

Complimenting Strategies in Sociolinguistic Settings: The Case of Preachers and Legitimate discourse Pre-Service Teachers

Jumaa Abofkhedeh
Al-Quds University

Abstract

Research on compliments and compliment responses (CRs) across different cultures have shown that there is no universal model using this type of speech act. The present study contributes to the understanding of the cultural similarities and differences in the use of compliment and CRs strategies between Preachers and Legitimate discourse university students. Results show that in terms of compliment strategies, the legitimate discourse group used compliment and non-compliment strategies more often than the Preachers group. Similar result was also found in terms of the CRs strategies employed. Overall, Legitimate discourse group had registered more frequent usage of the four macro CRs strategies. Emerging patterns for compliments were also discovered and discussed. The interplay between culture and language use was underscored by presenting the distinct traits of legitimate discourse and Preachers that were reflected in their compliments and CRs. Implications on cross-cultural communication as well as English pedagogy were also raised.

Keywords: culture, speech acts, compliment, compliment responses

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence along with linguistic and socio-linguistic competences is the key for successful communication. Barron (2003) gave a comprehensive definition of the term pragmatic competence as the knowledge of the available linguistic resources in a language for the realization of certain illocutions, knowledge of speech acts' sequential aspects and contextual use of a language's linguistic resources. For Searle (1969) the fact that linguistic communication involves linguistic acts serves as the basis for focusing on the study of speech acts.

Complimenting is a kind of speech act belonging to the category of expressive based on Searle's (1969) classification. It is a positive politeness strategy aiming to praise the addressee for a past or present action. 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 interlocutors. Holmes (1988) defined compliment as a speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some "good" (possession, characteristic, skill, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer. They are said to "grease the social wheel" and thus serve as "social lubricants" (Wolfson, 1983 as cited in Zhang, 2013). They are often used to start a conversation or to 'lubricate' the conversational interaction by reinforcing the rapport between the interlocutors.

Compliment responses (CRs) is a type of speech act that is also worth exploring due to the various functions it performs. It is a response to a compliment given by a complimenter and received by a complimentee. Further, the employment of CRs as 'a phatic expression' may also serve "a particular role in maintaining

the solidarity of interpersonal relationships and the harmony of social interaction (Heidari, Rezazadeh, Rasekh, 2009).

Phoocharoensil (2012) cited various studies (e.g. Cedar, 2006; Chen, 1993; Falasi, 2007; Han, 1992; Lin 2008; Liu 1995; Qu & Wang, 2005; Sattar & Lah, 2009; Salut & Ozkan, 2005; Tran, 2007; Yu, 1999, 2003, 2004) to establish the fact that compliments and CRs in English have been studied for decades not only in speakers whose first language is English but also of those speakers whose L1 is not English.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Studies on Cross-Cultural Differences on Compliments and Compliment Responses

Studying compliments and CRs across different cultures has shown that there is no universal model using this type of speech act. It has been revealed that different cultures have different ways to deal with compliments. The distinctive and various responses to the compliment are not only a matter of individual preferences and choices, but it is also a matter of societal group. By individual, it tends to be stylistic showing that he/she has a different way of responding to one another while by society, the typical responses reflect the norms, tradition, and ethic of the people (Dirgeyasa, 2015).

Pomerantz (1978) asserted that cultures differ in terms of the extent to which they accept or reject compliment. To illustrate the previous premise, Yuan (2002) referred to the works of Herbert (1986) and Herbert and Straight (1989) showing that although the Americans, the British and the South Africans are all English-speaking, the latter two have been found to accept compliments more readily than the former.

Herbert and Straight (1989 in Yuan, 2002) found on a comparative study on American and South African compliment responses used by college students that Americans display a high frequency of compliment expression and a low frequency of compliment acceptance. Meanwhile, South

Africans give relatively lower number of compliments than Americans but accept compliments with higher frequency. The two authors attributed the differences between the two group to their respective socio-cultural background.

Yuan (2002) found that Kunming Chinese prefer to issue a clear positive or explicit statement when they pay compliments which accounted for 83.10% of the total tokens produced for compliments. The same study also revealed that non-complimentary replies, both non-compliments and opt outs, have a relatively high frequency of 11.19%. The studies of Chen (1993), Daikuhara (1986) and Wieland (1995) still in Yuan (2002) concluded that the Japanese, the Chinese and the French tend to reject compliments more often. Falasi (2007, cited in Phoocharoensil, 2012) found that Americans usually regard saying 'Thank you' in response to a compliment as the most common practice, whereas speakers of Asian languages often reject or disagree with praise to show modesty.

The present study attempts to contribute to the understanding of the cultural similarities and differences in the use of compliment and CRs strategies between the two group and cultural groups to strengthen the hypothesis that there is no universal model as regards the use of compliments and CRs strategies among communities and that different value systems can be reflected in the speech act of compliments and CRs they produce. Further, this study would benefit the realm of cross-cultural communication as well as English pedagogy.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How do Preachers and Legitimate discourse advanced ESL learners' compliment and respond to compliments?
2. How may their compliments and compliments responses strategies be compared?
3. What Preachers culture and Legitimate discourse culture are reflected in their compliments and ^[1]_[sep] compliment responses strategies?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded on Holmes' (1986) viewpoint which holds that to maintain social relationship and to reinforce a desired action, people may compliment one another. Compliment is a speech act that frequently occurs in everyday conversations. It is often used to start a conversation or to 'lubricate' the conversational interaction by reinforcing the rapport between the interlocutors. Goffman (1967) posited that compliments are primarily aimed at maintaining, enhancing or supporting the addressee's face and are used for a variety of reasons, the most significant of which is perhaps to express admiration or approval of someone's work/appearance or taste. Herbert (1990 as cited in Zhang, 2013) argued that "*the actual sociology of compliment work cannot be understood without considering simultaneously the whole of the compliment event*" (p. 202).

It would be inadequate to study compliments independently without taking the other half of the adjacency pair, i.e. CRs into account. Yuan (2002) defined CRs as anything that follows a compliment, verbal or non-verbal. Responding to compliments is not an easy speech act to perform because the speaker has to balance the two conflicting constraints namely to agree with one's conversational co-participants and to avoid self-praise. Pomerantz (1978) pointed out that CRs pose a dilemma for the recipient in that they involve two conversational principles that stand in potential conflict. Principle I, agreeing with and/or accepting compliment and Principle II, avoiding self-praise. These principles were also consistent with Leech's (1983) Politeness Principles or Politeness Maxims, more specifically the agreement and modesty maxims.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

A letter request was addressed to the college dean of the Teacher Education in a State University. After the letter was approved, a survey questionnaire was administered to 120 sophomore Bachelor of Secondary

Education major in English to determine their discourse group. The questionnaire required the students to report their place of birth, current province, length of stay in the province, province where they completed primary and secondary education, languages spoken at home, and parents' province of origin. After the students filled-out the survey form, the researchers identified students who met the criteria and considered them participants.

For the students to be classified as either Preachers or Legitimate discourse participants in the study, they must have: (1) completed primary and secondary education in any of the provinces known to be the province of Preachers or Legitimate discourse; (2) used either Preachers or Legitimate discourse as dominant language at home; and (3) one of their parents as either native Preachers or Legitimate discourse. The choice on the set of participants was done to ensure that they are suitable informants since situations in the DCT are expressed in English. The study participants were referred to as advanced ESL learners since they are pre-service teachers specializing in English, whom for Alieto (2018 as cited in Torres, 2019) will soon form part of the basic implementer of pedagogical policies. Of the 120 students who filled out the survey form, the researcher randomly selected 25 Preachers participants and 25 Legitimate discourse participants who met the criteria set.

Data Collection Device

The study used Discourse Completion Test to gather data. The DCT questionnaire had two parts. Part 1 was designed to explore the possible compliment strategies used by Preachers and Legitimate discourse advanced ESL students. As Yuan (2002) mentioned, positive characteristics of the complimenter such as appearance, possession and ability are common objects of the compliment. The DCT situations, which were used to elicit compliment from the participants, was patterned from those situations presented by Zhang (2013) to college students in AL-Dahreya University. Modifications were made to the situations in the DCT to ensure that topics and situations suited

the level, familiarity, and real-life experiences of the present participants. Six topics were presented to the participants, so they could have a clear picture of what the topic is as well as their relationship to the one described in the

situation. The participants were asked to play the role of the complimenter and give compliments. Table 1 presents the topics of compliments in DCT questionnaire.

Table 1. Topics of Compliments in the DCT Questionnaire

Context	Topic	Object of Compliment
1	Classmate is wearing a new shoes	Attire
2	Friend assisted in finding a cellphone application	Ability
3	Classmate made an excellent PPT	Ability
4	Friend listened to your problem	Kindness
5	Classmate taught you in your Biology lesson	Kindness
6	Friend bought a new laptop	Possession

For the compliment response, situations employed by Mohammad Ali Heidari et al. (2009) and modified by Morales (2012) as well as Zhang (2013) were adopted with little modifications to suit the present participants. Part II of the DCT also had six situations, where a complimentee responds to a complimenter's compliment. The given situations as well as the

topic and object. CRs are shown in Table 2 as follows:

Participants' actual DCT responses, which were lifted and used as examples in the results and discussion, were presented as they are and there were no modifications nor refinement of language structure that were done.

Table 2. Topics and Objects for Compliment Responses (CRs)

Context	Topic	Object of Compliment
1	You look good at a party	Appearance and Attire
2	You do favor for a classmate	Kindness
3	You sound nearly native American speaker	Ability

4	You have the latest cellphone model	Possession
5	You have a new hairstyle	Appearance
6	You wear signature collection perfume	Attire

FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

Coding System for Compliments

Participants' compliments were coded following Yuan's (2002) three types of compliments: compliment, non-compliment and opt out. According to Yuan, semantic formulas for compliment can be divided into two types: unbound semantic formulas and bound semantic formulas. Unbound semantic formulas refer to those expressions that can function independently as compliments, while bound semantic formulas refer to those responses that cannot be considered

as compliments by themselves but must be attached to or co-occur with one of the unbound semantic formulas to be interpreted as part of a compliment. Unbound semantic formulas can be further divided into two subtypes: explicit compliments and implicit compliments. Bound semantic formulas include explanation, information question, future reference, contrast, advice and request. Non-compliment refers to responses that cannot be regarded as compliments, be it either mere expression of thanks, or bound semantic formula occurring on their own, or replies that do not carry any positive meanings. Opt out refers to the cases where the participants indicated that "I would not say anything" when a compliment is expected in that situation.

Coding System for Compliment Responses (CRs)

The CRs were analyzed based on Holmes (1988, 1993) and Yu's (2003) categories of CR strategies. Holmes (1988, 1993) categorized the CRs in the forms of macro levels. Each act in the macro level is subdivided into sub-categories in the forms of micro levels. Macro levels include accept, reject and deflect or evade. Yu (2003) explored the CRs at discourse level and proposes the combination here. In the present study, the categories adapted have four macro and 10 micro levels as shown in Table 3.

DCTs were coded according to the categories of the CR strategies. For example, the CR "It's from my aunt", was coded into the category of 'Evade' at macro level and 'Informative comment' for micro level. Furthermore, if the participant responded more than one micro strategies (e.g. Thank you. This perfume was given to me by my aunt. You smell good too) these utterances were coded into 'Combination' strategies with three micro patterns which were 'Appreciation token', 'Informative comment' and 'Return compliment'. 'Appreciation token' pattern was coded when the participant said appreciation such as "Thank you", "Thanks a lot". Informative comment pattern was coded when the participant gave the informative comment to what had been given the compliment such as "It's the perfume being used by Hollywood celebrities". After the coding, the total number of compliments and CRs strategies was then counted.

Table 3. Framework of Analysis for CRs

Macro level	Micro level	CRs Examples
-------------	-------------	--------------

Accept	1. Appreciation Token	“Thanks”; “Thank you”; “Cheers”; “Yes”; “Good”
	2. Agreeing Utterance	“I know”; “I am glad you think so”; “I did realize I did that well”; “Yeah, I really like it;”
	3. Downgrading qualifying utterance	“It’s nothing”; “It was no problem”; “I enjoyed doing it”; “I hope it was OK”; I still only use it to call people”; “It’s not bad.”
	4. Return compliment	“You’re not too bad yourself”; “Your child was an angel”; “I’m sure you will be great”; “Yours was good too”.
Reject	1. Disagreeing utterance	“Nah, I don’t think so”, “I thought I did badly”; “Nah, it’s nothing special”; “It’s not”; ‘Don’t say so’
	2. Question accuracy	“Why?”, “It’s right”
	3. Challenging Sincerity	“Stop lying”, “Don’t lie”; “Don’t joke about it”; “You must be kidding”; “Don’t, come on.”
Deflect/Evade	1. Shift credit	“That’s what friends are for”; “You’re polite”; “No worries”, “My pleasure.”
	2. Informative comment	“It wasn’t hard”; “You can get it from (store name)”; “It’s really cheap”
	3. Request reassurance	“Really?!”
Combination of CRs strategies		

Inter-Coding of Compliments and Compliment Responses

Before coding the participants’ DCT responses, the three coders met and discussed how they would code participants’ responses based on scripts following the frameworks of

Yuan (2002) for compliments, and Holmes (1988, 1993) and Yu (2003) for compliment responses. To help the coders familiarize the coding of compliments and compliment responses, the researchers followed the inter-coding approach done by various researchers

(i.e., Torres, Collantes, Astrero, Millan & Gabriel, 2020; Torres & Flores, 2017). The coders practiced coding 40 actual DCT responses (equal distribution of compliments and compliment responses). After the practice, they compared their individual coding. Differences in their coding during the practice were discussed and agreement was set on how to code the responses that were coded differently. After the practice, the encoded responses were given by one of the researchers, who also served as coder, to the two inter-coders, who were also graduates of PhD in Applied Linguistics and teaching education and language courses in CHED recognized Teacher-Education Institutions. Cross tabulation results show the following Kappa (κ) values: between Rater 1 and Rater 2 ($\kappa = .886$), between Rater 2 and Rater 3 ($\kappa = .821$), and between Rater 1 and Rater 3 ($\kappa = .881$).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents and discusses the findings in the study. It begins by presenting how the participants from the two groups compliment and respond to compliments. Comparison of the compliments and CRs of Preachers and Legitimate discourse then follow. Cultural traits of the Preachers and Legitimate discourse groups that are reflected in their compliments and CRs were discussed in the latter part.

Compliments

Distribution of Compliment Strategies

A total of 335 compliment tokens were elicited from 50 participants who were asked to give their compliments in the six situations described through the DCT. Data from Table 4 show that 238 (71.04%) were considered compliments followed by 90 (26.87%) non-compliment replies and 7 (2.09%) opt-out.

Table 4. Overall Distribution of Compliment Strategies

Compliment Strategies	Preachers		Legitimate discourse		Total	
	Raw Tokens	%	Raw Tokens	%	Tokens	%
Compliments	115	34.32%	123	36.71%	238	71.04%
Non-Compliment	33	9.85%	57	17.01%	90	26.87%
Opt-out	3	0.90%	4	1.19%	7	2.09%
					335	

As shown in Table 5 the most frequently used compliment strategy by the Preachers and Legitimate discourse participants is explicit semantic formula accounting for 39.10% of the 335 compliment tokens. The previous finding coincides with the observation of Yuan (2003) and Zhang (2013) that people tend to make direct and positive statements in giving compliments. Explicit compliment is followed by non-compliment with 26.87% or 90 instances. The current result for the non-

compliment is 17.37% and 19.11% higher as to what Zhang (2013) and Yuan (2003) recorded in their respective studies. The two authors also observed the relatively high frequency of non-compliment response and explained their common observation following the idea that not paying compliments when the situation calls for is attributed to fact that the participants were not able to distinguish expression of thanks from expression of compliments. Expressing of compliment and expression of gratitude are two

different things. Giving compliments is a way of showing that one noticed and appreciated something about the person or the situation, while thanking is used to express grateful feeling to other people. Example 1 below illustrates how Legitimate discourse respondent 1 (TR1) did not compliment in the situation described in context 4 (C4):

Example 1:

I owe my life to you. Just kidding, but I'm very thankful that I felt better because of you (C4). - TR1

From the given example above, it can be seen that though the respondent had acknowledged the fact that the one who was supposed to be complimented extended help as described in the given situation, still no compliment was made. Although, gratitude had been expressed, it cannot be equated as a form of compliment.

Table 5. Detailed Distribution of Compliment Strategies

Compliment Strategy	Preachers		Legitimate discourse		Total	
	Raw Tokens	%	Raw Tokens	%	Tokens	%
Explicit	55	16.42%	76	22.67%	131	39.10%
Implicit	23	6.87%	22	6.58%	45	13.43%
Explanation	12	3.58%	6	1.79%	18	5.37%
Information Question	10	2.99%	6	1.79%	16	4.78%
Future Reference	4	1.19%	4	1.19%	8	2.39%
Contrast	-	-	1	0.30%	1	0.30%
Advice	1	0.30%	1	0.30%	2	0.60%
Request	10	2.99%	7	2.09%	17	5.07%
Non-compliment	33	9.85%	57	17.01%	90	26.87%
Opt-out	3	0.90%	4	1.19%	7	2.09%
					335	

The third most frequently used strategy is the implicit compliment with 13.43% or 45 tokens. Herbert (1997) described implicit compliments as those in which the value

judgment is presupposed and/or implicated by Gricean maxims. Therefore, the positive value of an expression can be inferred from what is said in a particular situation. Examples 2 and 3

show how Preachers and Legitimate discourse participants used this type of compliment strategy.

Example 2:

Thank you so much! That was a really big help. I don't know what to do without you. (C2) -TR27

Example 3:

“Hey thank you bro. Biology doesn't love me and the feeling is mutual but because of you we fell in love with each other hehe. Thank you, thank you Morad. I hope we both pass the exam. (C5) -IR1.

Based on the foregoing examples, positive values are not clearly stated in their responses but can be inferred based on the context. The context where Example 2 was derived could help in interpreting the last part of the reply (I don't know what to do without you) as a form of compliment to the ability of the one being complimented. Likewise, the context where Example 3 was produced could explain why the second part of the reply (Biology doesn't love me and the feeling is mutual but because of you we fell in love with each other) is a form of compliment to one's ability to explain the topic

well so that something that is perceived as hard subject could be easily understood.

Instances of explanation and request were also recorded accounting for 5.37% and 5.07% of the total tokens in compliment strategies. Opt-Out (2.09%) and other compliment strategies (information question, 4.78%; future reference, 2.39%; advice, 0.60%; and contrast, 0.30%) were the least frequently used strategies.

Compliment Responses

Distribution of Compliment Response Strategies

Presented in Table 6 is the overall findings on CRs strategies in the macro level. Of the 387 tokens, more than half (52.97%) of the responses were classified as acceptance tokens, more than one-fourth (25.32%) were deflect/evade, followed by combination of CRs (13.95%) and the remaining (7.75%) were classified reject strategies. Except for the presence of combination of the different CRs strategies, similar trend was found by Morales (2012) in her study of the CRs of high school students in the Al-Dahreya.

Table 7 summarizes participants' CRs strategies in the micro level.

Table 6. Overall Distribution of CRs

Compliment Responses Strategies	Preachers		Legitimate discourse		Total	
	Raw Tokens	%	Raw Tokens	%	Tokens	%
Accept	99	25.58	106	27.39	205	52.97%
Reject	13	3.36	17	4.39	30	7.75%
Deflect/Evade	36	9.30	62	16.02	98	25.32%
Combination	23	5.94	31	8.01	54	13.95%
					387	100.00%

From the data, it is evident that appreciation token (20.67%) was the most utilized CR type between the groups, followed by return compliment (15.25%). Hence, it might be the case that the Al-Dahreya English learners were able to learn the rule of thumb in responding to compliments, that is, to accept it when receiving one.

Other CRs strategies employed by the participants were combination strategies (13.95%), shift credit (13.69%), downgrading qualifying utterance (10.86%), informative comment (6.20%), agreeing utterance (6.20%), request assurance (5.43%), disagreeing utterance (5.42%), challenging sincerity (1.81%), and question accuracy (0.52%).

Table 7. Detailed Distribution of Compliment Responses (CRs)

Compliment Responses Strategies	Preachers		Legitimate discourse		Total	
	Raw Tokens	%	Raw Tokens	%	Tokens	%
Accept						
Appreciation Token	41	10.59%	39	10.08%	80	20.67%
Agreeing Utterance	16	4.13%	8	2.07%	24	6.20%
Downgrading qualifying utterance	21	5.43%	21	5.43%	42	10.86%
Return Compliment	21	5.43%	38	9.82%	59	15.25%
Reject						
Disagreeing Utterance	10	2.58%	11	2.84%	21	5.42%
Question Accuracy	-	-	2	0.52%	2	0.52%
Challenging Sincerity	3	0.78%	4	1.03%	7	1.81%
Deflect/Evade						
Shift Credit	23	5.94%	30	7.75%	53	13.69%
Informative Comment	7	1.81%	17	4.39%	24	6.20%

Request Assurance	6	1.55%	15	3.88%	21	5.43%
Combination	23	5.94%	31	8.01%	54	13.95%
					387	100

Comparison between Preachers and Legitimate discourse Compliment Strategies

As regards the frequency on the use of the different compliment strategies between the two groups, data in Table 3 shows that Legitimate discourse participants elicited more complimentary (2.39% higher), non-complimentary (7.16% higher), and opt-out (0.29% higher) than the Preachers group. However, looking at the frequency as to how the individual compliment strategies had been employed reveal that Preachers participants elicited more compliment strategies in the following types: implicit, explanation, information question and request than the Legitimate discourse group.

Aside from the frequency on the use of these strategies, instances as to how the two groups used the compliment and non-compliment strategies also vary. Examples 4 and 5 are non-compliment responses of Preachers and Legitimate discourse participants, respectively. Responses of Preachers respondents 2, 6 and 23 in Example 4 came from contexts 4 and 5 in the DCT, while responses of Legitimate discourse respondents 17 and 23 in Example 5 were produced from contexts 2 and 5. In comparing the replies of the two groups, it can be inferred that Preachers participants opt to promise that they too would be there for the person, who they complimented, when that person would be facing similar situation. Though the Legitimate discourse participant also promised something to the one being complimented, the difference is on the promise itself. While in the case of Preachers participants, they promised that they will also be there for the person or extend help to the same

person whom they complimented, the Legitimate discourse participant's promise would be in the form of offering the complementee a treat for a lunch or snacks to return the favor the Legitimate discourse participant received. The difference can be interpreted in a cultural lens. The Preachers are generally known for being hardworking, appreciative and determined and compared to other cultural group like the Legitimate discourse. Preachers are also known for their simple lifestyle and strong value for money.

Hence, the responses made by the Legitimate discourse participant is less likely to be heard from Preachers since they are known to be thrifty. Thus, the promise made by the Legitimate discourse tends to be more tangible and more likely to happen compared to the one the Preachers had promised. It can be deduced then based on the given examples that the return favor promised by the Legitimate discourse along with the non-compliment response will have a greater tendency to be realized first since the promise for a lunch or snack treat is immediate than the time when the person who was supposed to be complimented would be getting back the given favor.

Example 4:

Thank you so much for listening. It feels better now. I really appreciate it, remember that I'm always here for you too. (C4)-IR2

I feel much better right now. Thank you for listening Bel. I swear you can count on me. (C4)-IR6

I understand it already Morad. Thanks for your help. If you're needing help, count on me. (C5) - IR23

Example 5:

Morad, let's have a snack. My treat (C5)-TR17

Oh my gosh! Thank you for your help Rhea. I will treat you after our class. That's a promise. (C2)

Thank you very much Morad! If I get a high grade on our exam I will treat you. (C5) -TR23

The superior characteristic of legitimate discourse group can be reflected on the non-compliment reply made by legitimate discourse respondent 20 shown in Example 6. Legitimate discourse would have the tendency to yield non-complimentary in instances where they also possess the same object of the compliment, which for them is of the same quality or sometimes better.

Example 6:

I also have my own laptop. Don't show off too much. (C6)-TR20

Another way the Legitimate discourse participant used the non-compliment strategy is by combining it with a request. In Example 7, Legitimate discourse respondent 16 did not compliment in contexts 4 and 5, yet a request from the one who supposed to be complimented was asked. The request in context 4 is "Please don't tell this to anyone" and the request in context 5 is "I hope you can teach me again next time."

Example 7:

Thanks for being there and be my shoulder to lean on. You know I have no one to tell these cause I'm afraid I might be judged by anyone or everybody. Thank you and I love you. Please don't tell this to anyone. (C4)

Hey! Thanks. I've been confused with those concepts all the time. I badly needed to understand

Those for our first term examination is coming. Thank you and I hope you can teach me again next time. (C5)-TR16

It is also noteworthy to mention the possible emergence of new category of compliment observed from the DCT of Legitimate discourse participants. In Yuan's (2002) classification of compliments, request is one of them categorized under bound semantic formula. The bound semantic formula like that of 'request' must have to co-occur with one of the unbound semantic formula. In the case of Example 8, the unbound semantic formula is "Oh! So cool" is categorized explicit. However, the following structure (Let me try It.) which is supposedly labeled as bound semantic formula cannot be classified as request but a command. In Yuan's classification, command is not included. Yuan only provides two unbound semantic formulas and seven for bound semantic formulas.

Example 8:

Oh! So cool. Let me try it! (C6)-TR19

A participant from the Preachers group elicited explicit compliment that goes with a structure that does not fit to the previously identified type of bound semantic formulas for compliments. In example 9, the first part is classified explicit comment while the second component is different from the bound semantic formulas identified by Yuan (2002).

Example 9:

That's awesome dude! I would like to uninstall all of these though. (C6)-IR14

Another interesting finding that differentiates the Preachers group with the Legitimate discourse is the use of nonverbal compliment by an Preachers participant. In context 6 of the DCT Preachers respondent 11 wrote, "I will give her thumbs up for picking useful and adorable one". Nonverbal compliment like the previous did not register as a compliment strategy of the Legitimate discourse group.

Example 10 is a compliment from legitimate discourse participant. It can be observed that word such as “pricey” could carry either a positive or negative value. Taken away from the context, “pricey” alone could carry a negative value. But when used in the context as in the example, “pricey” was able to carry a positive value hence was considered compliment.

Example10:

Your laptop must be pricey. Yet it really helps
(C6)-TR10

Comparison between Preachers and Legitimate discourse Compliment Responses Strategies (CRs)

In terms of frequency on the use of CRs strategies, data from Table 7 shows that the Legitimate discourse group employed more return compliment, informative comment, request reassurance, shift credit, question accuracy, disagreeing utterance, and challenging sincerity. The participants from the Preachers group, on the other hand, used appreciation token and agreeing utterance as their CRs more frequent.

Aside from the difference on the frequency distribution in terms of the use of CRs

strategies by the participants from the two groups, it is also interesting to describe how Preachers and Legitimate discourse participants combined CRs strategies in one context. Table 8 presents the frequency distribution of combined CRs strategies as well as sample replies for each combination elicited by the participants in the DCT. A total of 19 combinations were noted from the responses which accounted for 54 tokens of combined CRs strategies. Participants from Preachers group elicited 23 tokens of combined CRs strategies, while the Legitimate discourse participants elicited 31 tokens of combined strategies. Combination of appreciation token and return compliment had the highest frequency of all the combined CRs strategies. It was used more frequently by the Preachers participants including combined Appreciation Token and Shift Credit and combined appreciation token, disagreeing utterance and informative comment. Meanwhile, the other combinations generated were frequently used by Legitimate discourse participants. Some of these include combined appreciation token and informative comment, combined appreciation token and disagreeing utterance, combined request reassurance, appreciation token and request reassurance, combined request reassurance, appreciation token and return compliment, and combined request reassurance and return compliment.

Table 8. Summary of the Combined Compliment Responses Strategies

Combined Compliment Responses Strategies	Preachers	Legitimate discourse	Total
	Tokens	Tokens	
Combination 1. Appreciation Token and Return Compliment Hey thank you, you look great too, you're stunning! (C1) IR23	12	4	16
Combination 2. Appreciation Token and Disagreeing Utterance I'm still stuttering a little but thanks (C3) TR20	-	2	2
Combination 3. Appreciation Token, Return Compliment and Challenging Sincerity Oww! Thank you! You too. You look great. I only hope you're not joking huh!	-	2	2

(C1) T16			
Combination 4. Appreciation Token and Shift Credit Thank you. My aunt gave this to me. (C6) -T13	3	1	4
Combination 5. Appreciation Token and Informative Comment Thank you, actually I used a signature perfume used by a famous celebrity. (C6) -T7	1	4	5
Combination 6. Appreciation Token, Informative Comment and Return Compliment Thank you. This perfume was given to me by my aunt. You smell good too. (C6) -T6	-	2	2
Combination 7. Appreciation Token, Shift Credit and Return Compliment Thank you. Thanks to my aunt. You also smell good. (C6) -T16	-	1	1

....continuation of Table 8			
Combination 8. Appreciation Token, Disagreeing Utterance and Informative Comment Thank you! But not that really, it's just that, I prepared for this presentation that's why I sounded good at it. (C3) -I5	2	-	2
Combination 9. Agreeing Utterance and Challenging Sincerity I think so, but are you sure? (C4) -I5	1	1	2
Combination 10. Return Compliment and Appreciation Token You too, thanks (C1) -I12	1	-	1
Combination 11. Disagreeing Utterance and Appreciation Token They not really. I just dressed up like this for her special day. But anyway thanks (C1) -T11	-	2	2
Combination 12. Disagreeing Utterance, Appreciation Token and Return Compliment	1	-	1

Uhm...not really, but thanks. you look good also (C1) -I22			
Combination 13. Challenging Sincerity and Return Compliment Really? Can I take you a photo? Stay there. It is more beautiful because of your smile. (C4) -T18	-	2	2
Combination 14. Challenging Sincerity and Appreciation Token Are you kidding me? Hahaha. Thank you so much. (C5) -T23	-	1	1
Combination 15. Request Reassurance, Appreciation Token, and Return Compliment Really? Thank you, and so you do! (C1) -T1	-	2	2
Combination 16. Request Reassurance, Appreciation Token and Shift Credit Is that so? Thanks. Maybe its the effect of watching too much movies. (C3) -T17	-	1	1
Combination 17. Request Reassurance, Shift Credit Really? Thanks to this phone. (C4) -T2	-	1	1
Combination 18. Request Reassurance and Appreciation Token Is that so? Well, thank you. (C5) -T9	2	3	5
Combination 19. Request Reassurance and Return Compliment Really? I think it also looks good on you (C5) -T10	-	2	2

Reflected culture in participants' compliments and compliment responses (CRs)

Analysis of the compliments and CRs elicited by the Preachers participants reveals the presence of the proverbial Preachers frugality. The compliments made by Preachers respondents 2, 6, and 23 in contexts 4 and 5 in the earlier examples support the claim that Preachers frugal nature manifests in their compliments. Unlike the participants from the Legitimate discourse group who promised the complimentee of a snack or lunch to return the favor they received as what is reflected in DCT

responses of Legitimate discourse respondents 17 and 23 in providing compliments in contexts 4 and 5, the Preachers participants, on the other hand, ensured the complimentee that they too would extend the same help or favor should the person they complimented be in the similar situation. In the compliments made by the Preachers, no promise of any material thing in exchange of the favor received was seen. This can be explained by an Preachers's thinking that since he earn his money the hard way, he is not the one to nullify his efforts by being spendthrift. Thus, even in complimenting, this trait has also become visible.

Preachers' frugalities were also revealed in the way they respond to compliment. Preachers participants employed combination of CRs less frequent than the Legitimate discourse participants. The less frequent use of the combined CRs means fewer uses of words and sentences. Hence, even in the utterances of words and sentences Preachers participants still tend to be thrifty. Likewise, a look at the frequency on the detailed frequency distribution of CRs in Table 7 shows that Preachers participants utilized fewer informative comments. As a CR micro strategy under Deflect/ Evade macro strategy, informative comment is a strategy in which the one who received the compliment would give the complimentary additional information as regards the object of the compliment. The fewer instances on the use of informative comment also reflect the Preachers' frugality.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

Following Yuan's (2002) framework of analysis for compliments, results show that of the 335 compliment tokens, 238 (71.04%) were considered compliment, 90 (26.87%) were classified non-compliment replies and 7 (2.09%) were coded opt out. The three most frequently used compliments were explicit (39.10%), implicit (13.43%) and explanation (5.37%).

Participants' CRs strategies were analyzed following Holmes (1988, 1993) and Yu's (2003) frameworks for CRs. On the macro level, accept (52.97%) is the most frequent, followed by deflect/evade (25.32%), combined CRs strategies (13.95%) and reject (7.75%). Comparison on how the participants from the two groups give compliments and employ CRs was also done. In terms of compliment strategies, the Legitimate discourse group used compliment and non-compliment strategies more often than the Preachers group. Similar result was also found in terms of the CRs strategies employed. Overall, Legitimate

discourse group had registered more frequent usage of the four macro CRs strategies.

Emerging patterns for compliments were also discovered. This can be attributed to the dynamic nature of language. The distinct cultural traits of the two groups, frugality for Preachers and superiority for Legitimate discourse, manifested in their compliments and CRs strategies were also discussed.

Conclusion

In this research, the compliment and CRs strategies of Preachers and Legitimate discourse advanced ESL learners have been compared using data from written DCT. Results revealed that since the participants are majoring in English, they apparently learned to employ CR patterns resembling those in the American norms. Thus, when there is a situation that would stimulate them to compliment and respond to a compliment, they give compliments and respond to compliments as well.

While there is high occurrence of complimenting among the participants, instances of non-compliments were also recorded. This can be attributed to the fact that there are still some from the participants who were not able to distinguish the speech act of gratitude from that of compliment giving. Thus, the nature and the felicity conditions of compliments should be explicitly instructed and the difference between compliments and gratitude should be explained (Zhang, 2013).

One of the reasons for opt-out, as mentioned in the DCT, is the lack of interest of the one who is supposed to compliment to the object of compliment. Hence, one's interest in the object of compliment can be a factor why a person will give a compliment. Complimenting then is relative. That is, we tend to compliment the things we are aware of. Having that said, it would be unusual for someone to compliment something he has little or no knowledge at all.

The prevalent use of the combined CRs among the participants can be supported by the fact that since participants are specializing in English, there English conversational

competence has already been sufficiently developed to elaborate their feelings in giving CRs. For instance, it may begin with an appreciation token (e.g. Thanks), followed by a compliment downgrade (e.g. I think it's not that beautiful), which represents the principal content of this CR. The use of combined CRs strategies can also be interpreted in a different way adhering with what Pomerantz (1978) pointed out that CRs pose a dilemma for the recipient in that they involve two conversation principles, one is agreeing with and/or accepting compliment and the other is avoiding self-praise. Hence, another possible reason for the use of combined CRs strategies among the participants is that at first, they do not want to accept the compliment so the tendency is that they employ other strategies such as disagree first, then return the compliment and finally accept it.

The findings on the difference on the frequency and use of compliments and CRs strategies between the two groups conform to the idea that cultures carry norms and expectations on how speech acts are performed. Results also strengthen the connection between language and culture, which are intricately related to each other to a certain extent that they are somehow inseparable (Cedar & Setiadi, 2016). Culture, is often, if not always reflected in the language one speaks or in how they speak a language. No matter how close two cultures literally are, like the Preachers and Legitimate discourse belonging to one nationality, differences are unavoidable. Thus, communication is becoming more and more intercultural because it involves interlocutors who have different first languages, communicate in a common language, and represent different cultures (Kecskes, 2004).

The role of context is important especially in understanding the communicative content of an utterance. In the case of compliments, context is important especially in interpreting implicit compliment. Context plays a big role in determining whether a word carries a positive or negative value. If the context allows a word to carry positive value, then the word is used for complimenting.

Recommendation

Since the present study explored the compliment and CRs strategies in English between Preachers and Legitimate discourse using the DCT as the data gathering instrument, it is recommended that in carrying out any further research in comparing the speech act of complimenting between the two groups, other research methods should be explored. DCT method predetermined many aspects of speech acts including the demographics of the interlocutors, the object of compliment, and the occasion of compliment. Using DCT enables the researcher to determine in advance who compliments whom, where and when. It is assumed that data from oral role-play or natural setting might yield different insights. For Yuan (2001), field note data can help the researcher identify when and where a speech act is likely to occur, by whom, and in what social contexts, whereas natural speech, if recorded properly, can provide the most accurate picture of everyday conversations. It is also worth exploring to determine how the two groups compliment and respond to compliments in conversations between interlocutors of unequal status. Using the same groups, it would also be interesting to compare the compliments they produce in both written and oral discourses.

Additional studies have to be done to explore and validate emerging compliment types and to account for the combined compliment responses since 19 combinations were seen in the study accounting for a total of 53 occurrences. It is hoped that future studies can further explain the occurrence why they occurred and more about the particular context in which they are used. The study is an exploratory attempt to compare the pragmatics of compliments and CRs of Al-Dahreya English as used by Preachers and Legitimate discourse participants. Since only 50 participants were considered in the study and that they are tertiary English majors, results in this study should be interpreted with caution. To validate the findings in the study and to gain a full picture of compliment speech events in Al-Dahreya

English specifically in the case of Preachers and Legitimate discourse groups.

It is widely acknowledged that teaching and learning languages involves far more than targeting surface grammatical or lexical systems. In designing curriculum and textbooks for English learners, culture should also be given emphasis. Syllabus designers should consider learner's needs (Tan, Polong Collantes & Torres, 2020) considering the understanding and production of speech acts they are likely to come across. As Grossi (2009 as cited in Razi, 2013) suggests presenting naturally occurring oral examples of compliments and CRs by speakers of different ages, and types of relationships collected in different settings such as the workplace and home can be helpful.

References

- Agoncillo, T. A. (1990). *History of the Filipino People*. Garotech Publishing, Quezon City.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to do Things With Words in a Study Abroad Context*. John Benjamins.
- Cedar, P. & Setiadi, A. (2016). Performance of Indonesian EFL learners and Thai EFL learners in compliment responses in English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(7), 63-76.
- Dirgeyasa, I. W. (2015). *The compliments: Its concepts, functions, common topics, and typical responses in communication*. Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas, Negeri, Padang.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, N.Y: [L SEP] Doubleday.
- Heidari, M.A., Rezazadeh, M., & Rasekh, A.E. (2009). A contrastive study of compliment responses among male and female Iranian teenage EFL learners. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 29, 18-31.
- Herbert, R. (1997). The sociology of compliment work in Polish and English. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 487-500). London: Macmillan.
- Holmes, J. (1993). New Zealand women are good to talk to: An analysis of politeness strategies [L SEP] in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20(2), 91-116.
- Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: A sex preferential politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 445-465.
- Holmes, J. (1986). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological Linguistics*. 28(4), 485-508.
- Jucker, A. H. (2009). Speech act research between armchair, field and laboratory: The case of compliments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1611-1635.
- Kecskes, I. (2004). *Editorial: Lexical merging, conceptual blending, and cultural crossing*. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, De Gruyter 1: 1-26.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Mojica, L.A. (2002). Compliment-Giving among Filipino college students: An exploratory study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 3(1), 115-124.
- Morales, R.C. (2012). Compliment responses across gender in Philippine context. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 18 (1), 47-60.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2012). L2 English compliment responses: an investigation of pragmatic transfer. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(6), 276-288. Retrieved

March 11, 2017 from
[https://www.academia.edu/4595083/](https://www.academia.edu/4595083/Complimenti)
 Complimenti 1

Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses. In J. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversation interaction*. New York Academic Press, pp. 79-112.

Razi, N. (2013). A contrastive study of compliment responses among Australian English and Iranian Persian speakers. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 61-66.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: [SEP] Cambridge University Press.

Torres, J.M., Collantes, L.M., Astrero, E.T., Millan, A.R., & Gabriel, C.M. (2020). Pandemic humor: Inventory of the humor scripts produced during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 7(3.1), 138-164.

Torres, J.M. & Medriano, R. (2020). Rhetorical Organization of Ilocano and Tagalog Pre-service teachers in their argumentative essays. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 27(2.2.), 261-286.

Yu, M. (2003). On the universality of face: evidence from Chinese compliment response behavior. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1679-1710.

Yuan, Y. (2002). Compliments and compliment responses in Kunming Chinese. *International Pragmatics Association*, 12(2), 183-226.