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Abstract
This paper examines praising and slandering terms in three (3) English and three (3) Kurdish poems. It discusses the connections of praising and slandering terms with some others. The study goes further to show the analyses tables which indicate the frequency of these two types of terms in both the English and the Kurdish language poems. The paper concludes that praising terms are used in the English poems more than the slandering ones whereas in the Kurdish ones the slandering terms are used more. In the findings of the study section, the frequency and the percentage of these two types of terms are shown in the both languages.

Introduction
1. Common Definitions of praising
To Stevic and Ward (2008: 524-225) praise is defined as the act of conveying approval to someone or of something. In given praise, it is to show people that they have done well in something or to show support for the other. In workplaces, praise can be an important part of completing tasks for some people and for others, it is not important to receive praise to continue doing their jobs sufficiently. Whether it is important to someone or not, it is still something that can and should be given to employees from managers, fellow employees or group members. “ According to a comprehensive study by the Gallup Organization, employees in America have reported receiving little recognition and praise” and it was stated that “approximately 65% of Americans reported receiving no recognition or praise within the workplace 2004)” Receiving recognition or praise may not affect the level of productivity or the effort one puts in at work because praise is not something everyone neither seeks nor needs to feel successful in their jobs. For others, receiving no enough or any praise can hinder their level of productivity and can greatly affect
the effort they put into their tasks at work. It can be said that “the power of positive recognition, praise, and life satisfaction not only appear to influence the optimal functioning of people in the present, but also encourage positive development in the future” and this development can greatly impact someone’s career and daily work habits (ibid). Ladika (2013: 52) states that praise and recognition can come in many different forms within a corporate setting. Monetary based rewards could promote motivation and productivity, but verbal praise and non-monetary rewards for goals can also help strengthen an employee’s mood or work engagement. Washakowski (2015: 9) in concerning praise says that if an employee completes his project or task in a good way, in the given time frame, or works extremely hard on it, he deserves to be given praise by his manager and or peers in his place of work. Although it may not be what drives someone to get his work done, for others it may make all the difference for their work life and their personal life. Brophy (2010:148) agrees that generally, praise should be administered in private and rather than controlling, be appreciative and informative. Praise, he suggests, “preserves and supports fundamental motivation by avoiding explanations that lead students to infer that they engage only to please you or to obtain rewards”.

2. Praising and Motivation
Praise refers to “positive evaluations made by a person of another’s products, performances, or attributes, where the evaluator presumes the validity of the standards on which the evaluation is based” Kanouse and Canvan-Gumptert (1981: 98). This definition was selected in part because it is comprehensive, but also because it resonates well with a commonsense conception of praise. It lacks a few key elements, however, that need to be addressed. First, the “positive evaluations” mentioned in this definition do not necessarily serve a strict reinforcing function, but rather have the potential either to enhance or to undermine motivation. Second, praise is not a simple one-way transmission from the evaluator to the recipient but rather a complex social communication in which the role of the recipient is just as critical as the role of the evaluator. That is, the effects of praise vary depending not only on the content of the praise but also on the context in which it is delivered, the arrangement of potential meanings it may convey, and the characteristics and interpretations of the recipient. Finally, it is also important to distinguish praise from other related concepts. Praise is different from simple acknowledgment and feedback (e.g., “That's right”; “You scored 90 %.”), which are more neutral forms of recognition, and is also distinct from encouragement (e.g., “You can do it!”), which is more future-focused than praise and often is used in response to negative performance outcomes. In defining motivation, it is important to draw a distinction between intrinsic motivation, which refers to engagement motivated by pleasure or enjoyment, and extrinsic motivation, which refers to engagement motivated by external pressures or constraints. The primary interest here is to understand how praise may foster or undermine intrinsic motivation, largely because internally driven engagement is associated with a group of positive outcomes such as creativity, insistence, and life-long learning. Of course, extrinsic motivation is also affected by praise, particularly when there is a continued expectation of reward or praise in the future. Indeed, if the extrinsic motivator is powerful enough, intrinsic motivation becomes almost irrelevant, or at least very difficult to measure, in the immediate situation. Thus, studies that measure motivation in later and more distant situations that are free from obvious external probability are particularly valuable for ensuring that intrinsic—and not extrinsic—
motivation is being assessed. In some cases, praise may encourage behaviors or patterns of engagement that appear adaptive in situations of success but maladaptive when subsequent challenges arise (ibid).

3. Praising and Flattering
Prook et al (2015:1) believes that praise refers to “positive evaluations made by a person of another’s performances or attributes, where the evaluator presumes the validity of the standards on which the evaluation is based”. Flattery can be defined as insincere praise, which emphasized that flattery is a positive evaluation of things that “just happen”. The precise distinction may not be that important, as humans often react to flattery in the same manner as praise. It is argued that because most people have a positive self-view, they are willing to readily accept positive statements about them, without giving much thought to the motivations of the person praising or flattering them. People who are flattered compare the flattering statements to their own self-evaluation and temporarily adjust the self-evaluation in a positive direction. This induces a good mood and it boosts self-esteem. Praise will enhance intrinsic motivation when it is perceived as sincere, when it provides information about task specific standards of excellence, or when it conveys reasonable expectations of the evaluator. Additionally, praise can increase perseverance and encourage adaptive performance attributions. When done well, praise provides positive information about competence without overly relying on social comparisons.

3. The Effects of Praising
Dev (1997:16) says we as a society seem to believe that praise has positive effects on people. We make a point to praise others for their accomplishments, and we expect our praise to enhance their motivation and boost their self-esteem. Indeed, many books echo this conventional wisdom that praise leads to positive outcomes. One recent article suggested that teachers “reward the student with verbal reinforcement when she or he exhibits desired behavior”. McKay (1992: 243) states that Parents are given similar advice that is to be generous with your praise. Find as many opportunities to sincerely praise your children as you can and praise is even recommended with adults. Carnegie (1964:38) wrote that a key to winning friends and influencing people is to “be hearty in your approbation and lavish in your praise. For Cannella (1986:297) It is quite surprising, that the research literature is far less clear about how praise actually affects children’s motivation. In fact, a substantial number of studies indicate that praise can often be ineffective and sometimes even dysfunctional. One proponent of this view has suggested that “praise and reward, although often seen as positive, may be constructed as controlling interactions that delay or stifle the development of autonomous individuals”. Faber and Mazlish (1995:35) argued that “children become very uncomfortable with praise that evaluates them and they push it away. Sometimes they’ll deliberately misbehave to prove that you are wrong”. Farson (1963:61) proposed that, with adults, “praise is not only of limited and questionable value as a motivator, but may in fact be experienced as threatening”. Thus, the commonsense view that praise leads directly to overwhelmingly positive outcomes may be at least somewhat misguided. For Prook et al (2015:1) In the study of personality, it has been found that some types of praise can be detrimental to performance: Praising someone for their intelligence after an easy challenge can have negative effects on subsequent actions, which include:
1. Choosing easier challenges to maintain good performance.
2. Being less interested in learning new ways to improve performance.
3. When failures happen later on, sharp decrements in intrinsic motivation and performance are often observed.

4. Praising Expressions
The use of praise expressions abounds in the everyday lives of people. This aspect of culture is highly significant, and it is also highly subjective. Turney and Littman note that ‘a positive semantic orientation denotes a positive evaluation (i.e., praise) and a negative semantic orientation denotes a negative evaluation (i.e., criticism)’. Hence, the evaluation of the praiser determines the type of expression to be used—whether he or she will use positive or negative words. Over a given period, the expressions may become names that parents give to their children. Finnegan, in line with this, observes that ‘Among the Yoruba, the oriki praise names are permanent titles held by individuals, given to them by friends or, most often, by the drummers’. The use of drums to accompany praise singing is a common feature in panegyric events. In public display, praisers use instruments to beautify their art and entertain their audience. Hence, praise expressions have become a common aspect of today’s musical performances Omorègbe and Evbboomwan (2016:73).

5. Common Definitions of Slandering
Slandering has been defined as the action of defaming others by false or injurious statements and the person who defames others in this sense is called slanderous zintuyat (1982:314). It is stated that slander means a statement about someone in which it is intended to damage the good opinion that other people have of him/her Oxford Wordpower dictionary (P: 702). Societies have recognized publishing false statements that cause injury to the honor and reputation of another is a grievous wrong. To Shakespear slandering (defamation) has sharp edge “sharper than the sword”. In the bible, Matthew places slander in the same category as murder Claytor and Cole (2004:111). In most slander cases the plaintiff’s case fails without proof of pecuniary harm, even if a real loss of reputation occurred. Slander (defamation) tends to injure reputation or to diminish esteem, respect, goodwill or confidence in the plaintiff, or to excite derogatory feelings or opinions about the plaintiff Sipe (2004: 147-49). Generally, slandering (defamation) is the communication of a false statement of fact that harms another person’s reputation or character Klein and Wueller (2017:6). In an action for slander in respect of words calculated to disparage the plaintiff in any office, profession, calling, trade or business held or carried on by him at the time of the publication, it shall not be necessary to allege or prove special damage, whether or not the words are spoken of the plaintiff in the way of his office, profession, calling, trade or business Vannin (1954:5). To create liability for defamation, the following elements must be proven: (1) a false and defamatory statement concerning the plaintiff; (2) an unprivileged publication to a third party; (3) fault amounting at least to negligence on the part of the publisher; and (4) either actionability of the statement irrespective of special harm or the existence of special harm caused by the publication Barry (1989:282). To Defamation Act which was Published on www.legislation.wa.gov.au (2005:18) If a person has brought slandering (defamation) proceedings for damages against any person in relation to the publication of any matter, the person cannot bring further defamation proceedings for damages against the same defendant in relation to the same or any other publication of the same or like matter, except
with the leave of the court in which the further proceedings are to be brought.

6. Slandering and Libel
Wyse (1955:314) states that as a preliminary matter, it is important to distinguish the two terms, libel and slander from each other. They slightly depending on the method used to defame. Historically, the term "libel" has been used to signify a written, printed, or similar form of defamation, while "slander" has referred to an oral defamation. Since writing had more permanence than oral communication, had a potentially greater circulation and was thought the more likely to be believed, a cause of action for libel was formerly, and is to a lesser degree today, more favored than one for slander. Close et al (1985:8) says, libel is defamatory matter in writing or other permanent form; the Libel and Slander Act makes defamatory matter in a radio or television broadcast libel. Slander is oral defamation, other than in a broadcast. To Qeleshi (2017:92-93) Libel is a defamatory statement in some permanent form, for example, writing, recorded film or speech and it is actionable in itself (without proof of special damage which is calculable as a specific sum of money) while slander is not. Finally, libel may be a crime as well as a tort, whereas slander is only a tort.

7. Slandering and Gossip
To Raichur (2015:2) slander is making a false, negative, malicious and defamatory statement or report about someone. Gossip on the other hand is typically idle talk or rumor, especially about personal or private affairs of others. It is the spreading of misinformation about people. Naranjarga et al (2008:13-15) affirms that slander is the spreading of deliberately falsified information that denigrates the honor and dignity of another person or undermines his reputation. To him if it asserts or disseminates a fact in relation to another, which is capable of maligning him or disparaging him in the public opinion is then gossip.

8. Slandering Expressions
Forms of expression on the internet similar to or contrasting with defamatory speech. The internet have augmented the means by which expression (speech) may be made. Guidance is taken from the Commission’s focus on defamation law as a private law tort. There are now different means of expression beyond words or photos in slandering. For example, social media has introduced the concepts of ‘liking’ or ‘re-tweeting’ (even emojis) as means of expression. (To some they may be similar to the concept of re-publication in defamation. And yet, they also add an element of approval that may be absent in re-publication.) The different forms of expression inform the substantive discussions that follow Mangan (2017:17).

9. The Samples of the Research
The sample of the study consists of six (6) poems, (3) three of them are English and the other three are Kurdish. The reason behind choosing poems in different languages, is to find out whether praising or slandering are used more in these languages concerning poems (Table 1, 2).

10. The plan of the Analysis
All the poems will be divided into lines and the praising expressions as well as slandering ones are presented in addition, the numbers of the lines which contain such expressions are indicated.

10.1 The analysis of poem (1) "Mutability"
The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Mutability" poem by "Percy Bysshe Shelley" (Table 3).

10.2 The analysis of poem (2) "Bright Star"
The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Bright Star" poem by John Keats (Table 43).
10.3 The analysis of poem (3) "London, 1802"

The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "London, 1802" poem by William Wordsworth (Table 5).

10.4 The analysis of poem (4) "Jezhwan"

The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Jezhwan" poem by "Henn Mukryani" (Table 6).

10.5 The analysis of poem (5) "Shekh Ali Talabani"

The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Shekh Ali Talabani" poem by "Shekh Razai Talabani" (Table 73).

10.6 The analysis of poem (6) "Zulfaini ba Kham mar u ba Halqan waku Aqrab"

The table below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Zulfaini ba Kham mar u ba Halqan waku Aqrab" poem by "Nali" (Table 8).

11. Conclusion and Results

This research concludes that praising and slandering terms are used in both English and Kurdish languages. According to it, one can conclude that in English language praising terms are used more than slandering while in Kurdish slandering terms are used more. The study finds out that praising terms have been used (30) thirty times in the three selected English poems while the slandering ones used (11) eleven times. Concerning the Kurdish poems the praising terms have been used 13 (thirteen) times while the slandering ones (22) twenty two times. This means that the total terms of praising and slandering in the all poems is (76) expressions. So the percentage of the English praising terms is 39.473% and that of the slandering ones is 14.736%. The Kurdish praising terms constitutes 17.105%. Finally the slandering terms in the Kurdish poems constitutes 28.947%.

References

-Abrams, M.H. et al (1987)6th. The Anthology of English Literature. New York. London.

- Barry Ann M.(1989). Defamation Act. Published on: WWW.legislation.wa.gov.au Defamation in the Workplace: The Impact of Increasing Employer Liability Article 6 Volume72.http://scholarship.Law.marquette.edu/mlir.

-Brophy, J. (2010)3rd. Motivating students to learn. New York: Routledge.

-Cannella, G. S. (1986). Praise and concrete rewards: Concerns for childhood education. Childhood Education, 62, 297–301.

-Carnegie, D. (1964). How to win friends and influence people. New York.

-Close et al (1985) .Law Defamation Commission of British. Canada.

-Clytor, John and Cole, Jeffrey L.(2004) The journal of civil litigation published by Quartery by the Virginia Association of defense attomeys Coverage for defamation claim under the commercial general liability policy. Volume xv1 no.2 2004.

-Dev, P. C. (1997). Intrinsic motivation and academic achievement: What does their relationship imply for the classroom teacher? Remedial and Special Education.

-Faber, A., & Mazlish, E. (1995). Praise that doesn’t demean, criticism that doesn’t wound. American Educator, 19, 33–38.

-Farson, R. E. (1963). Praise reappraised. Harvard Business Review, 41, 61–66.

-Ferguson, Margaret et al (2005)5th. The Norton Anthology of Poetry.US.

-Greenblatt, Stephen (2012) 9th. The Norton Anthology of English Literature. Harvard University.
- Kanouse, D. E., Gumpert, P., & Canvan-Gumpert, D. (1981). The semantics of praise. In J. H. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research (Vol. 3, pp. 97–115). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Klein, O. David and Rwuller, Joshua (2017) Journal of internet law volume 20 no.10 2017 fake news: a legal perspective.

- Ladika, Susan. (2013): Workforce 92.12 - 52-56. Web “Companies Recognizing Importance of Recognition.”

- Mangan, David (2017). The Relationship between Defamation, Breach and privacy and other legal claims involving offensive internet content. University of London.

- McKay, J. (1992) 2nd. Building self-esteem in children. New Harbinger.

- Naranjargal et al (2008). Are defamation and insult crime? Us Embassy in Us Mongolia.

-Omoregbe,Esohe M. and Evbuomwan Osaigbovo O. (2016).The Pragmatics of Edo Praise Expression Journal of Benin and Edo Studies, Vol.1, 2016 69. University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.

-Oxford wordpower Dictionary. Oxford University.

- Prook, Joachim S.et al (2015) The Negative Effects of Praise and Flattery. NHTV University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands and Institute of Digital Games University of Malta.

- Qeleshir, Joana (2017). Defamation and other Torts Affecting the Reputation united Kingdom Legislation and Jurisprudence. Global Journal of Politics and Law Research Vol5 No.5, pp.89-94, September Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)89Print ISSN: ISSN 2053-6321(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2053-6593. Albania.

- Raichur, Ashish (2015). Shhh! No Gossip. India.

- Sipe, Julie (2004). Defamation Law, Warts and All (A CALL FOR REFORM).

- Stevic, Celinda R., et al. (2008): 89.3: 523-534. “Initiating Personal Growth: The Role of Recognition and Life Satisfaction on the Development of College Students. Social Indicators Research.

- Vannin, Ellen (1954) Isle of man. DEFAMATION ACT 1954.

- Washakowski Alyssa.(2015) The Moderating Effects of Praise on the Relationship between Autonomy and Work Motivation. University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository Honors Theses and Capstones Student Scholarship.

- Wyse, Joseph (1995) The Complaint in Libel and Slander: A Dilemma for plaintiff Volume 33 | Issue 4 Article 3. Chicago-Kent College of Law Review.

- Internet Sources

- Defamation Act which was published on www.legislation.wa.gov.au (2005:18).

- المصادر العربية

- زندویات میشال. A.B.C Al Mawrd .1982. لبنان/پیروت
Table (1) The Sample of the English poems.

| No. | Poems             | Authors' Name     | source                                      |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Mutability        | Percy Bysshe Shelley | The Norton Anthology of English Literature 6th ed. |
| 2   | Bright Star       | John Keats        | Norton Anthology of Poetry 5th ed.          |
| 3   | London,1802       | William Wordsworth | The Norton Anthology of English Literature 9th ed. |

Table (2) The Sample of the Kurdish poems.

| No. | Poems             | Authors' Name       | source                                      |
|-----|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1   | jezhwan           | Hemn Mukryani       | Diwani Hemn Mukryani                        |
| 2   | Shekh Ali Talabani| Shekh Razai Talabani| Diwani Shekh Razai Talabani                 |
| 3   | Zulfaini ba Kham mar u ba Halqan waku Aqrab | Nali | Diwani Nali |

Table (3) the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Mutability" poem by "Percy Bysshe Shelley".

| No. | Praising terms | line | No. | Slandering terms | line |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|------------------|------|
| 1   | Smile          | 1    | 1   | Mocks            | 6    |
| 2   | Delight        | 5    | 2   | frail            | 8    |
| 3   | Bright         | 7    | 3   | poor             | 10   |
| 4   | Bright         | 15   | 4   | despair          | 11   |
| 5   | Glad           | 18   | 5   | Gay              | 16   |
|     |                 |      | 6   | Calm             | 19   |

Table (4) shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Bright Star" poem by John Keats.

| No. | Praising terms | line | No. | Slandering terms | line |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|------------------|------|
| 1   | Bright         | 1    | 1   | Unrest           | 12   |
| 2   | Steadfast      | 1    |     |                  |      |
| 3   | Splendor       | 2    |     |                  |      |
| 4   | Eremite        | 4    |     |                  |      |
| 5   | Pure           | 6    |     |                  |      |
| 6   | Soft           | 7    |     |                  |      |
| 7   | Steadfast      | 9    |     |                  |      |
| 8   | Fair           | 10   |     |                  |      |
| 9   | Ripening       | 10   |     |                  |      |
| 10  | Soft           | 11   |     |                  |      |
| 11  | Sweet          | 12   |     |                  |      |
| 12  | Tender         | 13   |     |                  |      |
Table (5) below shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "London, 1802" poem by William Wordsworth.

| No. | Praising terms | line | No. | Slandering terms | line |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|------------------|------|
| 1   | Heroic         | 4    | 1   | Fen              | 2    |
| 2   | Wealth         | 4    | 2   | Stagnant         | 3    |
| 3   | Manners        | 8    | 3   | Selfish          | 6    |
| 4   | Virtue         | 8    | 4   | lowliest         | 14   |
| 5   | Freedom        | 8    |     |                  |      |
| 6   | Power          | 8    |     |                  |      |
| 7   | Star           | 9    |     |                  |      |
| 8   | Sea            | 10   |     |                  |      |
| 9   | Pure           | 11   |     |                  |      |
| 10  | Majestic       | 11   |     |                  |      |
| 11  | Free           | 11   |     |                  |      |
| 12  | Cheerful       | 13   |     |                  |      |
| 13  | Godliness      | 13   |     |                  |      |

Table (6) shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Jezhwan" poem by "Hemn Mukryani".

| No. | Praising terms | line | No. | Slandering terms | line |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|------------------|------|
| 1   | کولمه ی نه رم ونیل | 8    | 1   | ده له روزی | 1    |
| 2   | جوانه          | 10   | 2   | تیستی لله ماره | 3    |
| 3   | ماندوک نه بورو | 14   | 3   | سویامی لی پراوه | 5    |
|     |                |      | 4   | تیستی باری گرتوه | 7    |
|     |                |      | 5   | لی برو هیز | 9    |
| 6   |                |      |     | پرو له غم | 12   |
| 7   |                |      |     | شه روزی گرتوه | 13   |

Table (7) shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Shekh Ali Talabani " poem by "Shekh Razai Talabani".

| No. | Praising terms | line | No. | Slandering terms | line |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|------------------|------|
| 1   | جاه            | 1    | 1   | توله            | 4    |
| 2   | جه به روتون | 1    | 2   | عه نووتین | 6    |
| 3   | موشعق         | 8    | 3   | رو حمینان نیه | 7    |
| 4   | زیکر          | 12   | 4   | نادان         | 9    |
| 5   | قورنوتین      | 12   | 5   | قورمساغ     | 9    |
|     |                |      | 6   | نه رانن     | 9    |
Table (8) shows the frequency of praising and slandering terms in "Zulfaini ba Kham mar u ba Halkan waku Aqrab" poem by "Nali".

| No. | Praising terms     | line | No. | Slandering terms    | line |
|-----|--------------------|------|-----|--------------------|------|
| 1   | موره تنله ب         | 2    | 1   | مار                 | 1    |
| 2   | شه هدي             | 5    | 2   | عه قرو ب            | 1    |
| 3   | له دده تده که بئینی | 6    | 3   | موشه ووه ش          | 2    |
| 4   | صافی              | 9    | 4   | درؤ                 | 7    |
| 5   | عاقل               | 12   | 5   | حه سودان            | 7    |
| 6   | سه گگ              |       | 6   | سه ب                | 8    |
| 7   |                    |       | 7   | جه هلی              | 8    |
| 8   |                    |       | 8   | عه پاریبی نیه       | 12   |
| 9   |                    |       | 9   |                     | 15   |