most frequently used which made up 74.5% with

appreciation token receiving 26.2%, comment acceptance 16.8%, praise upgrade 4.1%, comment history 7.9%, reassignment 14.4% and return 5.1%. This rejects the findings of Ren and Gao et al. (2012) in which it is stated that low proficient learners of English used less acceptance strategies as they might sound arrogant. The other two categories received different weights in the low proficient participants' responses, with non-agreement response types receiving 17.5% and other interpretation including offer and formulaic expressions comprising 7.5%.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

This study was set out to investigate pragmatic transfer by Kurdish (Sorani) EFL learners in the use of compliments and compliment responses with reference to proficiency level. Therefore, the following questions were posed:

1. How do Kurdish native speakers produce compliments and compliment responses in Kurdish?
2. Are Kurdish native speakers different from English native speakers in producing the speech acts of compliments and compliment responses?
3. How do Kurdish native speakers produce compliments and compliment responses in English?
4. Does proficiency level affect pragmatic transfer of Kurdish EFL learners in the use of English compliments and compliment responses?
5. Do Kurdish EFL learners transfer the norms of their native language and culture to the use of compliments and compliment responses?

Conclusions

The findings of the study show that pragmatic competence is as important as linguistic competence. A comparison was made between the data collected from both high and low proficient groups with that of native speakers of Kurdish and English in terms of compliment strategy use. The results of the quantitative data shows that the strategies used by the EFL learners from both groups are statistically closer to the American baseline data rather than the Kurdish. Regarding the Kurdish baseline data for

compliments there is not much difference in terms of directness and indirectness strategies. As shown in (Table 1) 54.5% of the responses were direct strategies and 45.4% were indirect strategies. On the contrary, the American baseline data show that a great majority of the Americans use direct compliments which comprises 91% of the data. Consequently, there is quite a large difference between the Kurdish and the American strategies. However, after a comparison between the Kurdish baseline data and the American baseline data with that of the inter-lingual group it was shown that the majority of both high and low proficient participants use direct compliments which is similar to the American baseline data. Furthermore, the syntactic patterns of the compliments also indicate that there is little discrepancy between the American baseline data and the inter-lingual data. One category was absent in both high and low proficient participants' compliment clauses, instead a new pattern emerged in the low proficient participants' data. However, the majority of the interlingual data, like the American baseline data, fell under the first syntactic pattern which was (NP is/looks (really) ADJ.) (Shown in Table 6). These discrepancies may have been due to the shortcomings of the DCTs as they are not like face to face interactions. The participants obviously did not have the chance to express their compliments as naturally as they would in a naturally occurring situation. Nevertheless, Golato (2003) argues that although DCTs are advantageous in terms of controlling certain variables such as age, features of the scenarios and etc., and also collecting a large amount of data, however the responses elicited from them do not always resemble that of naturally occurring data. He further argues that the data collected from DCTs represent what the participants would think is suitable for that situation. From the results of the quantitative analysis, one might conclude that there is no transfer and both low and high proficient participants as the data show similar numbers. Furthermore, the reader might presume that the participants are familiar with syntactic structures and strategies used by native speakers of English.

However, this result might be true only statistically. If we take a closer look at the qualitative data and the content of the compliment clauses, it can be seen that there is a great deal of dependence on cultural elements. The use of the norms of the Kurdish language like wishing people to have better things when buying a house or a car, instead of giving a compliment, which is a feature of the Kurdish culture as accentuated by the interviewees, is clear sign of transfer from both high and low proficient participants. Moreover, Item two was put in the DCTs on purpose and the results show the content of the compliments given by Kurdish native speakers are pretty much similar to that of the interlingual groups. The Kurdish native speakers and both high and low proficient participants provided implicit compliments to this situation. A great majority of the participants used expressions of wishes and happiness that resembled the same Kurdish expressions used in the Kurdish baseline-data. Further evidence of transfer in both high and low proficient participants' responses was the use of the expression "*Mashalla*". Some participants of both high and low proficiency levels made use of this expression either alone or before giving a compliment. As explained before, this is a culturally and religiously bound expression used before giving compliments to show that the compliment-giver has no bad intention when talking about someone else's possessions. This explanation was also given by the interviewees. However, one of the interviewees said that "It's just to say that it's nice!" therefore, we can see that the function of fixed expressions might change as time passes. In other words, some people might not even think about securing the complimentee. Saying the expression *Mashalla* is just something they have gotten used to saying before complimenting something. Nevertheless, the use of these culturally and religiously bound expressions results in communication breakdowns and pragmatic failure, therefore one has to be aware of the cultural norms of the target language to avoid pragmatic failure. Bahçelerli (2015) claims that it is important to be aware of the norms of the target language as the findings

of her study suggested that the Turkish-Cypriot participants transferred the norms of their language into English and gave literal translations of expressions from their language as they were unaware of the norms of the target language.

In addition, with regard to the compliment responses, the findings of this research show that there were indications of pragmatic transfer in both high and low proficient participants' responses. Although, the agreement category responses types of both high and low proficient participants were similar to those of the Americans, there were two new response types that emerged in their responses namely, *offer* and *formulaic expressions*. Both of these response types are evidence of pragmatic transfer which ultimately results in communication breakdown. The response type of *offer* is not always the case, the interviewees revealed that they would only offer the item if they mean it, otherwise they would reply without offering the item. This makes the analysis more meaningful as the items that require offering are not all replied with offer. Some of them replied with other response types, such as appreciation tokens, comment acceptance and etc.

According to the findings of this study, it can be concluded that even with complete awareness of grammatical structures, it would be hard to avoid the norms of the source language. In other words, it would be tempting not to incorporate the norms of a mother tongue. That is to say, regardless of proficiency level, a learner is subject to pragmatic transfer as there were elements of the Kurdish culture in both compliments and compliment responses of the EFL learners' responses. These findings are backed by Hashemian et al. (2012) who found out that although his low proficient participants transferred the norms of their mother tongue in the use of refusal strategies more, both groups of high and low proficient participants displayed transfer in certain aspects. This further proves previous research on pragmatic transfer with reference to proficiency

level. Therefore, it can also be claimed that it would be difficult for learners of a second language to get rid of the norms of a source language. The findings are also in line with Keshavarz et al. (2006) who concluded that even with high proficiency level of the target language, a learner is still subject to pragmatic transfer. Furthermore, Beebe and Takahashi et al. (1986) set out their study on transfer and found out that both high and low proficient groups of learners in both EFL and ESL contexts transfer the norms of their language. Furthermore, Al Falasi et al. (2007) also concluded that proficiency level of the participants in his study was had no significant role in producing target-like compliment responses and he suggested providing pragmatic input to help learners avoid miscommunication.

Pedagogical implications

In light of the findings of this study, EFL teachers should provide pragmatic awareness along with grammar and the other skills of language. The provision of pragmatic awareness may help reduce pragmatic transfer that results in communication breakdown between interlocutors. EFL teachers should also concentrate on teaching EFL learners how to deal with situations that are culturally different between source language and a target language.

Limitations and suggestions for further research

Variables such as gender, social status and intimacy between compliment-givers and receivers are not dealt with in the present study. Further research can be carried out to broaden the scope and fill this gap in the field of inter-lingual research. In addition,

the provision of pragmatic awareness can be studied to see if it has impact on the issue of pragmatic transfer.

References:

- Abed, A. Q. (2011). Pragmatic Transfer in Iraqi EFL Learners' Refusals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2), 166-185.
- Afghari, A. K. (2011). Compliments in English and Persian interaction: A cross-cultural perspective. *Jezikoslovlje*, 12(1), 27-50.
- Aijuan, L. (2010). On Pragmatic "Borrowing Transfer": Evidence From Chinese EFL learner's Compliment Response Behavior. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(4), 26-44.
- Al-Falasi, H. (2007). Just Say "Thank You": A Study of Compliment Responses. *The Linguistics Journal*, 2(1), 28-42.
- Al-Khateeb, S.M.I. (2009). The speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by the Arab speakers of English - a comparative intercultural study. An Unpublished MA Thesis, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
- Amaya, L. F. (2008). Teaching culture: Is It Possible to Avoid Pragmatic Failure? *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, 11-24.
- Bahçelerlib, E. S. (2015). A study of compliment responses in English: a case of North Cyprus. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 3285-3291.
- Beuzeville, S. M.-T. (2012). A contrastive study of compliment responses among Persians and Australians: The effects of exposure to a new speech community. *Applied Research in English*, 1(1), 21-42.
- Bu, J. (2010). Study of Pragmatic Transfer in Persuasion Strategies by Chinese Learners of English. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 16(2), 93-114.
- Cai, Y. (2012). A Study on Compliment Response Strategies by Chinese College Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(3), 543-549.
- Cheung, C. S. (2009). Politeness strategies of Chinese and American speakers. *LCOM papers*, 1, 45-54.
- Cortes, N. C. (2005). Negative Language Transfer When Learning Spanish as a Foreign Language. *Interlinguistica*, 16(1), 237-248.
- David K. Dickinson, A. M.-C. (2004). Cross-Language Transfer of Phonological Awareness in Low-Income Spanish and English Bilingual Preschool Children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25(3), 323-347.
- Farenkia, B. M. (2013). Canadian and Cameroonian English-Speaking University Students' Compliment Strategies. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(3), 69-98.
- Fathi, A. Y. (2015). A Cross Cultural Study on Iranian EFL Students' Pragmatic Transfer. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 498-505.
- Fukasawa, E. (2011). Compliment Responses and Study Abroad. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Journal*, 31, 35-50.

- Gao, J. R. (2012). Negative Pragmatic Transfer in Chinese Students' Complimentary Speech Acts. *Psychological Reports*, 110(1), 149-165.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying Compliment Responses: A Comparison of DCTs and Recordings of Naturally Occurring Talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 90-121.
- Hashemian, M. (2012). Cross-Cultural Differences and Pragmatic Transfer in English and Persian Refusals. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 4(3), 23-46.
- Heidrick, I. (2006). Beyond the L2: How Is Transfer Affected by Multilingualism? *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 1-3.
- Hiba Qusay Abdul Sattar, S. C. (2010). A Study on Strategies Used in Iraqi Arabic to Refuse Suggestions. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*(30), 81-95.
- Isurin, L. (2005). Cross Linguistic Transfer in Word Order: Evidence from L1 Forgetting and L2 Acquisition. *4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 1115-1130). Ohio: Cascadilla Press.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kim, H. J. (2003). A study of compliments across cultures: the effect of sociolinguistic transfer on EFL learners. Korea: Korea University.
- Matsuura, H. (2004). Compliment-giving Behavior in American English and Japanese. *JALT Journal*, 26(2), 147-170.
- Monjezi, M. (2014). The Effects of Proficiency and Gender on the Compliments and Compliment Responses Made by Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(1), 625-638.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2012). L2 English Compliment Responses: An Investigation of Pragmatic Transfer. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(6), 276-287.
- Pitarch, E. A. (2010). The Effect of Instruction on Learners' Pragmatic Awareness: a Focus on Refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 65-80.
- Qadermazi, S. H. (2014). Refusal Strategies of Iranian University English as a Foreign Language and Non-English Learners in Native Language: A Comparative Study. *CEPS Journal*, 4(4), 121-142.
- Salman, S. E. (2015). Using Compliment Responses in Arabic and English: Focusing on Male and Female EFL Learners in Iraq. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(7), 157-178.
- Seyyed Ayatolla Razmjoo, E. B. (2013). An Investigation into the Speech Act of Compliment Response in Persian. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(1), 44-52.
- Sharifian, F. (2008). Cultural schemas in L1 and L2 Compliment Responses: A Study of Persian-Speaking Learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 4, 55-80.

- Shoushtari, M. M. (2012). A Comparative Study of the Complaint Strategies among Iranian EFL and ESL Students – The Study of the Effect of Length of Residence and the Amount of Contact. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 118-124.
- Silva, A. J. (2003). The Effects of Instruction on Pragmatic Development: Teaching Polite Refusals in English. *Second Language Studies*, 22(1), 55-106.
- Soemantri, N. F. (2014). The Evidence of Pragmatic Transfer in Compliment Responses in English Conversation between Indonesian and American Speakers. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(1), 654-662.
- Tabatabaei, S. (2015). Realization of Complaint Strategies by English and Persian Native Speakers. *MJAL*, 7(1), 123-145.
- Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT journal*, 8(2), 131-155.
- Tran, G. Q. (2010). Replying to compliments in English and Vietnamese. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*(30), 104-130.
- Wannaruk, A. (2008). Pragmatic Transfer in Thai EFL Refusals . *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 39(3), 318-337.
- Yousefvand, Z. (2010). Study of Compliment Speech Act Realization Pattenrs Across Gender in Persian. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT*, 17, 91-112.
- Yu, M.-c. (2005). Sociolinguistic Competence in the Complimenting Act of Native Chinese and American English Speakers: A Mirror of Cultural Value. *LANGUAGE AND SPEECH*, 48(1), 91-119.
- Zhang, J.-p. (2013). Compliments And Compliment Responses In Philippine English. *Journal of Language Studies*, 13(1), 25-41.

APPENDIX A

English DCT on compliments for Kurdish EFL learners

Dear participant,

The aim of this questionnaire is to collect data about the use of English by Kurdish speakers. Your contribution is important for this research, and will help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Please read the instruction for each part carefully and give your answers sincerely. Please note that **this is not a test** and your responses will not affect your grades in any course. They will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Part 1: Background Information

Name: (optional)

Gender: Male Female

Age:

Ethnicity:

Place of Residence: City Province

First Language: Kurdish Arabic Other (please specify).....

How long have you been studying English?

Have you ever travelled to English-speaking countries such as England or America?

Yes No please specify the name of the try.

If yes, how long did you stay there?

Compliments:

1- It is very cold outside. You see one of your friends at the entrance of the university wearing a pair of boots that looks very good and warm. You want to tell him/her your feelings (what you think) about the boots.

You:

2. Your friend comes to you and surprises you by saying "I am engaged". You are very delighted with the news and say "Congratulations! I am very happy for both of you". Then, s/he shows you a photo of his/her fiancé from the cellphone. You look at the picture and see that his/her fiancé is very beautiful/handsome. What do you say to her/him?

You:

3. You are walking down a street with a friend. An American tourist who is lost comes to you, asks you to show him/her the way to his/her hotel. Your friend helps him/her and speaks in a very fluent English. You are surprised and say:

You:

4. Your friend has recently got married. His wife calls you and invites you for dinner. She has cooked a very delicious dish, which you have never (had) before. What would you tell her?

You:

5. Your friend has recently bought a new house. You and your spouse buy them a gift and pay them a visit. When you enter the house, you realize that the interior of the house is very nice and everything is organized neatly. What would you say?

You:

6. You are a manager of a small company and one of your employees works very hard and gets tired. S/he has made lots of things easier for you, you want to talk to him/her and show your appreciation for what has s/he done. What would you say?

You:

7. Suppose you are on a picnic with your classmates and you are in a very nice place. One of your friends start singing. S/he sings very well and upon completion everyone applauds and you want to comment on his/her voice. What would you say?

You:

8. Suppose your younger brother has graduated from university and is one of the top students. Now, he has an offer to continue his study abroad. What would you tell him?

You:

9. You are a member of your university football team. A friend of yours has prepared a project for a sports event for the elementary school students. You are amazed by his idea and want to say something about it.

You:

10. You have an appointment with one of your friends in a restaurant. When s/he comes, you notice his/her new model of haircut which is very nice and modern. What would you say?

You:

APPENDIX B

English DCT on compliment responses for Kurdish EFL learners

Dear participant,

The aim of this questionnaire is to collect data about the use of English by Kurdish speakers. Your contribution is important for this research, and will help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Please read the instruction for each part carefully and give your answers sincerely. Please note that **this is not a test** and your responses will not affect your grades in any course. They will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Part 1: Background Information

Name: (optional)

Gender: Male Female

Age:

Ethnicity:

Place of Residence: City Province

First Language: Kurdish Arabic Other (please specify).....

How long have you been studying English?

Have you ever travelled to English-speaking countries such as England or America?

No Yes please specify the name of the country.

If yes, how long did you stay there?

Part II:

Please put yourself in the following situations and provide the honest answer to these compliments and their answers.

- 1- You have just graduated from high school and received a prize for your graduation as the first of your class. One of your former teachers is very delighted for hearing the news and celebrates your success:
Congratulations. You have done a great job!
You would say:
.....
.....

- 2- You have invited a friend for dinner and s/he is very amazed by your food and has enjoyed it a lot. S/he compliments you saying:
The food was really great!
You would say:
.....
.....

- 3- Suppose you have a break between your lectures and you want to go to the cafeteria with a friend of yours. When you enter the cafeteria, you come across your sister and you superficially introduce your friend and sister together just saying their names, i.e. your friend does not know she is your sister. When she leaves, your friend compliments her saying:
She was beautiful!
You would say:
.....
.....

- 4- You have bought a new pair of jeans, and you wear it for the first day of university after summer break. You meet your classmate and s/he says:
Your jeans are very nice!
You would say:
.....
.....

- 5- You have recently built a house. You have built it yourself with a very nice design. Your friend pays you a visit and says:
Your house is excellent!
You would say:
.....
.....

- 6- You have bought a new American car, you go to university. You see one of your friends in the car park, s/he compliments your car saying:

It is a very nice car!

You would say:

.....
.....

7- You have presented a subject in the class and it seems that everyone likes the subject. One of your friends comes to you and says:

Well done! The information was really good and beneficial.

You would say:

.....
.....

8- It has been a week since you have started your new job. You work hard to satisfy your boss and sometimes you stay late to finish your tasks. Your boss realizes that you stay late. S/he comes to you to show his/her appreciation for what you do, says:

I know you work very hard here, I appreciate it!

You would say:

.....
.....

9- You have received a gift as you were one of the top students of your college.

Your mom tells you:

Congratulations! I am proud of you!

You would say:

.....
.....

10- Assume that your instructor hands you a paragraph and asks you to write on the board, five minutes before s/he comes to class and the lecture starts. While writing, one of your classmates notices that your handwriting is very nice and compliments your handwriting, saying:

Your handwriting is really nice.

You would say:

.....
.....

APPENDIX C
Kurdish DCT on compliments for the Kurdish native speakers

خویندکاری به‌پێز،

ئامانج لهم راپرسیه کۆکردنه‌وه‌ی زانیاریه له‌سه‌ر به‌کاره‌یانی زمانی ئینگلیزی له لایه‌ن قسه‌که‌ری کورده‌وه. هاوکاری تۆ گرنگه بۆ ئەم توێژینه‌وه‌یه و ده‌بیته هۆی باشتکردنی فێرکردن و فێربوونی زمانی ئینگلیزی له کوردستاندا. راپرسیه‌که له دوو به‌ش پێک دێت، تکایه به وردی ریکاره‌کانی هه‌ردوو به‌شه‌که بخوێنه‌وه‌وه و هه‌لامیکی راستگۆیانه دابنێ. تکایه ئه‌وه بزانه که ئه‌مه تافیکردنه‌وه نیه و هه‌لامه‌کانت کاریگه‌ری نابێت له‌سه‌ر هیچ کام له نمره‌ی وانه‌کانت. ته‌نها بۆ مه‌به‌ستی توێژینه‌وه به‌کار دێن.

هاوکاریکردنت جیگه‌ی سوپاسه.

به‌شی یه‌که‌م: زانیاری که‌سی

ناو:

په‌گه‌ز:

ته‌مه‌ن:

نه‌ته‌وه:

شوێنی نیشته‌جێبوون:

زمانی دایک:

بەشى دووم:

پيا ھەلدان:

1- كەش و ھەواى دەرەو زۆر ساردە. لە ناو دەرگاي زانگۆ يەككە لە ھاورپيەكانت دەبينيت و جووتى پوتى لە پيداىە كە زۆر گەرم و چاك ديارە. دتەوئ پيى بليى كە ھەستت چۆنە لە بارەى پوتەكانەوہ.

تۆ:

.....

2- ھاورپكەت ديت بۆ لات و سەرسامت دەكات و دەئى "مارە كرام! / زنم مارەكرد". تۆ زۆر دلخۆشى بە بيستنى ھەوالەكە و دەئىي "پيرۆزە! زۆر دلخۆشم بۆ ھەردووكتان". پاشان مۆبايلەكەى دەر دەھيىت و وینەيەكى دەستگيرانەكەيەت پشان دەدات. سەپرىكى وینەكە دەكەيت و دەبينى كە دەستگيرانەكەى زۆر جوانە. چى پى دەئىيت؟

تۆ:

.....

3- لەگەل ھاورپيەكت لەسەر جادەيەك پياسە دەكەيت و گەشتيارىكى ئەمريكى ديت بۆ لات و ريگەى لييتىك چووہ. داواى ئەووت ليدەكات كە ريگەى ئوتيلەكەى پى پيشان بەدەيت. ھاورپكەت يارمەتى دەدات و زۆر بە ئينگليزيەكى باش قسەى لەگەل دەكات. تۆ پيى سەرساميت و دەئىي:

تۆ:

.....

4- ھاورپكەت تازە زنى ھيئاوہ. خيزانەكەى تەلەفونت بۆ دەكات و بانگھيشتت دەكات بۆ نانى ئيوارە. خواردنىكى زۆر خۆشى ليئاوہ كە ھەرگيز لەوہو پيش نەتخواردوہ. چى پيدەئىي؟

تۆ:

.....

5- ھاورپېكت تازە خانووی نوپیان كړپوه. له گهڼ ھاوسره كهت دياريه كيان بۇ ده كړن و ده چن بۇ سەردانيان. كه ده چنه ناو خانووه كه وه ده بينى كه ناوه وهى خانوه كه زور جوانه و شته كان زور به جوانى ديزاين كراون. چى ده لئى؟

تۆ:

.....

6- تۇ به رپوه به رى كۇمپانيايه كى بچوكيت و يه كيك له كارمەنده كانت زور كار ده كات و هيلاك ده بيت. هه موو كاريكى بۇ ئاسان كردوويت و توش ده ته وئ بانگى بكه يت و پيزانيى خوتى بۇ دەر بريت بۇ كاره كانى. چى پى ده لئىت؟

تۆ:

.....

7- وا دانى كه له گهڼ ھاوپوله كانت له سه يرانيت. چوون بۇ شوپنيكى زور خوش. يه كيك له ھاورپېكانت ده ست ده كات به گورانى ووتن. ده ننگى زور خوشه و كه ته واو ده بيت هه موو چه پلهى بۇ ليددهن توش ده ته وئ شتيكى پى بلئيت له بارهى ده ننگيه وه. چى پى ده لئىت؟

تۆ:

.....

8- وا دانى كه برا بچوكه كه ت دمر چووه له زانكو و يه كيكه له خویندكاره يه كه مه كان. ئيستا ئوفه ريكى وەرگرتوه بۇ نه وهى دريژه به خویندن بدات له دەر وهى ولات. چى پيدهلئيت؟

تۆ:

.....

9- تۇ نه نامى تيميكى توبى پى له زانكو كه ت. يه كيك له ھاورپېكانت پرؤژه يه كى ناماده كردوه بۇ بونه يه كى وەرزشى بۇ خویندكارانى قوتا بخانه سەر هتاييه كان. تۇ زور سەرسام بويت به بيرۆكه كه و ده ته وئ شتيكى له باره وه بلئى.

تۆ:

.....
.....

10- لەگەن ھاوڕێیەکت دیداریکت ھەبە لە یەگێک لە رێستۆرانتەکان. کاتیگ دیت، دەبینی کە قژی بە مۆدیلیکی نوێ بریوووە کە زۆر جوان و مۆدیرنە. چی دەئیی؟

تۆ:

.....
.....

APPENDIX D
Kurdish DCT on compliments for the Kurdish native speakers

خویندکاری به پێز،

ئامانج لهم راپرسیه کۆکردنه وهی زانیاریه له سههر به کارهێنانی زمانی ئینگلیزی له لایهن قسه کهری کورد هوه. هاوکاری تۆ گرنگه بۆ ئەم توێژینه وهیه و ده بیته هۆی با شتر کردنی فێرکردن و فێر بوونی زمانی ئینگلیزی له کوردستاندا. راپرسیه که له دوو بهش پیک دیت، تکایه به وردی ریکاره کانی ههردوو بهشه که بخوین ههروهو وه لأمیکی راستگۆیان هه دابن. تکایه ئەوه بزانه که ئەمه تافیکردنه وه نیه و وه لأمه کانت کاریگهری نابیت له سههر هیچ کام له نمره ی وانه کانت. ته نهها بۆ مه بهستی توێژینه وه به کار دین.

هاوکاری کردنت جیگه ی سوپاسه.

به شی یه که م: زانیاری که سی

ناو:

ره گه ز:

ته مه ن:

نه ته وه:

شوینی نی شه جی بوون:

زمانی دایک:

به شی دوو هه م:

تکایه خۆت بخه ره ئەم بارانه ی خواره وه و وه لامی راستگۆیان هه دابین بکه بۆ ئەم پیا هه لدان و وه لأمانه یان.

1- تازه له قۆناعی ئاماده یی ده رچوویت و خه لاتیکت وه رگرتوو ه به بۆنه ی ده رچوونت به

پله ی یه که م. یه کیک له مامۆستا کانت زۆر دلخۆشه به بیستی هه واله که و به م شی وه یه

پیرۆزبایی ئەم سه رکه وته نت لیده کات:

پیرۆزت بیت. کاریکی زۆر با شت کردوو ه!

تۆ ده لئی:

هاورپيېكت بانگه‌يشت كردوو ه بۇ نانى ئىواره و ئەو زۆر سەرسامە بە خواردنەكەت و زۆر چىزى لى ئەبىنىت. ئەو پياتا هەلەدەتات و دەلى:

بە راستى خواردنەكە بە تام بوو!

تۆ دەلى:

2- وا دانى كه له نيوان دوو وانەدا پشويەكت هەيه و دەتەوى لەگەل هاورپيېكت بچيت بو كافتريا. كاتيك دەچيته ناو كافتريا، خوشكەكەت دەبىنى و لەگەل هاورپيېكت تەنها بە ناو بە يەكيان دەناسىنى. واتە هاورپيېكت نازانى كه ئەو خوشكتە. كاتيك خوشكەكەت دەروات، هاورپيېكت پييدا هەلەدەتات و دەلى:

بە راستى ئەو كچه جوان بوو!

تۆ دەلى:

.....

3- كاوبۇيەكى تازەت كرىو و له دواى پشوى هاوين بو يەكەم رۆزى زانكو له پى دەكەى. هاوپۆلەكەت دەبىنى و پىت دەلى:

كاوبۇكەت زۆر جوانه!

تۆ دەلى:

4- بەم دوايىانە خانوويەكت دروست كردوو. خۆت دروستت كردوو و دىزايەكەى زۆر جوانه. هاورپيېكت سەردانتان دەكات و دەلى:

خانوەكەت زۆر نايابە!

تۆ دەلى:

5- ئۆتۆمبىلىكى نوپى ئەمريكىت كرىو و دەروى بو زانكو. له گەراجەكە هاورپيېكت دەبىنىت، بە ئۆتۆمبىلەكەتدا هەلەدەتات و دەلى:

ئۆتۆمبىلىكى زۆر جوانه!

تۆ دەلى:

6- بابەتەكت لە پۆلدا پېشكەش كىردوو و وا ديارە كە ھەموويان ھەزىيان لە بابەتەكە بوو. يەككە لە ھاوړيكانت ديت بۆ لات و پيت دەلئ:

دەست خۆش! بە راستى زانىارى بەخش و باش بوو.

تۆ دەلئى:

7- ماوهى ھەفتەيەك دەپيت لەوتەى كارە نوپيەكەت دەست پيكردوو. زۆر خۆت ھيلاك دەكەيت بۆ ئەوھى سەركارەكەت لە خۆت رازى بكەيت و ھەندىك جاريش تا درەنگ دەمىنيتەوھ بۆ ئەوھى كارەكان بە ئەنجام بگەيەنيت. سەركارەكەت بەمە دەزانيت و دەزانيت كە تا درەنگ دەمىنيتەوھ. ديت بۆ لات و بۆ ئەوھى پيژانينى خۆى دەرپرپيت بۆ كاركردەكەت و پيت دەلئ:

ئەزانم كە تۆ خۆت زۆر ھيلاك ئەكەيت ليرە، پي ئەزانم!

تۆ دەلئى:

8- ديارىەكت وەرگرتووھ لەبەر ئەوھى يەككە بووى لە خويىندكارە يەكەمىنەكانى كۆليژەكەت. دايكت پيت دەلئ:

پيرۆزت بى! شانازيت پيوھ ئەكەم!

تۆ دەلئى:

9- وا دانئ كە مامۆستاكەت پينج خولەك پيش وانە دەست پيكردن بانگت دەكات و پاراگرافىكت دەداتئ و دەلئ لەسەر تەختەكە بۆم بنوسە پيش ئەوھى پيت بۆ پۆل. كاتىك كە دەست دەكەيت بە نووسين يەككە لە ھاوپۆلەكانت تيبينى ئەوھ دەكات كە دەست و خەتت زۆر جوانە و بە دەست و خەتتدا ھەلەدەتات و دەلئ:

بە راستى دەست و خەتت جوانە!

تۆ دەلئى: