Compliments And Compliment Responses In Philippine English

Zhang, Jin-pei
zhangjinpei@gmail.com
School of Foreign Languages,
Shenzhen Institute of Information Technology, China

ABSTRACT

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. One line of academic research on compliments is to investigate similarities and differences across varieties of English (Jucker, 2009). So far, many varieties of English, such as American English, New Zealand English, and African English have been explored and it was found that compliments are formulaic in terms of both the meaning and the syntactic forms (e.g. Manes & Wolfson, 1981; Holmes, 1986; Herbert & Straight, 1989). However, only few studies have been done on Philippine English. This paper aims to fill the gap. A Discourse Completion Test (Henceforth DCT) was used to elicit data of giving and receiving compliments from 30 college students in a Philippine University. An analysis is provided of the compliment strategies, the syntactic and lexical patterns characterizing compliments, and the compliment response strategies. It was found that Philippine English speakers tend to use explicit compliments plus a bound semantic formula most frequently. The compliments in Philippine English are as formulaic at syntactic and lexical levels as other varieties of English. Filipinos are more likely to accept the compliment, rather than reject it, when they receive one.

Keywords: compliments; compliment responses; discourse completion test; varieties of English; Philippine English

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

English has become a global language and the non-native speakers of English have outnumbered that of native speakers (Lee, Lee, Wong, & Azizah Yaacob, 2010). English is not only used among native speakers or between native speakers and non-native speakers, it is also used between non-native speakers and other non-native speakers. This phenomenon captured the attention of more and more linguists(e.g., B. Kachru, 1985; Crystal, 2005), many of whom are shifting their research focus to other varieties of English, i.e., varieties in the Outer Circle and Expanding Circle, than the native varieties in the Inner Circle (e.g., Herbert & Straight, 1989; Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Bautista & Bolton, 2008).

The Philippines boasts the third largest English-speaking country in the world and the distinct features of Philippine English in terms of phonology, word choice, syntactic construction, discourse patterns have attracted the attention of many linguists both at

home and abroad and it is one of the most well explored varieties in the Outer Circle (Bautista, 2004).

Complimenting is one of the most important discursive strategies interlocutors use to negotiate interpersonal meaning and to build and sustain rapport and solidarity among the interactants. Compliments are said to "grease the social wheels" and thus to serve as "social lubricants"(Wolfson, 1983, p.89). However, despite its significance, few studies have been done to examine how Filipinos give and take compliments in English. Extant literature in the Philippine context mainly focused on Filipino speech acts, rather than English. For example, Bautista (1979) used the scripts of Filipino radio dramas as data to examine compliment response strategies in the Filipino speech community. Likewise, Mojica (2002), investigated how college students gave compliments using Filipino language. So far, few studies have been carried out on the speech act of compliments in Philippine English. This paper aims to look into compliment strategies, the syntactic and lexical features of compliments and compliment response strategies in Philippine English.

LITERATURE REVIEW

COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT RESPONSES

Jucker (2009) classified compliments into personal compliments, ceremonious compliments, season compliments and free gift compliments. It is personal compliment that has aroused great interest in many fields of linguistic studies such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis. According to Holmes (1986), a compliment is "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"(p. 485).

Searle (1969) pointed out that for a speech act to be felicitous it must satisfy a certain set of felicity conditions, composed of propositional act, preparatory condition, sincerity condition and essential condition. The felicity conditions of compliment were laid out by Thomas (1995):

Felicity Conditions of Compliment
Propositional act: some event, act, etc., E related to H.
Preparatory condition: E is in H's interest and S believes E is in H's interest.
Sincerity condition: S is pleased at E.
Essential condition: Counts as a commendation of E or tribute to H.
(A: act; H: hearer; E: event; S: speaker)   (p. 98)

It would be inadequate to study compliments independently without taking the other half of the adjacency pair, i.e., compliment responses into account. Compliment response, is defined by Yuan (2002) as anything that follows a compliment, verbal or non-verbal. Herbert (1990) argued that "The actual sociology of compliment work cannot be understood without considering simultaneously the whole of the compliment event" (p.202).

The speech act of compliment response is similar to that of thanking. Based on the felicity conditions of "thanking" which was provided in Huang (2007, p.319), the felicity conditions of compliment response are as follows:

Felicity Conditions of Compliment Response
Propositional act: past act, A done by H.
Preparatory condition: A is in S's interest and S believes A is in S's interest.
Sincerity condition: S feels appreciative for A.
Essential condition: the utterance of *e* counts as an appreciation to H.
(A: act; H: hearer; *e*: linguistic expression; S: speaker)

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Compliment has been investigated from different perspectives: nature of compliment, syntactic and semantic patterns of compliment, demographic distribution of compliment (such as gender and status), object of compliment and compliment responses, with different research methods, inter-lingually (such as Chinese vs. English), intra-lingually (such as diachronic development), or across varieties of the same language (such as varieties of Englishes). Since this paper will restrict its scope to patterns of compliments and compliment responses, only related studies will be reviewed here (for an overview of compliments, see Jucker, 2009; Golato, 2005).

REALIZATION PATTERNS

Manes and Wolfson (1981) collected 686 compliments using an ethnographic method. The researchers wrote down on a notebook the compliments that they encountered in daily life and they also sought the help of research assistants to collect data. They found that in American English, compliment as a speech act is highly formulaic on the syntactic and semantic levels in that three patterns are sufficient to account for 85% of the syntactic structure of the whole data and that two thirds of all the adjectival compliments make use of only five adjectives.

Holmes (1986) replicated Manes and Wolfson's (1981) study and a corpus of 517 compliments in New Zealand English was collected using an ethnographic method The number of syntactic patterns which occur regularly is high. The formulaic features of compliment were corroborated in this variety of English. The three most frequent syntactic patterns reported by Manes and Wolfson account for 70% of Holmes' New Zealand data. Six adjectives were used with high frequency and accounted for about two thirds of all the adjectives used. However, Holmes also noted the occurrence of the distinctively New Zealand syntactic variants.

Mojica (2002) collected 270 compliments ethnographically with the help of some student assistants. Her research agenda is to examine how Philippine college students gave and respond to compliments using Filipino language. Mojica found that Filipino compliments were formulaic in nature in that a limited set of syntactic patterns and some positively-valued adjectives were frequently employed to give compliments.

Rose (2001) built a corpus of compliments and compliment responses from 40 American feature films and compared with the research results reported by Manes and Wolfson (1981). He finds that the film data corresponds fairly closely to the naturally-

occurring data from the pragmalinguistic perspective, though not so in terms of sociopragmatics. The overall distribution of syntactic patterns in compliments is very similar to the one reported by Manes and Wolfson. Rose's method is labeled by Jucker (2009) as the philological method, by which the researcher collects data from fictional material, such as short stories, novels and movies, and then takes note of all the compliments and compliment responses that can be found.

Laboratory methods such as DCT are used to research compliment strategies, patterns of compliments, and compliment responses. DCT, according to Yuan (2002), is a written questionnaire that contains a number of hypothetical scenarios or situations used to elicit a certain speech act. Participants are required to supply, in writing, what they would say in real life if similar situations happen to them.

DCTs are widely used as controlled elicitationtools to collect written discourse for discourse analysis. Yuan (2002) successfully collected large amount of data on compliments and compliment responses in Kunming Chinese using DCT. With DCTs, one can easily control the contextual variables that are significant for study. The controlled variables about a given context in production questionnaires make it possible to look into the effect of the variables.

Recently, Jucker, Schneider, Taavitsainen and Breustedt (2008) successfully retrieved 343 compliments from the BNC (British National Corpus) using a corpus method, in which the researcher makes use of computerized search techniques to retrieve data of compliments from electronic corpora. A comparison of compliment pattern frequency was made between the BNC data and those sampled by Manes and Wolfson (1981). However, Jucker (2009) warned that it might be difficult to identify any new patterns using this method.

COMPLIMENT RESPONSES

Pomerantz (1978) was the first researcher to draw attention to compliment response strategies. She identified a wide range of compliment response types. Pomerantz (1978) further argued that compliment response is constrained by two general conditions: agree with the speaker and avoid self-praise (p. 81-82). As a result, the compliment recipient is faced with a dilemma: on the one hand, the recipient of a compliment is expected to agree with the complimenter and thus accept the compliment. On the other hand, there is strong pressure on how the recipient can accept the compliment without seeming to praise oneself**.**

However, Pomerantz used a conversation analytical method in her study and did not report the frequency of each type of compliment response. Nonetheless, precise proportion of each type of response is considered the prerequisite to understand how social factors are played out in the speech act of compliment. As Herbert (1989) pointed out, "distributional facts are essential to a satisfying treatment of CR behavior, i.e. a taxonomy of forms is merely the prerequisite to a sociolinguistic analysis"(p. 11).

Holmes (1986) used an ethnographic method to explore the compliment response strategies in New Zealand English and she developed a model to classify compliment response strategies on the basis of Pomerantz's pioneering work. The model includes three categories of strategies, namely, accept, reject and deflect/evade. Each can be further divided into sub-types of strategies. Accept is divided into appreciation or agreement token, agreeing utterance, downgrading or qualifying utterance and return

compliment; reject is divided into disagreeing utterance, question accuracy, and challenge complimenter's sincerity; deflect/evade is divided into shift credit, informative comment, ignore, legitimate evasion and request reassurance/repetition. On the basis of her findings, the most New Zealand common response to a compliment is to accept it (61.1%), with the next frequent response being to deflect/evade it (28.8%). New Zealand English speakers rarely reject a compliment (10%).

Building on Pomerantz's (1978) preliminary schema and on his own data of 1062 compliment responses, Herbert (1986), Herbert (1989), Herbert and Straight (1989) distinguished three broad categories of compliment responses in American English: agreement, non-agreement and other interpretations. Each category is divided into several subcategories. Agreement includes acceptance (further broken down into appreciation token, comment acceptance, and praise upgrade); comment history; and transfers (broken down into reassignment and return). Non-agreement includes scale down; question; non-acceptance (broken down into disagreement and qualification); and no acknowledgement. Other interpretations are also labeled as request. Agreement response types occurred most frequently in American English (65.9%), followed by Non-agreement (31.2%) and Other interpretations (2.9%).

As mentioned above, Yuan (2002) used DCT to elicit compliment response strategies in Kunming Chinese. Her categories of compliment responses include acceptance, explanation, return, appreciation, upgrade, reassignment, suggestion, invitation, confirmation question, downgrade, disagreement, and opt out.

Although there are many studies on compliment and compliment responses in other languages and varieties of English, research of compliment events in Philippine English is still few. Holmes (1986), Holmes and Brown (1987) noted that there is difference between New Zealand English and American English in compliments and compliment responses. They reported that New Zealand English speakers feel that Americans pay far too many compliments and assume that their compliments are not sincere. Herbert (1986), Herbert (1989), and Herbert and Straight (1989) highlighted the difference between American English and South African English in terms of frequency of compliments and the range of compliment response types. American English speakers tend to give more compliments and are also more likely to reject compliments frequently than South African speakers, whereas African English speakers give less compliments but accept most of the compliments that they receive. Of equal importance is that most previous studies focused mostly on the explicit compliments while the implicit compliments and other bound elements attached to a compliment are largely neglected.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions are as follow:
1. How do Philippine English speakers compliment?
2. What are the realization patterns of explicit compliments in Philippine English, if any?
3. How do Philippine English speakers respond to compliments?

METHODOLOGY

DATA COLLECTION METHOD

This study used Discourse Completion Test (Yuan, 2002) to gather data. DCT, as previously mentioned, is a written questionnaire that contains a number of hypothetical scenarios or situations. Participants are required to write in the space provided, what they would say in real life if similar situations happen to them. DCTs are widely used as controlled elicitation tools to collect written discourse for discourse analysis. Nonetheless, DCT, as a data elicitation method, also has its weakness. For example, the informants might be forced to play unfamiliar roles. Likewise, the participant takes only one turn in a DCT scenario while in real life more turns may be involved to complete a conversation. Jucker (2009) argued that research methods should be determined by research questions and no research method is superior or best in nature. Rose (2001) went even further when he pointed out that each research method is fraught with its own shortcomings. Ethnographic method has been proven to be a powerful tool in gathering natural data in previous studies (such as Manes & Wolfson, 1981; Holmes, 1986; Herbert, 1986). However, it would be very time-consuming to gather enough data using an ethnographic method for the current study, especially because of the limited domains of usage of English in the Philippines and the dominance of Filipino in daily conversations, and it is a challenging job to collect compliments in various contexts. Conversely, DCT seems to be a more appropriate data collection method in the Philippine context, considering the research questions.

The DCT questionnaire (Appendix 1) has two parts. **Part One** was designed to explore the possible compliment strategies used by Philippine English speakers. Positive characteristics of the complimentee such as appearance, possession and ability are common objects of compliment (Yuan, 2002). Eight topics or scenarios which aimed to reveal such characteristics were described to the participants, so they could have a clear picture of what the topic is and what the relationship between the speakers is. The participants were asked to play the role of the complimenters and give compliments.

TABLE 1. Topics of compliments in DCT questionnaire

Context	Topic	Object of compliment
1	Tina helped Ondoy victims	Kindness and generosity
2	David fixed your laptop	Ability
3	Friend listened to your problems	Kindness
4	Nina made good presentation	Ability
5	Friend bought a new cell phone	Possession
6	Friend wearing fashionable dress	Attire
7	Classmate got a new laptop	Possession
8	Neighbor is wearing a new T-shirt	Attire

Part Two aims at eliciting the possible compliment response strategies used by Philippine English speakers. Four scenarios, in which the informants are the recipients of compliments, were designed. The participants were asked to play the role of the complimentees and respond to compliments they receive.

TABLE 2. Topics of compliment responses in DCT questionnaire

Context	Topic	Object of compliment
1	You look good at a party	Appearance & Attire
2	You do favors for classmate	Kindness
3	You speak English well	Ability
4	You have a nice Ipad	Possession

PARTICIPANTS

Thirty-three college students in a Philippine university answered the DCT questionnaire. Since the theme of the study is compliment and compliment responses in Philippine English, three questionnaires answered by Korean informants were excluded in the analysis. Hence only the 30 Philippine English speakers are valid respondents. Out of the 30 participants, there are 20 male students and 10 female students with an average age of 17. The participants received much of their primary and secondary education in English. Besides, they have been taking English as a language course in formal setting for more than 10 years.

PROCEDURE

The written DCT was administered in class. The researcher reminded the informants the questionnaire is about compliment and compliment response before they answered the DCT. It took the participants about 20 minutes to complete the whole questionnaire, i.e., parts one and two of DCT.

CODING

In the present study, the coding system of compliments proposed by Yuan (2002) was adopted, since this is one of the first few papers that gave a full discussion of compliment strategies. As for the compliment response strategies, the models proposed by Yuan (2002), Holmes (1986) and Herbert (1986) were employed.

THE CODING SYSTEM OF COMPLIMENTS

I divided the informants' response to the situation into three types: Compliment, Non-compliment and Opt Out. 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 informants indicate that "I would not say anything" when a compliment is expected in that situation. According to Yuan (2002), semantic formulas for compliments 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. For example, in context 5 (a new cell phone), response from one informant is "How much did you buy this?" This response was not considered as valid compliment

response because "how much did you buy this" is more of a question seeking for an answer of price than a compliment. It must co-occur with a bound semantic formula to be interpreted as part of a compliment. Unbound semantic formulas can be further divided into two sub-types: explicit compliments and implicit compliments. Explicit compliments refer to compliments outside of context, being realized by a small set of conventional formulae (Herbert, 1997). In the current study, explicit compliments were defined as those responses that carry at least one positive semantic value. Implicit compliments are those in which the value judgment is presupposed and/or implicated by Gricean maxims (Herbert, 1997). Therefore, the positive value of an expression can be inferred from what is said in a particular situation. Bound semantic formulas include explanation, information question, future reference, contrast, advice and request.

TABLE 3. Coding system of compliment strategies

Unbound Semantic Formulas: Explicit Compliment and Implicit Compliment
Bound Semantic Formulas: Explanation, Information Question, Future Reference, Contrast, Advice, Request
Non-compliment
Opt out

Each type of compliment strategy is illustrated below with examples from the data, wherein C stands for complimenter:

Explicit Compliment
Context 5   C: That is a <u>cool</u> cell phone.
Context 6   C: <u>Nice</u> dress.
In the above examples, 'cool' and 'nice' werecoded as explicit compliment because the word 'cool' carries a positive value.

Implicit Compliment
Context 5   C: Your phone is so cool. <u>I wish that I could buy a phone like that</u>.
Context7   C: <u>I wish I had an aunt like yours</u>, hehe. Lucky you!
The underlined parts were coded as implicit compliment because the utterance implies that the informant likes the complimentee's cell phone.

Explanation
Context 1   C: <u>Tina, I saw you distribute and deliver relief goods for the victims at Ondoy. I also heard you donated 2000 pesos</u>. That's quite thoughtful and generous of you. (*smiles at Tina*)
The underlined part alone cannot be regarded as compliment. But it co-occurs with an explicit semantic formula. The function of the underlined part is to explain why the complimenter would make the subsequent compliments.

Information Question
Context 6   C: What a beautiful dress! <u>Where did your aunt buy it?</u>
Context 5   C: Nice cell phone! <u>Where did you buy it?</u>

In addition to the explicit semantic formula, the complimenter asks more information about the dress and the cell phone. The underlined part was coded as an information question.

Future Reference
 Context 2   C: Thank you very much David, you're a life saver. <u>You have a future in fixing laptops</u>.
Here the complimenter refers to complimentee's bright future because of his capabilities.

Contrast
Context 1   C: "wow"! I hope I could be like you. I'm sure your parents are <u>as generous as</u> you.
Here the complimenter seems to generalize the generosity to the parents of complimentee. "As generous as" indicates a comparison or contrast.

Advice
Context 5   C: That's a nice phone you got there. <u>Take care of it.</u>
Context 5   C: Is it the latest model? Cool. <u>Don't lose it</u>.
Besides giving a compliment, the complimenter also gives advice to the complimentee to take care of the cell phone.

Request
Context 4   C: Oh my God! That was so brilliant. You did very well. <u>Can you help me with my presentation too</u>? It would be really nice to have any presentation to be as good as this.
Context 7   C: Nice laptop you've got there. <u>Can I borrow it</u>?
In the above contexts, the complimenter is making some requests to the complimentee.

Non-Compliment
Context 3   C: Sorry, I am telling all these to you. But thanks very much!
This was coded as non-compliment because this is an expression of apology and thanks. No compliment can be inferred from the utterance.

Opt-Out
Context 1   C: I would not say anything
Here the informant chooses to opt out, i.e., not to give any compliment when he/she is expected to.

<div align="center">

THE CODING SYSTEM OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE

</div>

In the present study, the following coding system for compliment response was used: the first three responses are acceptances, while downgrade and disagreement are rejections, and the rest correspond to deflect/evade strategies in Holmes' (1986) model. Each of the response type was illustrated with examples from my data. CR here stands for compliment response.

Acceptance Token
Context 1   CR: <u>Thanks</u>! (Then, I knock 3 times on wood)
Context 1   CR: <u>Thanks a lot</u>.
Acceptance token refers to verbal or non-verbal signs that a compliment has been noticed and accepted.

Return
Context 1   CR: Thank you. <u>You look great too</u>!
Context 3   CR: <u>So do you</u>, hehe.
The complimentee is returning the compliments to the complimenter.

Upgrade
Context 4   CR: Thank you. <u>I know this is so cool</u>.
Context 1   CR: <u>It really makes me look high classy</u>, huh.
Complimentee accepts the compliment and thinks that the complimenter under-compliments him/her or the complimentary force is insufficient.

Explanation (Informative Comment, Comment History)
Context 4   CR: Thank you. <u>It really took me some time to pick the right design</u>. Do you want to borrow it?
Complimentee offers a comment on how he/she is able to pick the right design.

Reassignment (Shift Credit)
Context 4   CR: Thank you! <u>My parents gave it to me for my 17th birthday</u>.
Context 4   CR: <u>My aunt bought it from the United States</u>.
Here, the credit is transferred to his/her parents or another person.

Request Interpretation/Offer
Context 4   CR: Thank you, man. <u>You want to borrow it?</u>
Context 4   CR: <u>Wanna try</u>?
The complimentee interprets the compliment he/she receives as a request. So he/she offers to lend the complimenter his/her iPod.

Topic Shift
Context 3   CR: Really? I'm flattered, thank you! I have practiced hard to speak well. <u>How long will you stay here in the Philippines</u>?
The complimentee is not limited to the compliment response. He/she initiates a new topic.

Reassurance
Context 3   CR: <u>Really?</u> I didn't know that! Well, thanks anyway.
Context 1   CR: <u>Really?</u> Thanks a lot.
In the above two examples, the complimentee is asking confirmation from the complimenter that the compliment is directed to her/him.

Downgrade (Scale Down)

Context 4   CR: Thank you. It's not very new, but I still like it.
The complimentee disagrees with the complimentary force, pointing to some flaw in the object by saying it's now new.

Disagreement

Context 3   CR: You're too kind. I'm not that good in English.
Context 3   CR: I still have a lot to learn.
The complimentee does not agree with the compliments. He/she thinks his/her English is not good enough.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

COMPLIMENTS

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLIMENT STRATEGIES

As shown in Table 4, the most frequently used compliment strategy by Philippine English speakers is explicit semantic formula. It accounts for 62% of the 378 compliment tokens I elicited through DCT. Such findings corroborate Yuan's (2002) observation that people tend to make direct and positive statements when they pay compliments.

TABLE 4. Distribution of compliment strategies

Compliment Strategy	Raw Tokens	Percentage
Explicit	235	62.2%
Implicit	22	5.8%
Explanation	11	2.9%
Information Question	38	10.1%
Future Reference	8	2.1%
Contrast	2	0.5%
Advice	10	2.6%
Request	7	1.9%
Other	4	1.1%
Non-Compliment	36	9.5%
Opt-Out	5	1.3%
Total	378	100%

The second most frequently used strategies are information question and non-compliments, about 10% respectively. As mentioned earlier, information question is a bound semantic formula and should be attached to an explicit or implicit compliment. Questions such as "Where did you buy it?" indicate that the complimenter is interested in or curious about the object of compliment. However, such curiosity or interest, which is common in Philippine English, may sound strange in other varieties of English. The relatively high frequency of non-compliments, i.e., not paying compliments when the situation calls for them, may be due to the fact that the respondents were not able to distinguish expression of thanks from expression of compliments.

Opt-Out and Other strategies (including Joke, Contrast, Blame, Offer, 1 token each in my data) were the least frequently used strategies, accounting for 1% of the total tokens respectively.

SEMANTIC PATTERN OF COMPLIMENTS

On the basis of lexical items used to express positive evaluation, the compliments can be divided into two major categories: adjectival compliments and verbal compliments. Although there are a large number of adjectives that are semantically positive, complimenters tended to restrict their use to four commonly used adjectives, which account for nearly 70% of the adjectival compliments. Of the adjectives, the most commonly used are *nice* (30.8%) and *good* (22.2%). The word c*ool* has 10.1% occurrences and *generous* 4.5%. Some Philippine English speakers have the tendency to use noun phrases as vehicle of positive evaluation, such as 'life saver', 'high tech'.

SYNTACTIC PATTERN OF COMPLIMENTS

According to previous studies such as Manes and Wolfson (1981), the following syntactic formulas are the most commonly used patterns to pay compliments in American English.

TABLE 5. Syntactic patterns (Manes & Wolfson, 1981, pp. 120-121)

	Syntactic Pattern	**Examples**
1	NP is/looks (really) ADJ	Your hair looks nice.
2	I (really) like/love NP	I love your hair.
3	PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP	This was really a great meal.
4	You V (a) (really) ADJ NP	You did a good job.
5	You V (NP) (really) ADV	You really handled that situation well.
6	You have (a) (really) ADJ NP!	You have such beautiful hair!
7	What (a) ADJ NP!	What a lovely baby you have!
8	ADJ NP!	Nice game!
9	Isn't NP ADJ!	Isn't your ring beautiful!

Note: *Really* stands for any intensifier (*really, very, so, such,* etc.); *Look* stands for any linking verb other than *be, including look, seem, smell, feel,* etc.); *Like* and *love* stand for any verb of liking (*like, love, admire, enjoy,* etc.)*ADJ* stands for any semantically positive adjective.*NP* stands for a noun phrase which does not include a semantically positive adjective. *PRO* stands for *you, this, that, these,* or *those.*

Each pattern was illustrated with examples from the data:

TABLE 6. Distribution of syntactic patterns in Philippine English

	Syntactic Pattern	**Examples**	**PhE (n=235)**	**AmE (n=686)**
1	NP is/looks (really) ADJ	Your dress is really great.	48.5%	53.6%
2	I (really) like/love NP	I really like your phone.	6.4%	16.1%
3	PRO is (really) (a) ADJ NP	That's really a nice phone.	13.2%	14.9%
4	You V (a) (really) ADJ NP	You did a good job.	4.3%	3.3%

5	You V (NP) (really) ADV	You did very well.	0.9%	2.7%
6	You have (a) (really) ADJ NP!	You have a nice phone.	0.4%	2.4%
7	What (a) ADJ NP!	What a beautiful dress.	3.8%	1.6%
8	ADJ NP!	Really cool laptop.	14.9%	1.6%
9	Isn't NP ADJ!	Isn't it new!	0.4%	1.0%
10	Other	cool	7.2%	2.8%
	Total		**100%**	**100%**

As shown in Table 6, similar to American English speakers reported by Manes and Wolfson (1981), the most frequently used syntactic pattern by Philippine English speakers is Pattern 1, which accounts for nearly half of the total explicit semantic formulas. This seems to imply that these participants are quite familiar with the appropriate syntactic structures used in compliments. The obvious difference between Philippine English speaker and American English speaker lies in Pattern 2 and Pattern 8. American English speakers tended to express compliments using 'I (really) like/love NP'. In contrast, Philippine English speakers favored "ADJ NP" or "ADJ" pattern. It seems safe to infer from this difference that American English speakers depend on both semantically positive adjectives and verbs to express positive evaluation, whereas Philippine English speakers prefer compliments which make use of the adjectives to carry the positive semantic load. Such findings may also suggest that in terms of personal focus, first person tops the list in American English while third person focus or impersonal focus is prioritized in Philippine English.

COMPLIMENT RESPONSE

As shown in the following table, the most common stragegy used by Philippine English speakers to respond to compliments is 'acceptance token', which accounts for nearly half of raw tokens of compliment response. Return and explanation are the second and third most frequently used strategies by Philippine English speakers.Since strategies such as 'acceptance token', 'return', 'upgrade' are acceptances of some kind, the total percentage of acceptance of compliments in Philippine English is 60%. Downgrade and disagreement strategies account only for less than a quarter of compliment response strategies. Such findings did not lend support to Mojica's (2002) observation that Filipino college students used more non-acceptance and non-agreement strategies in response to compliments and that the Filipino students are more likely to be constrained by modesty maxim. However, the target language in Mojica's study is Filipino, the native language in the Philippines. It might be the case that the Philippine English learners were able to learn the rule of thumb in responding to compliments, that is, to accept it when receiving one.

TABLE 7. Distribution of compliment response strategies

	Compliment response strategies	Raw Tokens	Ph.E (n=211)
1	Acceptance token	89	42.2%
2	Return	33	15.6%
3	Upgrade	5	2.4%
4	Explanation	23	10.9%
5	Reassignment	8	3.8%
6	Offer/request interpretation	13	6.2%
7	Topic shift	5	2.4%

8	Reassurance	2	0.9%
9	Downgrade	22	10.4%
10	Disagreement	8	3.8%
11	Other	3	1.4%
	Total	**211**	**100%**

A comparison of the Philippine English data with the American data reported by Herbert (1986) is not included here. On the one hand, different models of compliment response strategies have been used to capture the subcategories of response types. On the other hand, different coding strategy has been used to code the "compound responses", such as:

Female 2: "Neat Scarf."
Female 1: "Isn't it funky? Kerin gave it to me."

(Herbert, 1986, p. 80)

Herbert (1986) reported that he coded such responses as one instance of 'reassignment' on the basis of what he called the 'perceived intention of speaker'. However, such proceeding was debunked by Chick (1996) since it increases subjectivity in coding responses (p.333). Accordingly, this paper adopts the policy of coding all the response types involved and Female 1's responses would be coded as one instance of 'appreciation token' (Isn't it funky?) and one instance of 'reassignment' (Kerin gave it to me.).

IMPLICATION AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, I used DCT methods to elicit data for compliments and compliment responses and gave a detailed analysis of the data collected. It was found that in Philippine English, the most commonly used compliment strategy is "explicit semantic formula", and the most frequently used compliment response strategy is to accept it. Also, I described the distribution of typical syntactic and semantic patterns used by Philippine English speakers to express explicit compliment. It is confirmed that Philippine English is highly formulaic at semantic and syntactic levels.

This study has several implications. It was pointed out early that the high frequency of non compliments among the participants can be attributed to the fact that they 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.

Many aspects of speech acts are predetermined in DCT methods, including the demographics of theinteractants, the object of compliment, and the occasion of compliment. In other words, the researcher specifies in advance who compliments whom, where and when (Jucker, 2009). As a result, DCT methods cannot provide any results on the demographics of theinteractants, such as age, gender and social status of complimenters and complimentees. Nor can it tell us anything about the occasion when compliments are actually used. If we are to gain a full picture of complimenting speech events in Philippine English, for instance, if we are interested to find out the common objects of compliment, other data collection should be used. Ethnographic method seems to fit the task best. Likewise, compliments and compliment responses in Philippine English elicited by DCT method can also be triangulated by a corpus method. International Corpus of English (ICE)-Philippines provides such an avenue.

This study is an exploratory attempt to chart the pragmatics of Philippine English. However, the results should be interpreted with caution since only 30 participants were investigated and I focused merely on the compliment giving and taking among the educated Philippine English speakers. Future studies should expand to participants of other age brackets and background of education.

REFERENCES

Bautista, M.L.S.(1979). Apologies, compliments, directives, and probes in Pilipino radio dramas: an exploratory analysis of Pilipino speech acts. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. *Vol 10*(1&2), 45-62.

Bautista, M.L.S.(2004). Researching English in the Philippines: Bibliographical resources. *World Englishes*. *Vol* 23(1), 199-210.

Bautista, M.L.S. & Bolton, K. (2008) (Eds.). Philippine English: Linguistic and Literary perspectives. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Chick, J. K. (1996).Intercultural communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp.329-348)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2004). The past, present and future of World English. In A. Gardt& B. Hüppauf (Eds.).*Globalization and the future of German* (pp. 27-46). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Golato, A. (2005). *Compliments and compliment responses: Grammatical structure and sequential organization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herbert, K. R. (1986). Say 'thank you'---or something. *American Speech*. *Vol* 61, 76-88.

Herbert, K. R. (1989). The ethnography of English compliment and compliment response: A contrastive sketch. In W. Oleksy (Ed.). *Contrastive Pragmatics* (pp. 3-35). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herbert, K. R. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. *Language in Society*. *Vol* 19(2), 201-224.

Herbert, K. R. (1997). The sociology of compliment work in Polish and English.In N. Coupland& A. Jaworski (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A reader* (pp.487-500). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Herbert, K. R. & Straight, H. S. (1989). Compliment-rejection versus compliment-avoidance: Listener-based pragmatic strategies. *Language and Communication*. *Vol* 9, 35-47.

Holmes, J. (1986). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological Linguistics*. *Vol* 28(4), 485-508.

Holmes, J. & Brown, D. F. (1987).Teachers and students learning about compliments.*TESOL Quarterly*. *Vol* 21, 523-46.

Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jucker, A. H. (2009). Speech act research between armchair, field and laboratory: The case of compliments. *Journal of Pragmatics*. *Vol* 41, 1611-1635.

Jucker, A. H., Schneider, G., Taavitsainen, I., & Breustedt, B. (2008). Fishing for compliments: precision and recall in corpus-linguistic compliment research. In A. H. Jucker & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.).*Speech Acts in the History of English* (pp.273-294). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H.G. Widdowson (Eds.).*English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and the literature* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: CUP/British Council.

Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (2006).*World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lee, S. K., Lee, K. S., Wong, F. F., & Azizah Yaacob (2010).The English language and its impact on identities of multilingual Malaysian undergraduates. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies. Vol* 10(1), 87-101.

Manes, J. & Wolfson, N. (1981).The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp.116-132). Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Mojica, L. A. (2002). Compliment-Giving among Filipino college students: An exploratory study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. *Vol* 3(1), 115-124.

Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.). *Language, Thought, and Culture: Advances in the Study of Cognition* (pp.79-112). New York: Academic Press.

Rose K. R. (2001). Compliments and compliment responses in film: implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *IRAL*. *Vol* 39(4), 309-326.

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

Thomas J. (1995).*Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Wolfson, N. (1983). 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.

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

APPENDIX

Compliment and Compliment Response Questionnaire
Name: Gender: Age: Nationality:

Instruction: The following is a questionnaire about *compliment and compliment response* in Philippine English. Please provide as much information as possible based on your experience in daily life. Imagine yourself in the situations given and write in the space provided exactly what you would say in real life. If for some reason you think you will not say anything in a particular situation, state that in the same place.

Part One
1. During typhoon Ondoy, you saw your classmate Tina help the NGOs distribute and deliver the relief goods. She also donated 2000 pesos to the victims. And you know that she is not from a very rich family. You say this to her:
2. Your laptop is hit by a virus and won't start any more. There is very important data in it. You don't know what to do. Your friend David sees you panicking and gives you a hand. Your laptop is now working properly. You say this to him:
3. You feel stressed out. Your friend Jim listens to you. You feel much better after letting it out. You say this to him:
4. Your classmate Nina made a very good presentation in the class. The slides are well designed and the major points are explained in a very accessible way. You say this to her:
5. Your friend bought a cell phone of the latest model. She was showing you the many functions it has. You say this to her:
6. At a birthday party, your friend is wearing a fashionable dress her aunt sent from the US. It looks nice on her. You see it and say this to her:
7. Your classmate's aunt gave him a new laptop. The design is very nice and it runs really fast. You see it and say this to him:
8. Your neighbor Paul is wearing a new T-shirt today. He looks really good. You say to him:

Part Two
1. Your classmates have organized a party to celebrate the end of a semester and the coming of Christmas. You have dressed up for the party. As you arrive at the party, one of your friends says: "hey, you look great today!" To this, you reply:
2. Your classmate went back to the province. You helped her print the term paper and submit it the teacher before the due day. She said: "Thank you so much. You are always so kind and helpful." To this, you reply:
3. You were talking with an American. She said: "Your English is so good. You speak like a native speaker." To this, you reply:
4. You are listening to music on your iPod. Your friend says: "you have a very nice iPod". To this, you reply:

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Zhang, Jin-pei holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics. He is currently an associate professor at Shenzhen Institute of Information Technology, China. His research interests include SLA, syntax and discourse