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ABSTRACT. Responding to compliments is particularly of great importance for researchers because they require a great deal of pragmatic knowledge. Strategies used in responding to a compliment vary from culture to culture. In order to master a foreign language, to be fully competent in a foreign language it is helpful for students to learn the social values and rules of that society. Not knowing the sociolinguistic rules of the language being used may cause pragmatic failure. This in turn may cause communication breakdown. In the light of these assumptions comparative and contrastive studies of languages can serve to ease the task of comprehending both the linguistic and pragmatic features of a language and the differences between native and the foreign languages. The present study investigates compliment responses (CR) among Russian and Turkish speakers. The data were collected through the use of written Discourse Completion Tasks (DTC), with 12 questions on 4 topics (appearance, ability, possession and personality). Total 30 university students participated in the study.
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INTRODUCTION. Compliments are speech acts used to increase or consolidate the solidarity between the speaker and addressee and reflect social value in the culture [1; 2; 3]. Compliment is a “complex sociolinguistic skill” [4]. Han stated that the “same speech act is very likely to be realized quite differently across different cultures” [5]. For example, Einstein and Bodman show how expressions of gratitude differ across cultures [6]. Yu, Fu and Yu Hou show how compliment response strategies differ from that of English [7]. All these studies provide evidence that not knowing the sociolinguistic rules of the language being used may cause pragmatic failure. This in turn may cause miscommunication or communication breakdown [5]. Pragmatic failure occurs when learners transfer first language sociolinguistic, pragmatic rules into second language. This transfer of rules can lead the speakers to be perceived as rude or inconsiderate. Han asserts that second language learners are expected to develop sociolinguistic competence as well [5]. That’s why; when learners make sociolinguistic errors the native speakers may not be as understanding as they are of linguistic errors [8]. Most of the scholars in the field of intercultural communication agree that in order to reduce miscommunication which might occur in instances of intercultural settings empirical studies which describe and compare the speech acts of various cultures are needed. Also, teaching communication according to the socio-cultural rules that govern speech acts in a given speech community is a valuable way to make students aware of what is valued within a culture and how this is communicated. Raising pragmatic awareness can foster ‘intercultural competence’ where speakers increase their understanding of the norms of language use in other cultures [9; 10; 11].

Definition of a Compliment

A number of definitions were made on compliment. According to Hobbs, “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” [12]. For Holmes “to be heard as a compliment an utterance must refer to something which is positively valued by the participants and attributed to the addressee” [1].

* This article was presented at The 1st Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics Conference, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, May. 2011.
Compliments are recognized as an important speech act in a socio-cultural context. As Holmes states the compliments are “positive speech acts which mainly serves ‘to oil social wheels paying attention to positive face wants and thus increasing or consolidating solidarity between the people” [1].

The scholars who studied the structure and content of compliments found out that the syntactic structure of the compliments were limited [13; 14; 15; 2]. For example, American compliments displayed a limited range of syntactic patterns like I like NP (Wow, I really like your hair), That’s a ADJ NP (That a neat jacket), and NP is ADJ (Your eyes are amazingly green). In the table below Manes and Wolfson listed the strategy types found in their study according to their frequency [12].

1. NP is/looks (really) ADJ. (e.g., “Your blouse is really nice.”) (50 %)
2. I (really) like/ love NP. (e.g., “I like your car.”) (16 %)
3. PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP. (e.g., “That’s a nice wall hanging.”) (14 %)
4. You V (a) (really) ADJ NP (e.g. “You did a Great job!”)
5. You NP (really) ADV (e.g. “You did your homework very well!”)
6. You have (a) (really) ADJ NP(e.g. “You have a beautiful house!”)
7. What (a) ADJ NP! (e.g. “What a pretty shirt!”)
8. Isn’t NP Good shot! (e.g. “Isn’t that ring pretty!”)

Table 1: Syntactic structure of compliment responses (15).

According to Wolfson, two-thirds of the English compliments use the adjectives ‘nice, good, pretty, beautiful and great’, and about 90% of them use the just two verbs "like and love" (p. 116)." Besides, Manes and Wolfson showed that the topics of the compliments mainly refer to appearance, possessions or the results of effort or the skill [13]. They suggested that the non-creativity in form and content of English compliments is related to their function in discourse [15]. They asserted that ‘compliments serve to negotiate solidarity with the addressee by making him or her ‘feel good’ [16; 17]. According to this functional interpretation it is not what they say that is important but rather what they want they mean to say, that is what do they do with compliments is important for example to maintain or re-establish the social relationship or to reinforce desired behavior etc. As Herbert states, the formulaic nature of compliments, offering a recognizable formuleae precisely, minimizes the possibility that they will be misinterpreted by the addressees [3].

Manes defines ‘compliment as «a speech act of course, reflects a variety of cultural norms and values and in so doing serves to express and maintain these values [2]. Compliments are of particular interest». CRs provide an invaluable but under-utilized insight into speakers’ reactions to external appraisals of their personal, and social, identity. In this sense, CRs, as Cs themselves, act as a “mirror of cultural values” [2].

Functions of compliments
Wolfson suggests `creating or maintaining solidarity between interlocutors` as a major function of compliment [14]. Holmes also agrees with this view and considers compliments as `positively affective speech acts directed to addressee which serve to increase or consolidate the solidarity between the speaker and addressee` [1].

Besides this primary function, compliments have other functions, too. Wolfson posits that they are used to reinforce desired behavior, for example in classroom settings. They are frequently used to soften criticism. In such situations, compliments may be followed by but, though, and a criticism. Compliments are often used to open a conversation. Also, it can be said that compliments serve as face threatening acts (FTA). For example, they may imply that the complimenter would like to possess something, whether an object or skill belonging to the addressee [1].

Topics of compliments
Wolfson and Manes found that compliments mainly refer to just two categories: ability and appearance [13]. Then other scholars like Holmes, Herbert elaborately investigated compliments and they indicated that compliments in their data fall into four broad categories like appearance, ability or good performance, possessions and some aspects of personality or character.
Compliment responses (CR)

Pomerantz was the first who studied compliment responses. She found responding to compliments complicated as there are two general conditions governing the act of responding to a compliment: agreeing with the speaker and avoiding self-praise [17]. These two conflict with each other and pose dilemmas for the speakers: how to accept compliments without seeing to praise oneself. As a result the speakers/ recipients of compliments have difficulties in responding to /receiving compliments. Although the prescriptive norms of American speech behavior state that the appropriate response to a compliment is to say “Thank you!” many of the speakers use praise downgrade and return in order to solve this conflict.


Table 2: Compliment response types (3).

Similar categorization was made by Holmes in 1988. Holmes believes that “a compliment does not only make a positive assertion, it attributes credit to the addressee in relation to that assertion. According to this assumption, she develops three categories of compliment responses.

Table 3: Compliment response types (1).
Purpose of the study. The aim of the study is to compare and contrast CRs in Russian and Turkish; to help students from different cultural background to understand each others better; to reduce the possibility of intercultural communication failure.

Research questions
1. What are the major compliment response strategies of Turkish students?
2. What are the major compliment response strategies of Russian students
3. Are there any similarities and differences between the CRs of two groups?

Methodology. This study investigates compliment responses (CRs) among Turkish and Russian speakers. The data were collected through the use of written Discourse Completion Task (DCT), with 12 questions on 4 topics (ability, appearance, personality and possession). Total 30 (15 Russian and 15 Turkish) university students participated in the study.

Participants. 15 Russian students of Translation and Communication Departments of Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University (Bishkek) and 15 Turkish students of English Language Teaching department of Fatih University (Istanbul) participated in this study. The gender distribution of the students in both groups is the same. Having equal numbers of male and female students in both groups helps to avoid any miscarriages and provides more accurate results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian participants</th>
<th>Turkish participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>Russian – 19–25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Participants.

Data collection instruments
A questionnaire consisting of 12 discourse completion tasks was used in the study and the questionnaire comprises of the four above-mentioned topics, having 3 questions per topic. It has been adapted from İstifçi [18] and questions related to personality have been added. Russian translation was checked by the linguists at Kyrgyz Turkish Manas University. A pilot study was applied to the 10 students at Fatih University and 10 students at Kyrgyz State Medical Academy.

In the questionnaire they were given situations in which they were asked to reply the compliments. For example,
1. Derslerinizin birinde bir sunum yaptınız. Sunumdan sonra sınıf arkadaşlarınızdan birisi yanınıza geldi, “Aferin, ne güzel sundun, iyi hazırlanmışsin,” dedi. Siz ne yanıt verirdiniz. (You gave a presentation in one of your classes. After the presentation, one of your classmates came to you and he said: ‘That was really excellent presentation, I enjoyed it very much. You were so well-prepared’. You would reply:___________________________)


ACCEPTING

1. Thanking  
Sağol, Teşekkür ederim; Спасибо! Спасибо огромное! (‘Thanks, thank you’)

2. Agreement  
Teşekkür ederim. Kendim de beğeniyorum  
(‘Thanks I myself like it, too’); lya oni mne очень подошли (‘Yeah, they suit to me’); Спасибо, все об этом говорят (‘Thanks, everybody tells me that’)

3. Comment upgrading/self praise  
Herhalde canım o kadar da para verdim.  
(‘Of course it is, I gave a lot of money for this’) lya mne все идет (‘You know, everything suits to me!’)

4. Return  
Спасибо, ты тоже хорошо выглядишь похорошела;  
Teşekkürler sende öylesin (‘Thanks, you too’)
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5. **Expressing Gladness**

Старался, очень рад что вам понравилось (I tried, I’m glad you like it), Sağolun hocam, çok sevindim beğenmeniz (‘Thank you teacher, I’m glad that you like it’)

6. **Joke**

Önceden çirkinmiydim? Ну ты и сказал! Хочешь сказать что раньше плохо выглядела. (‘Do you mean that before I looked/was awful’)

**DEFLECTING**

7. **Expressing a good wish**

Daha güzeli sizin olsun! (‘May you have much nicer one’)

8. **Offer/Suggestion**

Могу подсказать где продается. (‘I can show you the place where to buy’) Спасибо, тебе нравятся? Sıçrın demek? (Thanks, if you like it I give it to you?)

9. **Explanation/comment on history**

Çестра подарила (‘my sister gave it to me’), Çok uğraştım (‘I’ve worked hard for it’), Oy mne ego podarili a tak w çasi ne noșu (‘It’s a gift. Actually I do not wear a watch’)

10. **Questioning**

Öyle mi? Teşekkürler (‘Really?Thanks’) Вы серьезно? (Are you serious?)

11. **Shifting credit**

Sağolun hocam. Sayenizde (‘Thanks, teacher. Thanks to you’).

**REJECTING**

12. **Challenge sincerity**

Неужели? ‘Really’

13. **Down grading**

minimizes the compliment Ne demek; (‘It’s all right’)

14. **Disagreement**

Bence değil, (‘I don’t think so, No it’s old. I hate’)

**IGNORING**

15. **Answer**

Afiet olsun! (‘Enjoy your meal’) Rica ederim! (‘You are welcome’)

16. **Silence**

complimentees opt out

17. **Interpretation**

they do not accept the compliment as a compliment they just interpret the statement like: Çalışma yana ekmek yok; (‘No pain. No gain’) İnsan yedisinde neyse yetmişinde de odur. (‘Child is father of the man’)

**OTHER STRATEGIES**

18. **Combination**

“Beğendiğin için teşekkür ederim, senin saçın da güzel” (I’m glad that you like it. Your hair is also beautiful!);

---

Table 5: Compliment response types found in this study.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Results were analyzed according to major strategies, sub strategies, and according to the topics in order to obtain a more detailed and clear picture of strategy preferences. 

**Results according to major strategies**

Figure 1 shows the results obtained from the questionnaire according to the use of major categories. In this figure it is seen that students in both groups mostly preferred Accepting strategies. Deflecting strategies are in the second place in terms of preference. The less used category in both groups appears to be Ignoring. The use of Accepting strategies seems to be almost the same in both groups. Russian group students used Deflecting and Rejecting strategies more than Turkish group students. Among Deflecting strategies, as you will see in the Figure 2 below, the most used ones are Offer/Suggestion, Shift Credit, and Explanation, which, at the same time, were preferred by Russian students more than Turkish students. In Turkish group more than half of the
students just accepted or agreed with the compliments, while Russian students seem to be more modest using more deflecting and rejecting strategies. More than a quarter of them chose deflecting strategies and one-sixth rejected the compliments. Among Turkish students one-fifth of them evaded the compliments and about one-tenth of them expressed disagreement. Except these strategies some other strategies like combinations (Expressing Gladness + Return: “Beğendiğin için teşekkür ederim, senin saçın da güzel” (I'm glad (thankful) that you like it, your’s (your hair) is beautiful, too), Offer + Expressing Gladness: “Sana da bir gün yaparım, beğendiğine sevindim” (I will cook for you too. I'm glad that you like it’) and though very rarely, laugh and silence (in the questionnaire students mentioned that they would opt out in a given situation by using silence and laugh) were used.

Results according to sub strategies

Subcategories were not used at equal frequency. When we look through the strategies used by the subjects in each major group only some of the sub strategies were preferred mostly. For example, in the major strategy group Accepting Thanking, Comment upgrading and Return seem to be mostly chosen ones. Typically responses included the responses like “Sağol”, “Teşekkür ederim”, “Спасибо” (‘Thanks’).

When we compare the sub strategy choices of the participants (Figure 2) we can notice a striking difference between two groups in the use of self-praise and returning. While Turkish students seem to be more straightforward accepting the compliments (E.g. “Sağol”, “Teşekkür ederim”, “Sağol, teşekkürler”, and “Eyvallah”, “Eyvallah, sağol” (‘Thank you’)) and more self-confident using upgrading strategy (E.g. “Her zamanı halım” This is my usual self”, “Evet
"öyleyim" ('Yes, I am'), “Biz yaptık mı böyle yaparız” ('If we do something, we do it perfectly'), “Güzele ne yakışmaz” ('Every thing would suit the beautiful'), “Tercüme konuşuyor, sağolun” ('This is the job of my experience'), “O kadar/ çok para verdim, olur o kadar” ('Sure. I gave a lot of money for this'), “Biliyorum”, “Bu dağınık hali” ('It has never been this messy')). Russian students used this strategy less frequently and they seem to be more modest. Russian students mostly responded to the compliments with similar compliments like “Спасибо, ты тоже хорошо выглядишь” ('Thanks, you too'), “Ой спасибо, у тебя тоже хороший вкус” ('Thank you. You also have a good taste in fashion'), “Спасибо, ты тоже не изменился” ('Thanks, you too haven’t changed') while Turkish students do not use returning strategy that much. Furthermore there is a difference between two groups in the use of Joking. In this respect Turkish students seem to be more sincere with their superiors (instructors) and elders (aunts, olds) as you will see in the following examples:

**Situation 7:** You gave an assignment in one of your courses. After two days, your lecturer said: “That was good. Not only the theory well presented but also the examples were good” You would reply: 
Student 1: **Teşekkür ederim. Bir de bunu notlara yanıstız.** (Thanks. I would be glad if you reflect it on the grade/I would like to see it as a grade)
Student 2: **Peki kaç verdiniz.** (Ok, how many points you gave to it?)

Similarly in the second major strategy group **Deflecting** the most common strategies are *Offer and Shift credit and Explanation*. A significant number of students of both groups preferred *Offering* in their responses. Only few people in both groups *expressed gladness* as a reply to the compliments. Russian students were eager to add explanations as “Конечно это было не легко, пришлось потрать, но все равно спасибо” ('It was difficult to do, anyway thanks.'), “Спасибо. Тяжело было их найти.” ('Thanks. It was difficult for me to find them'), “Надо меняться” ('Time to changes') while Turkish students used this strategy lesser. Another distinction comes out in the use of the sub strategy *Question.* While some Turkish students used questions as a response to the compliments “Ой спасибо! Присоединяйся!” ('Thanks. Join us!)”

*Rusian students often shifted credit using reassigning phrases like:* Жене спасибо! (Thanks to my wife!), Как обучили так и сделал (I did as I was taught), Папе спасибо! (Thanks to my Dad!); **“Teşekkür ederim, o sizin güzelliğiniz”**
Among Rejecting strategies the most used strategy is Downgrading. In Russian students used more diverse strategies than Turkish students. Russian students, though only one percent of them, used Challenge sincerity strategy when responding to the compliments: “Неужели” (‘Really?’). Turkish students did not use this strategy.

Answer and Interpretation are the most preferred ignoring strategies. It should be mentioned that Answers in both groups mainly comprise of formulaic expressions like “Rica ederim”, “Всегда пожалуйста!” (You’re welcome, Not at all), “Афиет оlsun” (‘Enjoy your meal!’), “На здоровье” (‘My pleasure!’). Turkish is rich of such conversational routines used as an answer, as a response for specific situations. Therefore considering them as Answer strategies deemed suitable.

Most of the combinations are composed of Expressing Gladness and Return with combination of other strategies: “Beğendiğin için teşekkür ederim, senin saçın da güzel” (‘I’m glad (thankful) that you like it, your’s (your hair) is beautiful, too’); Sometimes triple responses were used like Thanking+Expressing Gladness+ Return - “Спасибо родная! Я очень рада! Ты тоже не отстаешь!” (‘Thank you darling. I’m glad that you like it. You also don’t lag behind!), Question+ Thanking+Explanation - “Да? Спасибо. Вот решила поменять стиль” (‘Really? Thanks, I just wanted to change the style’). But, these also were considered as combinations since Thanking here seems likely to be used as a matter of courtesy. The purport here is conveyed by the other two strategies. Examples of Offer+ Expressing Gladness and Upgrading+ Offer combinationa are “Sana da bir gün yaparım, beğendigine sevindim” (‘I’ll cook it for you too. I’m glad that you like it’), “Знаю, хочеш научу” (‘I know. If you want I’ll teach you’). Another combination is Downgrading combined with Return combinations “Да обычная футболка. На тебе не хуже” (‘Just a casual T-shirt. Your’s isn’t worse.’) The most interesting combination used by a Turkish student is Downgrading +Upgrading “Sağol senin kadar olmasam da yine de iyiyim” (‘Although I’m not as good as you, but still I am good’).

As you noticed most of the combinations are comprised of Expressing Gladness and Return. Expressing Gladness can be considered as a phatic expression used to be polite towards the complimenter.

Topics are one of the factors that affect the choice of CRs. As it is shown in the Figure 3 there are many striking differences in strategy use of two groups. Turkish students seem to be modest in terms of Ability and Possession using more deflecting and rejecting strategies in their answers related to those topics. But the same cannot be said to Russians in terms of Appearance and Personality. While 26, 6 % of Turkish students prefer to disagree with the compliment related to their personality (and tried to be modest) Russian students seemed to use diverse strategies and half of them preferred to accept the compliments straightly. Majority of Russian students (30 %) disagreed with the compliments related to their personality tried to be modest. Moreover some students (8.8 %) ignore those compliments related to Personality and Ability. Turkish students showed difference in responding to the compliments of Appearance: they used more straightforward approach and accepted the compliments. They did not reject any compliment on Appearance. Also, they preferred Accepting strategy more than Russian student on the topic of Possession and Ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Possession</th>
<th>Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accepting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deflecting</strong></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rejecting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: Strategies used by participants according to topics.

CONCLUSION

As it was discussed above there are many differences in replying to compliments between Russian and Turkish students. There were some similarities in terms of using major strategies. Both of them used accepting and deflecting strategies more frequently than disagreeing and ignoring. But in terms of downgrading and self-praise there were big differences. This may change according to the topics of compliment as it is shown above. Overall results show that Turkish students seem to be more straightforward and they tend to self-praise whereas Russian students prefer more deflecting strategies in order to be more modest and courteous. Especially in terms of possession they showed striking difference using accepting almost two times less (R – 37,4%; T – 63,8%) and more deflecting strategies (R – 33%; T – 24%).

This paper would be of higher value in terms of generalization if it favored a bigger population. However, comparative studies as the present study are considered of great value in terms of determining whether there is pragmatic transfer of the learners while they learn a foreign language. Whereas positive pragmatic transfers are welcomed, negative pragmatic transfers are likely confusing the learners even sometimes making them sound abrupt, impolite, or too modest in the target language.
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Аннотация. Изучение ответов на комплимент особенно важно для исследователей, так как им требуется большой объем практических знаний. Стратегии, используемые в ответах на комплименты различных для различных культур. Чтобы владеть иностранным языком, быть полноценно компетентным в иностранном языке, студентам полезно изучать социальные ценности и правила этого общества. Незнание социолингвистических правил используемого языка может стать причиной провала. Что, в свою очередь, может привести к коммуникационному кризису. В свете этих предположений сравнительное и сопоставительное изучение языков может облегчить понимание как лингвистических, так и практических особенностей языка и разницу между родным и иностранным языками. В данной работе изучаются ответы на комплимент среди говорящих на русском и турецком языках. Данные были получены с помощью использования письменных заданий окончания дискурса, включающих 12 вопросов по 4 тематикам (внешний вид, умения, принадлежность и личность). Всего 30 студентов университета приняли участие в исследовании.

Ключевые слова: комплименты; ответы на комплименты; преподавание языка; межкультурная коммуникация; прагматика.