

praised often enough in certain expected contexts. As a result they either complimented themselves or fished for compliments from their partners.

Table 2: Level of Speaker Initiation

	Untutored		Tutored	
	N	%	N	%
Spontaneous	9	(15.3)	80	(52.6)
Task-related	37	(62.7)	69	(45.4)
Addressee-induced	13	(22.1)	3	(2.0)

Chi square = 39.170* p < .001, df=2

3. Level of appropriateness

No significant differences were found in the level of appropriateness of compliments. As Table 3 shows most utterances produced by both groups of speakers were norm-appropriate. This finding indicates that speakers in both groups were mindful of the social and cultural rules that govern choice of topic, level of intimacy, and appropriate encoding.

Table 3: Level of Appropriateness

	Untutored		Tutored	
	N	%	N	%
Native norm appropriate	43	(93.5)	143	(95.4)
Troublesome	3	(6.5)	6	(4.0)
Non-normative	0	(0)	1	(0.6)

4. Linguistic well-formedness

This measure of performance also revealed no significant differences, as shown by Table 4. The vast majority of utterances for both groups of learners were native-like or contained minor errors in syntax, lexis or phonology which were not serious enough to interfere with comprehensibility. This finding is not too surprising considering that relatively little linguistic sophistication is required in order to give a well-formed compliment. In fact one or two words, not even a complete sentence, are all that is really necessary. This finding has important pedagogical implications in view of the

many commercially produced materials which endlessly drill the forms of these social routines.

Table 4: Linguistic Well-formedness

	Untutored		Tutored	
	N	%	N	%
Native-like/Acceptable	44	(88)	147	(98)
Troublesome	2	(4)	2	(1.3)
Unintelligible/Failed Attempt	4	(8)	1	(0.7)

5. Adjectival repertoire

On this measure of performance there are differences between the two groups. Learners in the tutored group used a more extensive repertoire of semantically positive adjectives than learners in the untutored group. In total numbers only 7 different adjectives were represented in compliments given by the untutored group, whereas learners in the tutored group overall produced a total of 24 different semantically positive adjectives. In terms of mean scores, individuals who received instruction in intensifier-adjective and adjective-noun collocations on average used twice as many different adjectives as did learners who had not received this instruction. Table 5 reports these findings which were significant at the .05 level.

Table 5: Adjectival Repertoire

Number of Different Semantically Positive Adjectives

Untutored	7				
Tutored	24				
	N	Mean	Min	Max	SD
Untutored	9	2.56	1	5	1.33
Tutored	9	5.44	2	13	3.64

t = 2.23* p < .05, df = 16

Replies to Compliments

1. Reply type and its effect on the interaction

Before reporting these findings it would be useful to give some background on the meaning of this category. Previous studies on compliment responses have shown that speakers of American and New Zealand English prefer replies which deflect or

evade praise over replies which express agreement or appreciation (see Billmyer, 1990 for a review of this research). The least preferred type of reply is that which rejects or denies the compliment (Herbert, 1986). Deflect-type replies include commenting or giving some history on the complimented item ("I got it at Wanamakers"), shifting credit to another ("My mother gave it to me"), downgrading the complimented item ("It was on sale"), returning the compliment ("Yours is nice too"), or requesting reassurance ("Do you really think so?"). According to Pomerantz (1978), these responses are preferred by speakers of American English because they allow the recipient of a compliment to reconcile two conflicting conversational maxims which require her first to agree with the speaker and at the same time to avoid self praise. It has also been demonstrated (as seen in an earlier example in this paper) that replies of this type quite often lead into an elaborated sequence of exchanges whereby commentary on the complimented item provides new topics for conversation and further opportunities to interact. It is just this type of strategy that learners of second languages might find useful in their attempts to interact more successfully with native speakers and learn more about their second language.

Based on evidence about the rules for replying to compliments among speakers of Japanese, it has been suggested that this type of reply is not necessarily preferred (Daikuhara, 1986). In fact rules regarding deference and politeness often require the recipient of a compliment to avoid self-praise, leading in many instances to denial or rejection. Therefore, one of the goals of instruction in complimenting was to raise the learners' awareness of these differences and at the same time increase their repertoire of deflect response types which are preferred by speakers of American English.

Table 6: Reply Types

Reply Type	Untutored		Tutored	
	N	%	N	%
Accept (Thanks, agree)	27	(43.6)	18	(25.7)
Deflect (Comment, shift credit, return, downgrade, question)	10	(16.1)	47	(67.2)
Reject (Deny, ignore, disagree)	25	(40.3)	5	(7.1)

Chi square = 38.809* p < .05, df = 2

Table 6 compares the raw numbers and percentages of reply types for learners in both groups. Response types for learners in the untutored group were predominantly acceptance or rejection replies. In essence these learners relied on simple expressions of appreciation and agreement ("thank you" "yes") -- or denial ("no" "that's not true") -- or they ignored the compliment altogether by means of silence, laughter, or by shifting to a new topic. By contrast, learners in the tutored group responded to 67% of the compliments with replies in the deflect category. These learners exhibited skill in using a variety of deflect strategies. Furthermore, their responses were longer and more closely approximated the length of the native speakers' replies. Both the type of reply and its length appeared to have a salutary effect on sustaining interaction and sharing the conversational burden. An example from both groups shows this contrast more dramatically:

Untutored:

NS: Oh this is a really nice picture
 NNS: Thank you
 NS: I like it. I like it.
 NNS: (silence)
 NS: That's nice.
 NNS: (silence)
 NS: So you keep these in your room?
 NNS: Yes.

Tutored:

(Re: the NNS's beach bag)
 NS: I see them sell these at I like them
 NNS: Really? It's made in Korea, and it I think it's useful and it lasts a long time and during summertime I think I can use this for several summertime at least for 5 years or something.
 NS: yeah
 NNS: so I think it's a good choice
 NS: It would be fun to go to the beach with that
 NNS: yeah

NS: I like the colors

NNS: Uh huh yeah there's various colors and hard to find just this one.

NS: It's a beautiful bag. I love the colors. I see them selling //it

NNS: //yeah//

NS: //on 40th street and they have such beautiful colors on the bag and they're handmade too which is great. I love how they I wish I knew how to do more weaving and knitting and things like that.

NNS: Oh yeah you do knitting?

Summary and Conclusion

On five out of seven measures of performance, subjects in the tutored group exhibited behavior more closely approximating native speaker norms in complimenting than did subjects in the untutored group. These findings lend considerable support to the hypothesis that formal instruction concerning the social rules of language use given in the classroom can assist learners in communicating more appropriately with native speakers of the target language in meaningful social interaction outside of the classroom.

References

- Barnlund, D. and Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 16 (1): 9-26.
- Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T. and Uliss-Weltz, R. (1985). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, and S. Krashen (Eds.), On the Development of Communicative Competence in a Second Language. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). The Effect of Formal Instruction on the Development of Sociolinguistic Competence: The Performance of Compliments. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness Phenomena. In E.N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction (pp.56-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics 1(1): 1-47.
- Carrell, P., and Konneker, B. (1981). Politeness: Comparing native and nonnative judgments. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, and J. Schacter (Eds.), On TESOL '79: The Learner in Focus (pp. 17-32). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Cohen, A.D., and Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociolinguistic competence: The case of apology. Language Learning 31(1): 113-134.
- Cohen, A.D., and Olshtain, E. (1988). The learning of complex speech act behavior. Paper presented at twenty second annual TESOL Convention, Chicago, Illinois.
- Daikuhara, M. (1986). A study of compliments from a cross-cultural perspective: Japanese v. American English. Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 2(2):103-134.
- Di Pietro, R. (1987). Strategic Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenstein, M, and Bodman, J. W. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English. Applied Linguistics 7(2):167-185.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). Discourse Strategies: Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning (pp. 34-70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Herbert, R.K. (1986). Say 'thank you' - or something. American Speech 61(1) :76-88.
- Herbert, R. K. (1987). Form, frequency, and function in speech acts: Analyzing compliment structures. Paper presented at Conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation, October, 1987.
- Herbert, R. K. (in press). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. To appear in Language in Society.
- Herbert, R.K., and Straight, H. S. (1989). Compliment-rejection versus compliment-avoidance: Listener-based versus speaker-based pragmatic strategies. Language and Communication 9:35-47.
- Holmes, J. (1988a.) Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand. Anthropological Linguistics 28(4):485-508.
- Holmes, J. (1988b). Paying compliments: A sex-preferential positive politeness strategy. Journal of Pragmatics 12:445-465.
- Holmes, J. and D.F. Brown. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. TESOL Quarterly 21(3):523-546.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On Communicative Competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Knapp, M.L., Hopper, R. and Bell, R. A. (1984). Compliments: A descriptive taxonomy. Journal of Communication 34(4):12-31.
- Krashen, S. (1981). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition 379:259-278. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Science.
- Manes, J. (1983). Compliments: A mirror of cultural values. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.) Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition (pp. 96-102). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Manes, J., and Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine (pp. 115-132). The Hague: Mouton.
- Paulston, C. B. (1974). Developing communicative competence: Goals, procedures and techniques. Paper presented at the Lackland Air Force Base Defense Language Institute.

- Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. Applied Linguistics 8(1):3-21.
- Pica, T., Doughty, C. and Young, R. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? I.T.L. Review of Applied Linguistics 72:1-25.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction (pp. 79-112). New York: Academic Press.
- Rutherford, W. (1987). Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching. New York: Longman.
- Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. Yorio, et al. (Eds.), On TESOL '79: The Learner in Focus (pp. 275-287). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Takahashi, T., and Beebe, L. (1987). Development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. Journal of the Japan Association of Language Teachers 8(2).
- Taylor, B.P. and Wolfson, N. (1978). Breaking down the free conversation myth. TESOL Quarterly 12(1):31-39.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics 4(2):91-109.
- Thomas, J. (1984). Cross-cultural discourse as 'Unequal encounter': Towards a pragmatic analysis. Applied Linguistics 5(3):226-235.
- Wolfson, N. (1981a). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. TESOL Quarterly 15(2):117-124.
- Wolfson, N. (1981b). Invitations, compliments, and the competence of the native speaker. International Journal of Psycholinguistics 24(4):7-22.
- Wolfson, N. (1983a). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition (pp. 82-95). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Wolfson, N. (1983b). Rules of speaking. In J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and Communication (pp.61-87). London: Longman.
- Wolfson, N. (1984). Pretty is as pretty does: A speech act view of complimenting in American English. Applied Linguistics 5(3):236-244.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). The social dynamics of native and non-native variation in complimenting behavior. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), Variation in Second Language Acquisition: Empirical Views (pp. 219-236). New York: Plenum Press.

Wolfson, N. and Manes, J. (1980). The compliment as a social strategy. Papers in Linguistics 13(3):391-410.