

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT
RESPONSES IN TURKISH AND AMERICAN ENGLISH
REGARDING FORM AND FUNCTION**

Can ŞAKIRGİL

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA - 2011

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT
RESPONSES IN TURKISH AND AMERICAN ENGLISH
REGARDING FORM AND FUNCTION**

Can ŞAKIRGİL

Supervisor : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice ÇUBUKÇU

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA - 2011

To ukurova University Institute of Social Sciences;

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of M.A.

Chairperson: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice UBUKU

(Supervisor)

Member of Examining Committee: Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ergun SERİNDAG

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

/ / 2011

Prof. Dr. Azmi YALIN

Director of Institute

P.S: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for a nother sources, is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought.No: 5846

NOT: Bu tezde kullanılan ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildiriřlerin, çizelge, řekil ve fotoęrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hükümlerine tabidir.

ÖZET

TÜRKÇEDE VE AMERIKAN İNGİLİZCESİNDE İLTİFAT ETME VE İLTİFATA CEVAP VERME SÖZ EYLEMLERİ'NİN BİÇİM VE İÇERİK AÇISINDAN KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Can ŞAKIRGİL

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Hatice ÇUBUKÇU

Temmuz 2011, 114 sayfa

Toplumsal olgularda yaygın olarak görülen İltifat Dil Olayları, edimbilim alanında çeşitli araştırmalara konu olmuştur. Hedef dilde Dil Olaylarının üretimi edimbilim ve iletişimsel yeterlilik açısından önemli olduğu için, Dil Olayları üzerine yapılan çalışmaların dil öğretmenlerine sınıf içi becerilerinin kullanımında yardımcı olması beklenmektedir. Ancak, bu alanda özellikle Türkçe iltifatları kapsayan karşılaştırmalı çalışmaların sayısı azdır. Bu sebeple, bu çalışmanın amacı Türkçe ve Amerikan İngilizcesindeki İltifat Dil Olaylarını niceliksel ve niteliksel olarak karşılaştırmaktır. Bu araştırma için 50 Türkçe ve 50 Amerikan İngilizcesi İltifat Dil Olayı, Saha Metodu da denilen doğal veri toplama yöntemiyle toplanmıştır. Verilerin çözümlenmesi, Konuşma Çözümlemesi metodunun ilkeleri doğrultusunda yapılmıştır. Çözümleme, İltifat Dil Olaylarının her iki dilde de yapısal ve işlevsel bir tanımlaması şeklinde yapılmıştır. Buna ek olarak, çözümleme işlevsel kategoride iki düzeyde yapılmıştır. Üst düzeyde İltifat Dil Olayları Söylemsel Edimler olarak ele alınmış, alt düzeyde ise bu Söylemsel Edimler gerçekleştiren Sözeylemleri incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın bir sonucu olarak da İltifat Dil Olaylarının, yapısal olarak her iki dilde de iki ana kategoride sınıflandırılabilceği ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlar, Yalın ve Karmaşık olarak sınıflandırılan Bitişken Sözcelerdir. Çözümlemenin işlevsel yönünde ise Söylemsel Edimler Bitişken Sözce olarak ele alınarak, Türkçede 5, Amerikan İngilizcesinde ise 6 farklı çiftin olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, Söylemsel Edimlerini gerçekleştiren Sözeylemleri karşılaştırıldığı zaman her iki dilde de geniş ölçüde çeşitlilik olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bu araştırmanın bulguları doğrultusunda İngilizce Öğretimi için çıkarımlar tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söylem, Etkileşim, Dil Olayları, Sözeylemler, Bitişken Sözce, İltifat, İltifata Cevap Verme, İletişimsel Yeterlilik.

ABSTRACT**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLIMENT
RESPONSES IN TURKISH AND AMERICAN ENGLISH
REGARDING FORM AND FUNCTION****Can ÇAKIRGİL****Master of Arts, English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice ÇUBUKÇU****July 2011, 114 pages**

As one of the most common social phenomena, Compliment Speech Events have been the subject of much research in pragmatics. Since Speech Event production in a target language is important in pragmatic and communicative competence, studies conducted about Speech Events should assist teachers in practical classroom usage. Unfortunately comparative studies have been underestimated in terms of importance, especially ones concerning Turkish Compliments. Therefore the purpose of this study is to compare Compliment Speech Events of Turkish and American English both quantitatively and qualitatively. The data of this study was collected from 50 Turkish and 50 American English Compliment Speech Events using the Field Method. The interactions were analyzed based on the conventions of Conversational Analysis. The analysis involved a description of the structural and the functional aspects of Compliment Speech Events in both languages. Furthermore, it dealt with a two level analysis in the functional category, which viewed the contents of Compliment Speech Events as Discourse Acts on a higher level and Speech Acts realizing Discourse Acts on a lower level. As a conclusion of this study, it was asserted that there are 2 main categories in the structural aspect of Compliment Speech Event in both languages. These are Adjacency Pairs, which fall into Plain and Complex categories. The functional aspect of the analysis suggested that there are 5 different pairs in Turkish and 6 different pairs in American English in terms of Discourse Acts as Adjacency Pairs. On the other hand, Speech Acts realizing Discourse Acts varied greatly when compared in both languages. In light of the findings of this research, the implications of the study for ELT have been discussed.

Keywords: Discourse, Interaction, Speech Events, Speech Acts, Adjacency Pairs, Compliments, Compliment Responses, Communicative Competence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to the people who contributed to this study. First and foremost, I would like to send my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice Çubukçu, for her patience, valuable feedback, expert comments and constant support. This thesis would have not been possible without her guidance.

I would also like to thank to Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ergün SERİNDAG for accepting to be a member of my examination committee and for their valuable comments and feedback.

I owe special debt of gratitude to Asst. Prof. Dr. Rana YILDIRIM for supporting me throughout my undergraduate and graduate life, both academically and personally. She was always available and willing to help whenever I needed it. I would also like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülten İLİN for her valuable remarks throughout my student life.

I have the deepest appreciation and gratitude for Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU and Asst. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ, for their regular encouragement and trust in me and their motivation during the writing process.

I would like to remember my students and co-workers at the English Language Teaching Department in Çag University for their support, especially the head of my department, Asst. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN. Without his flexibility and encouragement, this thesis could not have been written. Esen AKSAY and Maria ALPHONCE have also contributed considerable support as my office mates and dear friends.

I also would like to express that this study has been dedicated in loving memory to my dear friend Hanna HURİ, who inspired me greatly in my early youth, for helping me learn about sophisticated and cultured life.

My deepest appreciation goes to my dear family; my father Fuad, my mother Mariyet, my brothers Core and Enis, and finally my very dear and only sister Rana OLSON and her husband Jake OLSON. I am grateful for their love, patience, understanding and compassion all through my life.

Last but not least, my heart felt gratitude to my wife Laura ŞAKIRGİL. She not only supported, encouraged and provided for me but also gave valuable input while proofreading my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ÔZET.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Background to the Study.....	1
1.3. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.4. Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.5. Research Questions.....	3
1.6. Limitations of the Study.....	4
1.7. Operational Definitions.....	4

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction.....	6
2.2. Review of Literature.....	6
2.2.1. Discourse Analysis.....	6
2.2.2. Conversation Analysis.....	7
2.2.3. Speech Acts and Speech Events.....	8
2.2.4. Definition of Compliments and Compliment Responses.....	11
2.2.5. Previous Research on Compliments and Compliment Responses.....	12
2.2.6. Compliments and Compliment Responses across Cultures.....	15

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction	19
3.2. Data	19
3.3. Instruments	19
3.4. Data Analysis	20
3.4.1. Conversation Analysis	20
3.4.2. Adjacency Pairs	21
3.4.3. Discourse Acts	21
3.4.4. Speech Acts	23
3.5. Transcription and Symbols	25

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction	26
4.2. Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish Data	26
4.2.1. Plain Structures in Turkish	27
4.2.2. Complex Structures in Turkish	28
4.2.2.1. APs with Supportive Acts	29
4.2.2.2. Embedded APs	30
4.3. Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English... ..	32
4.3.1. Plain Structures in American English	33
4.3.2. Complex APs	34
4.3.2.1. APs with Supportive Acts	34
4.3.2.2. Embedded APs	35
4.4. Functional Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish	37
4.4.1. Discourse Acts as Adjacency Pairs	37
4.4.1.1 Compliment - Accepting Pair	37
4.4.1.2. Compliment - Demanding Reassurance Pair	41
4.4.1.3. Compliment - Ignoring Pair	43
4.4.1.4. Compliment - Rejecting Pair	44
4.4.1.5. Compliment - Providing Account Pair	45

4.4.2. Speech Acts Realizing Discourse Acts.....	46
4.4.2.1 Realization of Complimenting	47
4.4.2.2 Realization of Accepting.....	48
4.4.2.3. Realization of Downtoning	55
4.4.2.4. Realization of Providing Account.....	57
4.4.2.5 Realization of Ignoring	59
4.4.2.6. Realization of Returning Compliment	60
4.4.2.7. Realization of Demanding Reassurance.....	62
4.4.2.8. Realization of Self Assuring	62
4.4.2.9. Realization of Directing the Compliment to Someone Else.....	63
4.4.2.10. Realization of Providing Clarification	64
4.4.2.11 Realization of Expressing Reservation.....	65
4.4.2.12. Realization of Questioning	65
4.4.2.13 Realization of Rejecting	66
4.5. Functional Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English	
Data	68
4.5.1. Discourse Acts as Adjacency Pairs	68
4.5.1.1. Compliment - Accepting Pair.....	68
4.5.1.2. Compliment - Rejecting Pair.....	71
4.5.1.3. Compliment - Downtoning Pair.....	73
4.5.1.4. Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair.....	74
4.5.1.5. Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair.....	75
4.5.1.6. Compliment - Providing Account Pair.....	76
4.5.2. Speech Acts Realizing Discourse Acts.....	77
4.5.2.1. Realization of Complimenting	77
4.5.2.2. Realization of Accepting	79
4.5.2.3. Realization of Downtoning	83
4.5.2.4. Realization of Rejecting.....	85
4.5.2.5. Realization of Directing the Compliment to Someone Else.....	87
4.5.2.6. Realization of Providing Account.....	88
4.5.2.7. Realization of Returning Compliment	90
4.5.2.8. Realization of Demanding Reassurance.....	90
4.5.2.9. Realization of Eliciting Details.....	91
4.5.2.10. Realization of Questioning	91

4.5.2.11. Realization of Demanding Specification	92
4.6. The Description of Objects of Compliments	94

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction	101
5.2. Evaluation of Research Questions	101
5.3. Discussions and Conclusions Comparing the two Languages in terms of Structure and Content	104
5.4. Implications for ELT	107
5.5. Recommendations for further research	108

REFERENCES	109
-------------------------	------------

CURRICULUM VITAE	114
-------------------------------	------------

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish.....	27
Table 2: Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English.....	33
Table 3: Compliment - Accepting Pair.....	38
Table 4: Compliment - Demanding Reassurance Pair.....	42
Table 5: Compliment - Ignoring Pair.....	43
Table 6: Compliment - Rejecting Pair.....	45
Table 7: Compliment -Providing Account Pair.....	46
Table 8: Speech Acts Realizing Accepting.....	49
Table 9: Speech Acts Realizing Downtoning.....	55
Table 10: Speech Acts Realizing Providing Account.....	57
Table 11: Speech Acts Realizing Ignoring.....	59
Table 12: Speech Acts Realizing Returning Compliment.....	61
Table 13: Speech Acts Realizing Demanding Reassurance.....	62
Table 14: Speech Acts Realizing Self Assuring.....	63
Table 15: Speech Acts Realizing Directing the Compliment to Someone Else.....	63
Table 16: Speech Acts Realizing Providing Clarification.....	64
Table 17: Speech Acts Realizing Expressing Reservation.....	65
Table 18: Speech Acts Realizing Questioning.....	66
Table 19: Speech Acts Realizing Rejecting.....	66
Table 20: Compliment - Accepting Pair.....	69
Table 21: Compliment - Rejecting Pair.....	72
Table 22: Compliment - Downtoning Pair.....	73
Table 23: Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair.....	74
Table 24: Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else.....	75
Table 25: Compliment - Providing Account Pair.....	76
Table 26: Speech Acts Realizing Complimenting.....	78
Table 27: Speech Acts Realizing Accepting.....	79
Table 28: Speech Acts Realizing Downtoning.....	83
Table 29: Speech Acts Realizing Rejecting.....	85
Table 30: Speech Acts Realizing Directing the Compliment to Someone Else.....	87

Table 31: Speech Acts Realizing Providing Account	88
Table 32: Speech Acts Realizing Returning Compliment	90
Table 33: Speech Acts Realizing Demanding Reassurance.....	90
Table 34: Speech Acts Realizing Eliciting Details.....	91
Table 35: Speech Acts Realizing Questioning.....	92
Table 36: Speech Acts Realizing Demanding Specification.....	92
Table 37: Frequency Distribution of American English and Turkish Object of Compliments.....	94
Table 38: Objects of Compliments for Turkish	98
Table 39: Objects of Compliment for American English.....	100

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1.Introduction

This research reports on a study which describes the structures and functions of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish and American English from the perspective of Conversational Analysis. It also explains the Object of the Compliments in both languages.

This chapter aims to explain the overall concepts of this study. The first section will set forth the background related to the study. After a brief explanation regarding the background of the study, the purpose of the study will be rationalized. Then, the research questions will be defined. This chapter will end with the operational definitions of terms used throughout the study and the limitations regarding this study.

1.2. Background to the Study

Human language is primarily used for communication. There are two basic ways that communication is utilized among speech communities: the written and the spoken communication. Conversational interaction is the most prevalent use of communication that human beings are engaged in on a daily basis. As Liddicoat (2007) implies, human society depends on conversation in order to function. In other words, social interaction is the essential part of being human and is described as the primordial means through which the business of the social world is transacted, the identities of its participants are affirmed or denied, and its cultures are transmitted, renewed and modified C. Goodwin and Heritage (1990).

When human beings engage in conversation, they express intention or meaning by using utterances. Those utterances are reciprocal in most of cases, creating a larger social situation which involves interlocutors with some kind of social relationship and particular goals. Therefore, single utterances are involving more than one interlocutor and creating a social relationship are defined as Speech Events. In the relevant literature, there are a number of studies carried out on specific conversational units.

More specifically, Compliments and Compliment Response as Speech Events have intrigued researchers as they are one of the major units of social interaction. Compliments have been described as the social lubricants of human interaction and a great deal of language communities have been reported to employ Compliments in order to harmonize their social consents.

Recent studies on Compliment and Compliment Responses have suggested a variety of results explaining the structures, functions and contents of social interaction. Some of these studies focused on the lexical characteristics of Compliments such as the studies carried out by Manes and Wolfson (1980), whereas some others drew attention to the syntactic features of Compliments such as Wolfson (1984). There are also many different studies that compare different features of Compliments and Compliment Responses across different speech communities or across native and non-native speakers of English such as Chen (1993), Chiang and Pochtrager (1993) and Holmes (1988). However, an interesting study that attracted our attention and inspired this study is a study carried out by Golato (2002). In her comparative study of American English and German Compliment Responses Golato discovered that there are similarities and differences between the languages. American English speakers differ from Germans in terms of their agreement sequences in Compliment Responses. The research reports that when Germans agree or accept a Compliment, none of the speakers use an appreciation marker. In other words, there is no speech act of thanking in their responses. Whereas, American English speakers use thanking in the second pair-part of Compliment Speech Events. Another finding of the study implied that German speakers tend to direct their compliments to someone other than themselves in terms of the content of Compliment Responses. Germans also are suggested to reject compliments less than Americans. On the other hand, American English speakers are inclined to downtone the Compliments instead of outward rejection.

Such studies across languages are especially important in foreign language teaching. Bringing a detailed description and explanation of various Speech Events to the classroom can aid teachers in teaching the specific Speech Acts that are essential for communicative competence. Even though there are various studies comparing English with other languages in terms of Compliment Speech Event, there is a gap in literature when it comes to analyzing, describing and comparing Compliment Speech Event in

Turkish. Studies carried out in Turkish Compliments mainly focused on politeness, gender and conversational maxim, such as Ruhi (2006).

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Different aspects of Compliments and Compliment Responses have drawn the attention of many researchers. The majority of the studies have focused on American English as well as several other languages. This study will be aiming to illustrate the full picture of similarities and differences between Turkish and American English in regard to Compliment Speech Events which could assist English teachers in teaching pragmatic and communicative competence. Because it is critical that while learning a foreign language one has to be very attentive to learn how structures and functions of the target language are arranged, this study is designed to fill the gap in the literature. Moreover, there are no studies comparing the characteristics of Compliments and Compliment Responses between Turkish and American English to the best of researcher's knowledge. Thus the need to study the structures and contents of naturally occurring Compliment Speech Events is evolved. It is also important to note that Turkish has similarities with other languages in Complimenting Speech Events. The universality of such similarities calls for more research where languages are compared.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to discover, analyze and describe the interactional structures and functions of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish and American English. Accordingly, this study also aims to identify the similarities and the differences between Turkish and American English regarding Compliments and Compliment Responses. Finally, the research also attempts to bring about a description of Object of the Compliments in both languages, which will eventually shed light onto the aspect of universality regarding the pragmatics of Compliments.

1.5. Research Questions

The following research questions will be the focus of this study:

- How are Compliment Speech Events structured in terms of Discourse Acts in Turkish?
- How are Compliment Speech Event structured in terms of Discourse Acts in American English?
- What are the functions and contents of Discourse Acts constituting Compliment Speech Events in Turkish?
- What are the functions and contents of Discourse Acts constituting Compliment Speech Events in American English?
- What are the types of Objects of Compliments in both languages?

1.6. Limitations of the Study

As there are only 50 conversations per language, the main limitation may be the generalizability of the findings. As the data were gathered from different occasions and from different people, there are also individual differences. Because of this there is not one completely true explanation. Another limitation is the age of the participants. Age is not taken as a variable for the study, thus the study cannot be completely regarded as fact. Gender and social status also are other factors that may affect the details of the study, but were not taken into consideration. In order to generalize the results, further studies need to be carried with more conversations, taking age and gender into consideration.

1.7. Operational Definitions

Speech event: 1- A unified set of components having the same purpose of communication, the same topic, the same participants and the same language variety such as exchanging greeting, telling the time. 2 - A larger unit with multiple turns in which participants interact via language in some conventional way to arrive at some outcome such as asking the time, inviting someone to somewhere. (Hatch, 1992).

Discourse Act: Discourse act is described as the smallest identifiable unit of communicative behavior (Kroon, 1995).

Speech act: 1- A speech act is the basic unit of language used to express meaning, an utterance that expresses an intention. 2- A speech act is an utterance that

serves a function in communication. Groups of utterances with a single interactional function such as a greeting, a promise, an apology, functional unit at utterance level (Cohen, 1996).

Move: A move is the minimal free unit of interactional discourse that is able to enter into an exchange structure (Kroon, 1995).

Compliment: A speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some 'good' (possession, characteristics, skill, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer (Holmes, 1988).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the definition of Discourse Analysis is attempted to be defined in general terms. Major approaches to the issue are represented in accordance with their relative importance in the literature. Conversation Analysis, Speech Acts, and Speech Events are mentioned with specific emphases on 'Adjacency Pairs', 'Compliments' and 'Compliment Responses'. Descriptive research on Compliment and Compliment Responses are also presented.

2.2. Review of Literature

2.2.1. Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or clause level. It focuses on studying larger linguistics units, such as written texts or conversational exchanges. It is also concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular, with interaction or dialogue between speakers (Stubbs, 1983). Discourse analysis brings a broader view to the strategies people use when they are engaged in a conversation. It also includes the study of both spoken interaction and written texts (Hatch, 1992).

In other words, Discourse Analysis may also be defined as the examination of language use by members of a speech community involving both language and function (Demo, 2001). McCarty (1991) additionally describes Discourse Analysis as the study of the relationship between language and the context in which the language is used, laying emphasis on the importance of the context.

Discourse Analysis is also an interdisciplinary field which employs the methods and approaches of areas such as Interactional Sociolinguistic, Ethnomethodology, Pragmatics and Conversation Analysis. Each of these have different theoretical perspectives (Schiffrin, 1994). Even though the focus of each approach differs from one another, they share the common view that language is a social interaction.

Another perspective suggests that Discourse Analysis utilizes the principles and concepts of linguistics, applying these above the clause level. In this perception, it may well be suggested that grammatical analysis alone would not be sufficient to explain the meanings of sentences without considering the situation of the relationships of the speakers (Arikdal, 2006). As mentioned earlier, Discourse Analysis is concerned with text linguistics. However, written discourse has a very wide scope, in both written and conversational form, which is within the scope of this study. Because of this, in order to analyze spoken communication of a language community, another method is needed. This method is referred to as Conversation Analysis.

2.2.2. Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is described as an approach to the study of talk in interaction. It grew out of the ethnomethodological tradition in sociology developed by Harold Garfinkel (1974). Ethnomethodology is the branch of sociology that studies how people organize and understand ordinary life activities, focusing on people's relations with each other and how social interaction takes place between people (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992). It studies the common sense resources, practices and procedures through which members of a society produce and recognize mutually intelligible objects, events and courses of action (Liddicoat, 2007). By the late 1960s and early 1970s, through the work of Harvey Sacks and his colleagues Emmanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, Conversation Analysis began to emerge from sociology as an independent area of enquiry, oriented towards understanding the organizational structure of talk, which has influenced a number of the social science disciplines concerned with human communication (Lerner, 2004). From the study of ethnomethodology, conversation analysts drew a concern for understanding how order was achieved in social interaction, based on micro-analytic studies (Clayman and Maynard, 1995).

Thus, Conversation Analysis is the analysis of spoken discourse which derives its practices from ethnomethodology (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992). The focus of Conversation Analysis can be defined as the analysis of the practices that participants employ to organize their conversations. It can be perceived as the study of metacommunication. As Liddicoat (2007) suggests, Conversation Analysis also studies

the organization and orderliness of social interaction. In order to do this, it begins with an assumption that the conduct, including talk, of everyday life is produced as sensible and meaningful.

The basic, important issues of Conversation Analysis may be counted as Turn-Taking, Preference Organization, Repairs and Adjacency Pairs. Because of the focus and nature of the current study, a definition of Adjacency Pairs is needed.

Sacks (1979) defines Adjacency Pairs as speech acts in which the production of statement by one speaker invites the production of a corresponding, second part by another speaker. The first part of the Adjacency Pair could include questions, greetings, challenges, offers, requests, complaints, invitations, and announcements. The second pair is reciprocal for some pairs (e.g. greeting - greeting: hello-hello). Sometimes there is only one appropriate second pair (e.g. question-answer), and sometimes more than one appropriate second pair exists for the first part of the adjacency pair (complaint/apology/justification).

Taking Adjacency Pairs into consideration, it may be argued that in order to understand how social interaction occurs between people, an analysis of units should be conducted at a different level than the clause level. Furthermore, Liddicoat (2007) suggests that Conversational Analysis may well contribute to the study of speech acts by analyzing the sequential organization of natural data of participants who engage in social action through talk. However, in order to conduct a study in speech, a smaller unit of communication is required. Thus, Speech Acts and Adjacency Pairs come to the surface as the smallest unit of communication. When the realization of a Speech Act entails or requires the performance of another Speech Act, the two acts together to make an Adjacency Pair. Thus, each pair-part of an Adjacency Pair consists of Speech Acts, such as a Compliment requiring a Compliment Response.

2.2.3. Speech Acts and Speech Events

Adjacency pairs should lead the researchers to the study of Speech Acts. Each part of a pair naturally consists of a Speech Act. A Speech Act is defined as an utterance as a functional unit in communication (Richards, Piatt and Weber, 1985). It also could

be described as real-life interactions. They require not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture.

The Speech Act is the simplest but one of the most troublesome levels, following speech situations and speech events. It is the simplest because it is the minimal term of the speech set. However, it is also the most troublesome because it has a slightly different meaning in the study of the ethnography of communication, when compared to the meaning given to the term in linguistic pragmatics and philosophy. It is not quite 'minimal' after all (Hymes 1972; cited in Fasold, 1990). According to Hymes (1972), a Speech Act must be distinguished as separate from the sentence and must not to be identified with any unit at the grammar level, because Speech Acts are above sentence and grammar levels. As Schmidt & Richards (1980) state, speech acts occur within discourse. The interpretation and negotiation of a Speech Act's force is often dependent on the discourse or transactional context.

Several taxonomies for Speech Acts have been proposed. Fraser (1975) categorized Speech Acts as acts of asserting, evaluating, suggesting and stipulating. Austin (1962; cited in Leech, 1983) distinguishes between three kinds of speech act: a Locutionary Act (performing the act of saying something), an Illocutionary Act (performing an act in saying something), and a Perlocutionary Act (performing an act by saying something). Locutionary acts are also known to convey basic literal meaning; whereas the illocutionary force of the act has the effect the speaker wants the utterance to have on the listener. For example, in 'I am thirsty', the propositional meaning of the utterance is the speaker's physical state, but its illocutionary force is the effect it has on the listener, which is a request for something to drink.

On the other hand, for Searle (1976), the basis of Speech Act taxonomy is the 'illocutionary point' or purpose of the act from the speaker's perspective as the foundation for classification. Searle (1976) suggests that speech acts can be grouped into a small number of basic types based on the intention of the speaker. He proposed five different categories: representatives (the purpose being to commit the speaker in varying degrees to the truth of something), directives (including all speech acts whose primary point is to get the hearer to do something), expressives (the point being to express feelings and attitudes about states of affairs), declarations (wherein the

performance brings about the correspondence between the words and the world), and finally, commissives (with the goal of committing the speaker to do something).

Searle (1976) explains that commissives, more specifically, can also be described as Speech Acts the speaker uses to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. Commissives are promises, threats, refusals, and pledges. It is possible that commissives can be performed by the interlocutor alone or as a member of a group. Below are some examples for commissives:

I'll be back.

I'm going to get it right next time.

Saat 6 civarında görüşelim. (Let's meet at around six o'clock.)

Bir daha böyle yapmak yok. (There is no way we would repeat this again)

All of the above examples suggest some future action. Thus they are all commissives.

Speech acts can also be classified as 'indirect speech acts' which are often felt to be more polite ways of performing certain kinds of Speech Acts, such as requests and refusals (Richards, Platt and Weber, 1985). As Searle (1976) points out regarding indirect speech acts, one speech act is brought about indirectly by performing another one. Thus, a statement like, 'The food smells delicious.' may in one case serve as an expression of the speaker's wish that lunch will soon be served, but in another may serve as just a compliment for the host.

In another way, Speech Acts can be described as an utterance. However, an utterance is part of a larger social situation which involves people with some kind of social relationship and particular goals. The set of these utterances produced in such a situation can be defined as a speech event (Hatch, 1992). Hatch (1992) suggests further that speech events are the way people use speech acts within a larger discourse structure. She suggests this in order to provide a bridge between speech acts and the higher levels of communication systems. Thus, according to Hatch (1992), speech event analysis is a field trying to establish the components or pattern-like parts of a functionally-described interaction.

Speech events are the largest units for which one can discover linguistic structure. Several speech events can occur successively or simultaneously in the same situation as for example with distinct conversations in a social gathering. The relationship between speech events and speech acts is hierarchical; an event may consist of a single speech act but will often comprise several. (Hymes 1974, p. 52)

In other words, identification of speech acts in a larger discourse can be made by analyzing higher levels of discourse, namely the speech event.

2.2.4. Definition of Compliments and Compliment Responses

Compliments and Compliment Responses as Speech Acts are strategies used to express and establish politeness between a person and his/her surroundings and, as such, there are many ways to define compliments. The dictionary defines compliments as an expression of admiration or praise (Funk & Wagnalls, 1968). The word *compliment* actually comes from the root meaning of "completing a courtesy". Compliments can also be defined as expressions of praise, congratulation or encouragement

Compliments as Speech Acts can be categorized as expressives - expressions of likes and dislikes (Hatch, 1992). Holmes (1988) defines compliments broadly as Speech Acts which explicitly or implicitly attribute credit to someone rather than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some 'good' (possession, characteristic, skill, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and hearer.

It is also suggested that the speech event of a compliment not only includes the Speech Act utterance, but also the entire compliment interaction (Hatch 1992). Thus, the entire compliment interaction as an adjacency pair must be taken into consideration in order to bring an understanding to the way which speech events and speech acts occur in different languages. Therefore, a compliment response could be defined as a verbal acknowledgment that the recipient of the compliment heard and reacted to the compliment (Nelson, Al-Batal and Echols, 1996).

2.2.5. Previous Research on Compliments and Compliment Responses

Studies of compliments have basically focused on the following areas: compliment formulas, topics and distribution, compliment responses, functions, and compliments as a sex-preferential strategy. Most of the studies have concentrated on complimenting in different varieties of English; very few have examined compliments in Turkish.

The empirical studies on Compliments and Compliment Responses in American English (and in other languages) are vast. Many researchers have stated that "complimenting is a complex sociolinguistic skill" (Holmes 1986, p. 488). There are an abundant number of studies carried out on compliments and compliment responses by applying a variety of methodologies in different learning contexts. Earlier studies usually focused on describing American English Compliments and Compliment Responses, while later studies focused on how the complimenting speech act differs across cultures.

Early research on Compliments and Compliment Responses were carried out by Wolfson and Manes (1980) in their study on American English. Their leading study determined several lexical and syntactical features of Compliments and Compliment Responses, in addition to the functions that both Compliments and Compliment Responses serve. In their earlier research on the analysis of complimenting events among middle-class Americans (Manes and Wolfson 1981, Wolfson and Manes 1980), it was demonstrated that there is significant patterning in complimenting behavior at both the syntactic and the semantic levels. Based on their studies of approximately 700 compliments gathered through observation of everyday interaction, Wolfson (1984) concluded that Compliments are formulas. Likewise, their study on the semantic structure of compliments suggested that an overwhelming majority of compliments included a highly limited set of lexicon. The most commonly used adjectives were those with a positive semantic force: *nice*, *good*, *beautiful*, *pretty*, and *great*. Of all the compliments in their data, 80% were of the adjective type, and 16% made use of positive verbs (Wolfson, 1981). The verbs that appeared were positive in the semantic sense. More specifically, *like* and *love* were the verbs which were used the most. Manes and Wolfson (1981) also researched adverbs (*usually*, *well*) and nouns (*genius*), which

could express a positive reaction. Consequently, Manes and Wolfson concluded that complimenting as a speech act is, in fact, characterized by the formulaic nature of its syntactic and semantic composition. By the analysis of all compliments in her research, Wolfson (1984) revealed that more than half of the compliments (53%) make use of only a similar syntactic pattern:

1. NP (is/looks) (really) ADJ. (e.g. Your sweater is really nice.)

There were two other major syntactic patterns found:

2. I (really) (like/love) NP. (e.g. I like your car.)
3. PRO is (really) (a) ADJ.NP. (e.g. That is a good question.)

16.1% of the data followed the second pattern and (14.9%) followed the third. This suggests that 85% of all the compliments in the research can be explained by only three syntactic structures. In addition to these three, only six other patterns were found to occur with any regularity:

4. You V.(a) (really) ADJ. NP. (e.g. You did a great job.) (3.3%)
5. You V. NP. (really) ADV. (e.g. You sang that song really well.) (2.7%)
6. You have (a) (really) ADJ. NP. (e.g. You have a beautiful living room.) (2.4%)
7. What (a) ADJ. NP. (e.g. What a pretty skirt.) (1.6%)
8. ADJ. NP. (e.g. Good shot.) (1.6%)
9. Isn't NP. ADJ. (e.g. Isn't that ring pretty.) (1.0%)

Wolfson and Manes also suggested that the subject of compliments were limited to two main topics: appearance and ability. Moreover, they added that the functions of complimenting speech acts included thanking, starting a conversation, giving approval and reinforcing certain behaviors. Compliments serve to establish solidarity among same status speakers, while they can also be used as genuine expressions of admiration. Compliments are even used as a strategy to soften a potentially face-threatening act, such as criticism, apologies and requests (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Wolfson (1989)

also suggests that compliments might sometimes replace gratitude, greetings, congratulations and apologies.

Other researchers developed different views of compliment functions. Manes (1993) and Herbert (1990) both propose through their research that compliments are used to express admiration or approval of someone's work, appearance or taste. Billmyer (1990) suggests that compliments open and sustain conversation as a conversation strategy. Functions of complimenting behavior have also been described as "increasing or consolidating the solidarity between the speaker and the addressee" (Holmes 1988, p. 486), thus making them "social lubricants" (Holmes 1988, p. 486). Compliment functions can even be seen as acts to create or maintain rapport (Wolfson 1983.) Holmes (1995) explains that complimenting Speech Acts could sometimes have a dark side, as they may be interpreted as offensive, patronizing, sarcastic, ironic or even as put downs. She also notes giving a compliment may be considered "a face-threatening act because it leads to the complimenter's debt" (Holmes 1986, p. 487), where receivers might feel obliged to return the compliment. Ochs (1993) provides the suggestion that personally being complimented as a professional academic could be interpreted as the speaker trying to foreground her gender identity or as an attempt to establish a more intimate relationship, which may cause her to feel indebted to the speaker.

Pomerantz (1978) researched the sequential organization of American English compliment responses. It was observed that compliments may pose a problem for the receiver, because, when the receiver of a compliment wishes to avoid disagreement, he/she must also avoid self-praise. Strategies involved in avoiding self-praise are downgrading the compliment, shifting reference by reassigning the praise, or returning a compliment. The receiver of a compliment can choose to accept, agree, reject or disagree with the compliment. Holmes and Brown (1987) further detailed the compliment response types identified by Pomerantz. These classifications considered the role of the listener/hearer in the interaction. Holmes and Brown categorized the Compliment Responses in three actions: accepting, rejecting, or deflecting/evading the compliment.

Holmes (1986) also carried out a study where she looked into the structure and function of Compliments and Compliment Responses in New Zealand English. In terms of structure, she found, as in previous studies, that compliments are highly formulaic speech acts, which, at the lexical level, are typically expressed by a small number of adjectives. At the syntactic level, New Zealand English proposed a pattern which is different from other studies. It was the "'NP BE + -ing +Adj' form (e.g. You're looking really great.)" (Holmes, 1986; p. 489). Moreover, compliments were found to most likely occur as part of openings or closings of a conversation, which might suggest they are actually used as part of greetings and leave takings. As in previous research, Holmes found out that compliments established or increased solidarity, rapport or intimacy.

In a further study of American English compliments conducted by Holmes (1995), differences between genders emerged respecting Compliment functions. It was found that women giving compliments is generally more socially acceptable than men, while for men complimenting was generally regarded as a face-threatening act. Additionally, she found frequency, structure and topics of compliments showed differences among men and women. Overall, women were found to give and receive more compliments than men. Although it was less common for subordinates to compliment those in higher positions, women in higher status positions received more compliments than men in higher status positions. Patterns of compliments proposed differences as well. The study suggested that men prefer to reduce the force of the compliment, while women favored a structure that increased its force (Holmes, 1995). While men compliment more on possessions, women compliment more on appearances.

2.2.6. Compliments and Compliment Responses across Cultures

Wolfson (1981) observed that languages differ in terms of how and what is complimented. Holmes and Brown (1987) note that understanding the differences in compliment topics and who to compliment and when, is not enough on its own. The essential concepts to be understood when looking at complimentary cultural differences are the underlying cultural values that these differences convey. A large amount of studies have compared the speech act of complimenting across cultures and different speech communities.

Two ethnographic studies that compared English-speaking speech communities serve to emphasize that culturally appropriate behavior can vary even when speakers share similar linguistic resources. Herbert (1989) compared data from South African and American university students and found the frequency of compliments to be higher among American participants than those of South African ones. The compliment topics were very similar and they were mostly about appearance. An interesting finding was that there were much more acceptances of compliments in the South African data than the American data. Creese (1991) compared British and American English data among teachers, and found, as Wolfson and Manes (1980) also did, that compliments are employed to show solidarity, gratitude and to encourage. Creese (1991) noted differences in two areas. The first one was syntactic, where British participants preferred the syntactic category ('I (really) like/love + N'). Another difference was the topic of the compliment. For American participants, appearance was favored, while in the British data ability was generally complimented.

Daikuhara's (1986) ethnographic study analyzed compliment and compliment response behavior within a group of same-status Japanese and American English acquaintances. Many of the functions were suggested to be similar to those found by Wolfson and Manes (1980), namely that compliments serve to establish solidarity between same-status speakers. However, many compliments were also given so as to find out additional information about a subject. The author hypothesized that Japanese people do not give very many compliments. However, this turned out not to be the case. The author suggested that the high number of Japanese uses of *No, no.* and *That's not true.* was a transfer from Japanese. The application of such phrases were used to defer or show politeness towards the speaker. It was also found that, rather than disagreeing with a compliment, Japanese speakers downplayed the compliment or accepted it in much the same way as American speakers, employing 'thank you' following a compliment. The study also suggested that syntactically, the formula 'I like/love + N' did not appear in the Japanese exchanges.

Studies carried out by Golato (2003) and Huth (2006) investigated the use of compliments by American English students of German, using techniques of conversation analysis. The differences suggested that American speakers give more appreciation tokens (such as 'thank you') while German speakers prefer to agree with

the compliment. Moreover, in the second situation, a similar strength adjective is used. Giving a compliment in German usually generates another compliment. This is a problematic area for the American English speakers.

In another ethnographic study, Yu (2005) compared how compliments and compliment responses differed between American English and Chinese speakers. His study noted significant differences in terms of cultural norms. The American data suggested a higher frequency of compliments. The structure of compliments in the Chinese data was suggested to be indirect, where the speakers employed a variety of moves before the compliment. Small talk was noted to be the lead-up to an indirect compliment, whereas in English it would be regarded as an optional move. The topic or subject of the compliment also differed among cultures. Complimenting on appearances and possessions was noted to be typical in an American English context, while this wasn't the case in the Chinese data. Also, the American English function of complimenting to establish solidarity was not present in the Chinese data. Additionally, there were less lower-status compliments to higher-status speakers than in the American data. Yu suggested that these differences are because of the underlying Chinese cultural and social values of hierarchy. In conclusion, how well people know each other was seen as an important motivation in the use of compliments. American English speakers are more likely to give compliments to strangers, whereas Chinese speakers employed them often with people they knew well.

Sharifian (2005) investigated differences among Persian and Australian English speakers using discourse completion tasks and ethnographic methods. The researcher was concerned with how the notion of *shekastehnafsi* was communicated by the Persian interlocutors. In English, the closest concept to *shekastehnafsi*, which literally translates as 'self-breaking', is 'modesty'. Sharifian argued that even though 'modesty' exists as a word in both languages, the concept is different. The Persian schema encourages hearers receiving a compliment to downgrade it by attributing it to the speaker's talent. This occurrence was regarded as inappropriate by the interlocutors of Australian English, who were academics in a university. Additionally, Sharifian explains that when the compliment cannot be attributed to the interlocutor, there is a general tendency towards praising or enhancing the face of another party who could be responsible for the success, such as an employer or a family member. Moreover, Persian speakers feel that

they must return a compliment to make the speaker feel successful. Sharifian suggested that this emphasizes the Persian value of self in relation to others.

A study by Nelson, Al-Batal and Echols (1996) investigated the compliments and compliment response behavior of American English and Arabic speakers in Syria. They found some similarities in both groups, including the tendency to accept or downplay compliments, but rarely reject them. The differences were more in the compliment response behavior. American English speakers preferred to use appreciation tokens, such as thanking, whereas the Arabic equivalent 'Shukran' alone was not regarded enough and needed to be extended. Moreover, Syrian-Arabic speakers were suggested to use more formulaic forms of compliment responses than the American English ones. The length of the responses in Syrian-Arabic was tied to the sincerity of the compliments.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

In this section, information regarding data collection techniques, procedures and data analysis is presented. The data used in this research is compiled from naturally occurring talk in interactions of Complimenting Speech Events of 50 American English and 50 Turkish dialogues. The data was collected via the Field Method suggested by Clark and Bangerter (2004). The analysis has been conducted quantitatively and qualitatively by means of the Conversation Analysis principles.

3.2. Data

The data in this study was taken from a broad natural collection of Complimenting Speech Event exchanges of Turkish and American English. Since this study is only concerned with structural and functional description and analysis of Compliment Speech Events, the data collected involved different age groups and genders as well as different professional backgrounds. However none of these have been regarded as variables due to the nature of the study. The total number of the exchanges collected is 50 for Turkish and 50 for American English.

3.3. Instruments

Guided by the purpose of this research, the Field Method also known as the Note Book Method, was used as the data collection tool. The researcher took notes of the Compliments he encountered in his daily life, both in Turkey and the United States. He also enlisted the help of other Compliment collectors such as family, friends and students in both countries. The basis for the collection of the data is thus the observation of naturally occurring data. The Field Method is an ethnographic approach to collecting data which is suggested to be "the only reliable method for collecting data about the way compliments, or indeed, any other speech act functions" (Manes and Wolfson, 1981; p.115).

3.4. Data Analysis

In conducting, a research, the choice of data collection and analysis methods depend mainly on the purpose of the research and the issues that are under investigation. In this study, the objective is to describe and analyze the structure and content of Compliment Speech Events of Turkish and American English along with exploring the Object of Compliments.

3.4.1. Conversation Analysis

Based on the objective mentioned above Conversation Analysis was selected as the method of analysis. The nature of the research is the spoken communication which is the study of talk in interaction. The data was collected through the observation of naturally occurring data, thus requiring the conventions of Conversation Analysis. The main characteristic of Conversation Analysis is its emphasis on talk in its local context (Schegloff, 1982). Conversation Analysis is also mainly concerned with giving an account on how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood. Conversation Analysis also adopts an empirical approach, looking out for recurring patterns in natural conversation (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). For example, Sacks (1979) states some features of the sequential organization.

- 1- People talk one at a time
- 2- Speaker change recurs
- 3- Sequences that are two utterances long and are adjacently placed may be 'paired' activities
- 4- Activities can be required to occur at 'appropriate' places
- 5- Certain activities are 'chained'

More specifically the basic structures that are of importance in Conversation Analysis may be listed as such: adjacency pairs, turn-taking, preference organization and repairs.

3.4.2. Adjacency Pairs

Since the first step of this research was to identify the structures of Compliment Speech Events, the inquiry leads to the identification of the structures of Compliment Speech Events, which are composed of Adjacency Pairs (hereafter AP). In other words, Compliments and Compliment Responses naturally occur together in APs, which provide structural information about the interaction. They are important for studies in spoken language because they are a fundamental way to organize conversation.

APs can be defined as utterances in which the production of a first part by one speaker invites the production of a corresponding second part by another speaker (Sacks, 1979). The first pair includes questions, greetings, challenges, offers, requests, complaints, invitations, and announcements. The second pair is reciprocal (e.g. greeting - greeting: hello-hello) for some pairs. There is only one appropriate second pair for some first pair (e.g. question-answer), and more than one appropriate second pair conditions (e.g. complaint/apology/justification) for some first pairs. The general features of APs are as follows according to Schegloff and Sacks (1973):

1. They consist of two utterances, a first-pair part and a second-pair part.
2. The two utterances are spoken by different speakers.
3. The utterances are paired so that a first-pair part must precede a second-pair part.
4. The first-pair part constrains what can occur as a second-pair part.
5. Given the first-pair part, the second-pair part becomes conditionally relevant.

3.4.3. Discourse Acts

The next step was to identify the content of the Discourse Acts. The Discourse Acts have been identified in two levels. On a higher level, they have been identified by examining the turns to which these acts are associated. Also considered was their function, noting that Discourse Acts are defined mainly by their functions. Discourse Acts, which are the main concern in this work, is the smallest unit in the discourse stratum. The structure of Discourse Acts is just below that of discourse. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1992):

Discourse acts are typically one free clause plus any subordinate clauses, but there are certain closed classes where we can specify almost all the possible realizations which consist of single words or groups (p. 4)

Acts are defined principally by their functions (Coulthard, 1977) and they are categorized in many ways in the research. For example Sinclair and Coulthard identified 22 discourse acts. Olateju (1998) also, in analyzing discourse in the ESL classroom in Nigeria, identified 24 classes of acts. Strenstrom (1994) additionally differentiates between three different kinds of acts - primary acts, secondary acts and complementary acts. A primary act, more specifically, is the only obligatory act in a move. A secondary act accompanies primary acts by adding emphasis or further information to the primary act, for example to emphasize, expand, justify, meta-content, precursor or preface. Complementary acts accompany primary and secondary acts. They are mainly interactional and are low in informational content such as: 'well', 'em', 'you know', etc.

Discourse acts are defined (Kroon, 1995) as the smallest identifiable units of communicative behavior. Discourse acts can be combined into larger structures, called moves. A move is the minimal free unit of discourse that is able to enter into an exchange structure. An exchange consists of moves, ideally but not necessarily two of them. Larger structures, like moves and exchanges, account for the patterns of organization that are larger than individual clauses that are found in some languages.

As an example, consider this dialog from (Kroon, 1995):

1. S₁: I've got an extra ticket for the Santa Fe Chamber Orchestra tonight. Are you interested?
2. S₂: Yes, wonderful.

In this example, the whole dialog is a single exchange. There are two moves, one corresponding to (1S₁) and another corresponding to (2S₂). The former move is built up from two acts: one corresponding to 'I've got an extra ticket for the Santa Fe Chamber Orchestra tonight', and the other corresponding to 'Are you interested?' The latter move consists of a single discourse act.

3.4.4. Speech Acts

The lower level of investigation in this study has been the analysis of the different Speech Acts enabling the realization of the Discourse Acts. The Speech Act Theory was first developed because of the work of John Austin's *How To Do Things with Words* (1962), where he argues that when uttering a sentence, the speaker not only describes a state of affairs, but at the same time perform some acts. These acts, according to Austin take place at three levels, simultaneously

1. The Locutionary Act: The physical act of uttering a statement with sense and reference, e.g. "Open the door, please".
2. The Illocutionary Act: What this statement counts as or what communicative function involved in the utterance in the specific context of that utterance. E.g. "Open the door, please" may count as an order, or a request depending on the contextual components, for instance who says it, to whom, when, where.
3. The Perlocutionary Act: The effect created via the performance of an illocutionary act, e.g. the illocutionary act of threat may frighten the hearer.

Although Austin has expanded these three categories, illocutionary acts as the core message of the utterance have become the focus of attention within the Speech Act Theory and within the practices related to it.

John Searle (1969) incorporated Austin's work into linguistic theory. Schifffrin (1994) notes that Searle places the speech act at the center of the study of language, meaning and communication. Like Austin, Searle segmented utterances into speech acts. For Searle, The uttering of words (morphemes and sentences) is an utterance act. Referring and predicating are propositional acts. Acts like stating, requesting, commanding and promising are illocutionary acts" (Schifffrin, 1994: 55).

Searle (1969) also states that the basic unit of human linguistic communication is the illocutionary act. He proposes five categories of illocutionary speech acts using the following taxonomy:

1. Representatives: The illocutionary point of representatives is that they commit the speaker to incorporate her/his own beliefs to her/his words; e.g. believe, insist, etc.

E.g. I believe that he had psychological problems.

E.g. I insist you to change the subject.

2. Directives: The illocutionary point of directives is that they are the attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do some action; e.g. request, order, etc.

E.g. Can you bring me a glass of water? (request)

E.g. Read the paragraph by yourselves. (order)

3. Commissives: The illocutionary point of commissives is they commit the speaker to some future course of action; e.g. swear, promise, etc.

E.g. I swear to God I am telling the truth.

E.g. I promise to be there in time.

4. Expressives: The illocutionary point of expressives is that they express the psychological state about a state of affairs; e.g. thank, congratulate, etc.

E.g. Thank you very much for your help.

E.g. We all congratulate that you succeeded to promote after all the problems you encountered with your boss.

5. Declarations: The illocutionary point of declarations is that they alter the subject in their uttering; e.g. name, pronounce, etc.

E.g. I name this ship King Albert.

E.g. I pronounce you husband and wife.

3.5. Transcription and Symbols

The data has been transcribed using a version of the transcript notation developed Jefferson (1999). In general, transcribing a dialogue captures characteristics of speech delivery, pauses, gaps and overlaps. However, since pauses, gaps, and overlaps have not been a concern for the research, they have been disregarded in the transcription process. Therefore, a regular and simple way of transcribing has been selected in which numbers represent the turns in each overall data and the symbol S_1 denotes speaker roles and S_2 denotes hearer roles in the data. However, in cases where there are more than two interlocutors S_1 , and S_2 denotes speaker and S_3 denotes hearer roles.

While collecting the data, only praises directed at outward appearances, personalities, friendship, possessions, skills, abilities, accomplishments, performances and attitudes of the hearers have been counted as Compliments. Praises directed to a group where no body recognizes the Compliments have been discarded.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

In line with the basic aim of this study, which is to discover the interactional structures of Compliment Speech Events, this section presents respectively an overall description of the Compliment Speech events, taking the Adjacency Pair (hereafter AP) as the unit of analysis, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The first aspects presented in this section are the findings regarding the types of APs in the data. They have been categorized in terms of structure.

After the description of these conversational units from the structural aspect, the APs are described in terms of their function at Discourse Act level or the minimal units of interaction.

The further analysis is concerned with the discovery of the types of Speech Acts enabling the realization of Discourse Acts.

4.2. Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish Data

Conversational Analysis is mainly concerned with revealing the interactional structure in naturally occurring data. Taking the concept of Conversation Analysis as a starting point, the detection and identification of the types of structures that have been observed in Complimenting Speech Event are represented in this section. The data consisted of 50 different Turkish interactions of the Complimenting Speech Event. However, this section of the findings is only concerned with the structural representation of the Complimenting Speech Event. The contents in which Compliments and Compliment Responses occur in terms of Discourse Acts on higher level and Speech Acts on a lower level are identified in a further section.

Two different structures of APs were observed after the analysis of the Turkish data. These are labeled as Plain APs and Complex APs. In this study, Complex APs

further fell into two categories, namely APs with Supportive Acts and Embedded APs. The table below shows the frequency and the percentages of the AP structures for the Turkish data.

Table 1

Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish

		Frequency	%	Related Turns in the Data
Plain APs		28	56	T ₃ , T ₄ , T ₆ , T ₈ , T ₁₁ , T ₁₃ , T ₁₅ , T ₁₇ , T ₂₁ , T ₂₂ , T ₂₃ , T ₂₄ , T ₂₅ , T ₂₆ , T ₂₇ , T ₂₉ , T ₃₀ , T ₃₁ , T ₃₂ , T ₃₄ , T ₃₈ , T ₄₁ , T ₄₂ , T ₄₄ , T ₄₆ , T ₄₇ , T ₄₈ , T ₄₉
Complex APs	APs with Supportive Acts	19	38	T ₁ , T ₂ , T ₅ , T ₇ , T ₉ , T ₁₀ , T ₁₄ , T ₁₆ , T ₁₉ , T ₂₈ , T ₃₃ , T ₃₅ , T ₃₆ , T ₃₇ , T ₃₉ , T ₄₀ , T ₄₃ , T ₄₅ , T ₅₀
	Embedded APs	3	6	T ₁₂ , T ₁₈ , T ₂₀
TOTAL		50	100	50

4.2.1. Plain Structures in Turkish

The foremost of the categories observed in this study is the Plain AP structure (see excerpts T₁; T₂ T₃). Sacks (1979) defines APs as utterances in which the production of a first pair-part by one speaker invites the production of a corresponding second pair-part by the other interlocutor. Thus, APs that only consist of two single moves or pair-parts can be called Plain APs. The exchanges between interlocutors are confined to single moves in both the first and second pair-parts without any other acts involved in the transactional process. In other words, Plain APs are those which are composed of only two moves or acts. 28 of the 50 interactions between Turkish speakers were realized in the form of Plain AP structure. Below are examples of this kind of structure.

Excerpt T_i

- 14 S₁: *Esen hocam çok şık olmuştunuz.* [compliment]
 "You look very smart, Miss Esen."
 15 S₂: *Mersi.* [accepting]
 "Thanks."

Excerpt T₁₀

- 72 S₁ : *Saçların çok şirin olmuş ama.* [compliment]
 "You hair is very cute, though."
 73 S₂: *Ayy sağ ol canım.* [accepting]
 "Oh, thanks sweetie."

Excerpt T₃

- 111 S₁ : *Efendim soy isminiz nedir?* [pre-sequence]
 "What is your surname, sir?"
 112 S₂: *Şakırgil* [pre-sequence]
 113 S₁ : *Efendim ne kadar hoş ne kadar güzel bir isim,*
ben çok severim böyle ilginç adları. [compliment]
 "Oh sir, what a pleasant, interesting name.
 I love such interesting names."
 114 S₂: *Teşekkür ederim, sağ olun.* [accepting]
 "Thank you, thanks."

In lines 14, 72 and 113 of the Speech Events above, the first pair-parts of the APs open with a Complimenting Act and in lines 15, 73 and 114 second pair-parts close with a single act, in this case an Accepting Act. These 28 out of 50 dialogues suggest such a structure, making up 56% of the data. The abundance of such a structure may imply that native speakers of Turkish in general tend to respond to compliments with a simple and plain answer, thus causing a high occurrence of such a structure.

4.2.2. Complex Structures in Turkish

The second category observed in the data is the Complex AP structure. Complex AP structures are APs in which there is either an additional or supportive act in the second pair-part of the AP or where there are acts or moves embedded between the first pair-part and the second pair-part of the AP. These are called APs with Supportive Acts and Embedded APs respectively.

4.2.2.1. APs with Supportive Acts

The first category of the Complex APs is the AP with Supportive Acts (see excerpts T₄, T₅, T₆). In this kind of AP structures, the occurrence of more than one move or act in the second pair-part makes them complex. Hence, when the speaker compliments, the hearer corresponds with more than one act. In some cases the acts could be more than two. Such acts occurred 19 times in 50, making up the 38% of the data. Below are examples of this kind of AP structure. These are considered Discourse Acts with additional acts where speech events contain additional moves. Some examples in terms of Discourse Acts are Thanking, Downtoning and Providing Account.

Excerpt T₄

- | | | |
|----|--|------------------------|
| 22 | S ₁ : <i>Can sesin ne güzelmiş senin.</i> | [compliment] |
| | "Can, what a beautiful voice you have." | |
| 23 | S ₂ : <i>Sağ olun, koroda şarkı söyledim.</i> | [accepting + providing |
| | "Thanks, I used to sing in a choir." | account] |

In the provided Speech Event above, it can be seen in line 22 that after the Complimenting Act from the speaker, the interlocutor first accepts the Compliment and then supports his act with a Providing Account Act in line 23, making the structure a Complex AP.

Excerpt T₅

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 99 | S ₁ : <i>Güzel işte bunlar, bak ne güzel yapmışsın.</i> | [compliment] |
| | "See, these are very nice, look you've done it beautifully." | |
| 100 | S ₂ : <i>Evet, Alpay yazdırdı; ben de ezberledim.</i> | [accepting + downtoning] |
| | "Yes, Alpay dictated; I memorized." | |

Excerpt T10

- 106 S₁ : *Maşşallah sen ne de güzel bir kızsın.* [compliment]
 "By God, what a beautiful girl you are."
 107 S₂ : *Evet, maşallah, maşallah.* [compliment]
 "Yes, praise be to God."
 108 S₃ : *Ay güzelim ama bir de kafam bassa.* [accepting + downtoning]
 "Sure I am beautiful, but if only I was smart."

In the Speech Events above, it can again be seen that after the Complimenting Acts in lines 99, 106, both of the locutors first accept the Compliment and then support their Accepting Act with Downtoning Acts in lines 100, 108.

4.2.2.2. Embedded APs

As already mentioned above, APs consist of two utterances, a first pair-part and a second pair-part. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), the utterances are paired so that a first pair-part must precede a second pair-part. However in some cases, other acts or moves can occur between the two pairs. This phenomenon can be defined as the Embedded AP (see excerpts T₇, T₈, T₉). In these kinds of structures, after the Complimenting Act, the hearer employs a completely different act that cannot be categorized as a Compliment Response, which would act as the second pair-part of the AP. Thus, the event doesn't finalize because the first pair-part constrains what can occur as a second pair-part. However, once the Compliment Response is provided then the Speech Event closes. 3 of the 50 dialogues suggest such a structure, making up 6% of the overall data. Below are all of the examples of this structure of AP that have been found in the data.

Excerpt T₇

- 62 S₁ : *Hocam ya siz çok iyi bir insansınız.* [compliment]
 "Professor, you are such a good human being."
 63 S₂ : *Erken bırakacağım diye di mi?* [questioning]
 "It's because I am going to dismiss you early, right?"
 64 S₁ : *Hayır hocam, iyisiniz.* [reassuring]

"No, professor, you are just good."

65 S₂ *Sağ ol* [accepting]

"Thanks."

In the example above, the speaker compliments the hearer in line 62. Nevertheless, the hearer does not provide a direct response to the Complimenting Act, which would have operated as the second pair-part of the AP. Instead he employs a Questioning Act. Thus the speaker provides a Compliment Response to the Questioning by Reassuring and finally the hearer closes the pair by accepting the Compliment. Hence the first pair-part is line 62 and the second pair-part occurs in line 65.

Excerpt T₈

35 S₁ *Betül, günaydın, n 'aber ? Eteğin ne güzel.* [compliment]

"Betül, good morning. What's up? What a beautiful skirt."

36 $S_2 \cdot Elbise\ aslinda.$ [providing clarification]

"It's a dress actually."

37 S₁ : *Pardon.* [apologizing]

"Sorry."

38 S₂: *Teşekkür ederim.* [accepting]

"Thanks."

Above is another example of Embedded APs. Here it can be seen that after the Complimenting Act in line 35, the hearer doesn't provide a Compliment Response which would operate as a second pair-part of the AP. Instead, she provides clarification for a misunderstanding that the speaker had. Then the speaker apologizes for the misunderstanding and in the end the hearer accepts the Compliment, providing the second pair-part in line 38. Thus the first pair-part of the AP occurs in line 35, and the second pair-part in line 38.

Excerpt T10

- 56 S₁ : *Sen de dersin süper anlatıyorsun.* [compliment]
 "You also teach really well."
- 57 S₂ : *Öyle mi? Nereden biliyorsun?*
Öğrenciler mi söylüyor? [expressing reservation]
 "Really? How do you know? Do the students talk about it?"
- 58 S₁ : *Duyuyom sesini.* [assuring]
 "I hear your voice."
- 59 S₂ : *Sağ olasin.* [accepting]
 "Thanks."

The final example shown above is another occurrence of the Embedded AP structure. The speaker provides the first pair-part of the conversation in line 56. However the hearer doesn't provide a general Compliment Response as a second part. Instead, the hearer expresses reservation which makes the speaker assure the force of the Compliment. Then at the very end, the hearer accepts the Compliment in line 59, providing the second pair-part for the AP.

4.3. Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English

The same practice of uncovering the interactional structure in naturally occurring data was applied to the American English Data as well. The types of structures observed in the Complimenting Speech Event data are represented here. The American English data also consisted of 50 different interactions of Complimenting Speech Events. This part of the findings is only concerned with the structural representation of the Complimenting Speech Event in American English. The contents in which the Compliments and the Compliment Responses occur in terms of Discourse Acts and Speech Acts are described in further sections.

The structures detected in the Turkish data are also observed in the American English Data. These are Plain APs and Complex APs with sub-categories as well. Table 2 below shows the frequency and the percentages of the AP structures of the American English data.

Table 2

Structural Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English

		Frequency	%	Related Turns in the Data
Plain APs		27	56	A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, Ag, A10, A12, A15, ^17, ^18, ^21, ^23, ^25, ^26, ^27, ^28, ^30, ^31, ^33, ^38, ^42, ^44, ^45, ^49, ^50
Complex APs	APs with Supportive Acts	18	36	A9, A13, A14, A16, A19, A20, A22, A29, A32, A34, A35, A36, A37, A39, A40, A43, A47, A48
	Embedded APs	5	10	A1, A11, A24, A41, A46
TOTAL		50	100	50

4.3.1. Plain Structures in American English

The principal category of the structures is the Plain AP structure (see excerpts A₁ to A₃ below). 27 of the 50 interactions suggest a Plain AP structure in American English. Below are the examples of this kind of structure.

Excerpt A₁

- 15 S₁: This is really good cake. [compliment]
 16 S₂: Good. I'm glad. [accepting]

Excerpt A₂

- 19 S₁: You look good in that. [compliment]
 20 S₂: Yeah. I look fat. [rejecting]
 21 S₁: No, you look fat in coveralls. [post sequence]

Excerpt A₃

- 32 S₁: You played well. [compliment]
 33 S₂: It was a good game. [directing the compliment to someone else]

In the Speech Events illustrated above, the first pair-parts of the APs open with a Complimenting Act as seen in lines 15, 19 and 32. Second pair-parts close with a single act in line 16 an Accepting Act, in line 20 a Rejecting Act and in line 33 a Directing the Compliment to Someone Else. 54% of the data suggest such structures. The abundance of such a structure may very well suggest that native speakers of American English in general tend to respond to compliments with simple and single acts, hence causing the occurrence of such a structure. This finding is in accordance with the view by Holmes (1986) in which Compliments in American English are described to be formulaic in nature.

4.3.2. Complex APs

The second category observed in the data is the Complex AP structure. Complex AP structures are APs in which there is either an additional or supportive act in the second pair-part of the AP or where there are acts or moves embedded between the first pair-part and the second pair-part of the AP. They are called APs with Supportive Acts and Embedded APs respectively.

4.3.2.1. APs with Supportive Acts

APs with Supportive Acts are pairs in which the occurrence of more than one move or act in the second pair-part causes them to be complex. Hence, when the speaker compliments, the hearer corresponds with more than one act in the second pair-part. In some cases, the acts could be more than two. 18 of 50 exchanges in the study suggest such a structure, making up 36% of the data. Below are examples of this structure.

Excerpt A4

- | | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| 50 | S ₁ : I like your hair. | [compliment] |
| 51 | S ₂ : Thanks, I just got it cut. | [accepting + providing |
| | account] | |
| 52 | S ₁ : It looks good. | [post sequence] |
| 53 | S ₂ : Thanks. | [post sequence] |

Excerpt T10

- 81 S₁: That color looks great on you. [compliment]
 82 S₂: Oh, thanks...I got it from American Apparel. [accepting + providing
 account]
 83 S₁: You're always so stylish, Julie, I swear. [post sequence]

Excerpt A6

- 114 S₁: Those pants are nice Anna. [compliment]
 115 S₂: Thanks, they are from Target. [accepting + providing
 account]

In the provided Speech Events above, it can be seen that after the Complimenting Acts from the speakers in lines 50, 81 and 114, the interlocutors firstly accept the compliments and then support their acts with Providing Account Acts, thus turning the structure into APs with Supportive Acts.

4.3.2.2. Embedded APs

As detected in Turkish, Embedded APs have also been detected in American English. 5 of the 50 exchanges suggested such a structure, making up 10% of the data. Below are some examples of the Embedded AP structure.

Excerpt A₇

- 28 S₁: Wow, you got your hair cut, it looks great. [compliment]
 29 S₂: Really? [demanding reassurance]
 30 S₁: Yeah, I love it. [reassuring + supporting the
 compliment]
 31 S₂: Oh you are kind, thanks. [returning compliment +
 accepting]

The example above is another occurrence of the Embedded AP structure as a Complex AP. The speaker provides the first pair-part of the AP in line 121 by complimenting. However the hearer doesn't respond with an act which would operate as the second pair-part of the AP. She seeks reassurance with a Demanding Reassurance Act. Then, as a result the speaker reinforces the compliment. The hearer finally accepts the compliment in line 124 and ends the Speech Event by providing the second pair-part of the AP.

4.4. Functional Representation of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish

The data was further analyzed in terms of the components of the Compliment Speech Event. Regarding content Compliment Speech Events were composed of two different sets of functional categories: Discourse Acts and Speech Acts by which Discourse Acts are realized. They are identified as the functional units constituting the Compliment Speech Event. There also have been a number of different Speech Acts realizing Different Discourse Acts.

4.4.1. Discourse Acts as Adjacency Pairs

The analysis of the Speech Events revealed that there are five different pairs or categories regarding Discourse Acts in which Compliment and Compliments Response structures occur in terms of their functions and contents.

4.4.1.1. Compliment - Accepting Pair

Acceptance of a Compliment means that the hearer positively accepts the compliment and responds with a positive response by using different Speech Acts or moves. The data suggests a very high frequency of Accepting responses to compliments (see Table 3). 40 of the 50 dialogues propose contents where the Compliment Response is Accepting. This makes up 80% of all the data. This suggests in Turkish, compliments are more likely to be responded with an Accepting token.

Table 2

Compliment - Accepting Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
S O s	1	Si : [compliment] S2 : [accepting]	23	T ₃ , T ₄ , T ₆ , T ₈ , T ₁₁ , T ₁₃ , T ₁₅ , T ₁₇ , T ₂₂ , T ₂₃ , T ₂₄ , T ₂₉ , T ₃₀ , T ₃₁ , T ₃₂ , T ₃₄ , T ₃₈ , T ₄₁ , T ₄₂ , T ₄₄ , T ₄₆ , T ₄₇ , T ₄₉
		2	5	T ₂ , T ₇ , T ₁₆ , T ₁₉ , T ₄₃ *
		3	3	T ₃₃ , T ₃₆ , T ₃₇
		4	2	T ₂₆ , T ₅₀ *
		5	2	T ₃₅ , T ₄₀
		6	2	T ₁₄ , T ₃₉
		7	1	T ₁₂
		8	1	T ₁₈
		9	1	T ₂₀
		TOTAL	40	

This section illustrates the specific pairs that were observed as Compliment - Accepting Pair on excerpts no.10 to 14.

Excerpt T10

- 89 S₁ : *Hocam, elleriniz çok güzel. Maşallah.* [compliment]
 "Sir, your hands are beautiful. By God."
 90 S₂ : *Teşekkürler* [accepting]
 "Thanks"

Excerpt T₁₁

- 32 S₁ : *Ali Osman ne güzelmiş şeyin, kaban.* [compliment]
 "Ali Osman, how beautiful is your thing, your coat"
 33 S₂ : *Sağ olun hocam, size vereyim isterseniz.* [accepting]
 "Thanks professor, I'll give it to you if you want."
 34 S₁ : *Sağ ol.* [refusing the offer]
 "Thanks"

Excerpt T12

- 91 S₁ : *Saçların çok güzel.*
Belki canın sıkkın biliyorum
ama saçların çok güzel [compliment]
 "Your hair is beautiful.
 I know maybe you feel depressed, but you hair is very beautiful."
 92 S₂ : *Ayyyerim seni, yerim seni. Teşekkür ederim* [accepting]
 " Ohh, I am gonna eat you. Thank you."

It can be seen from the exchanges above that the Compliments in lines 72, 32 and 89 are responded by Accepting tokens in lines 73, 33 and 90. The speakers compliment, and the hearers respond with Accepting Acts in all the cases. The high number of Compliment - Accepting Pair may suggest that in Turkish, the Complimenting and Responding behavior can be quite formulaic. Since gender and age are not considered factors in analyzing the data and the corpus is quite variable considering age and gender, it could very well be suggested that Turkish has a very formulaic Speech Event of Complimenting in general.

As it may be seen from Table 3, all of the AP structures, described as Plain and Complex APs occur in the Compliment - Accepting Pair. Below is an example of a Complex AP structure.

Excerpt T₁₃

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 117 | S ₁ : <i>Elbisen ne güzel, yakışmış.</i> | [compliment] |
| | "Your dress is so beautiful, it suits you." | |
| 118 | S ₂ : <i>Teşekkür ederim, sana da öyle, yakışmış.</i> | [accepting + returning
compliment] |
| | "Thank you. Yours suits you too." | |

The example above represents an AP with a Supportive Act in Compliment - Accepting Pair. As apparent from the exchange, after the Complimenting Act in line 117, the hearer responds with an Accepting Act in the second pair-part of the AP. However the event doesn't end with one act; the hearer adds a Returning Compliment Act to her accepting move, thus making the event a Complex structure. In Table 3 lines 2, 3, 4 and 5 represents all the other Complex AP structures for Compliment - Accepting Pair.

Looking at lines 6,7 and 8 in Table 3, there are three examples of Embedded AP structures for the Compliment - Accepting Pair. It is worth noting that all of the Turkish Embedded AP examples are only found among Compliment - Accepting Pairs. The scarcity of the structure and it being limited to Compliment - Accepting Pairs only may entail that in Turkish, interlocutors are have a tendency to directly respond to compliments without creating an embedded move. This could also be explained by the formulaic nature of Turkish compliments. Below is an example of the Embedded AP structure of the Compliment - Accepting Pairs in terms of its contents.

Excerpt T10

- 62 S1 : *Hocam ya siz çok iyi bir insansınız.* [compliment]
 "Professor, you are such a good human being."
- 63 S2 : *Erken bırakacağım diye di mi?* [questioning]
 "It's because I am going to dismiss you early, right?"
- 64 S1 : *Hayır hocam, iyisiniz.* [reassuring]
 "No, professor, you are just good."
- 65 S2 : *Sağ ol* [accepting]
 "Thanks."

In the example above, after the Complimenting Act in line 62, the Accepting Act doesn't occur until line 65. Other acts go between the first pair-part and second pair-part of the AP structure, thus creating an Embedded AP structure of the Compliment - Accepting Pair.

4.4.1.2. Compliment - Demanding Reassurance Pair

As mentioned earlier, the data suggested five different categories of pairs for the Complimenting Speech Event. The second of these five pairs in terms of content is the Compliment - Demanding Reassurance Pair (see Table 4). When the Compliment Response of the hearer includes a Questioning Act or move which does or doesn't require an answer, this act or move is called a Demanding Reassurance Act. The name of this event should not always be regarded as a real demand for reassurance. Most of the time, the interlocutor demanding the reassurance doesn't wait for an answer. However in some of the exchanges, a habitual answer is provided to the hearer by the speaker. Moreover, it should be noted that even the smallest sound unit, such as *hii?* (huh?) or *di mi?* (right?) could operate as the demanding reassurance. This is an example of an unreal demand of reassurance. There are six examples of Compliment - Demanding Reassurance Pair in the Turkish data. Two of them are Plain APs and the other four are Complex AP structures. Moreover, Demanding Reassurance Acts could also be observed in other APs as supportive acts in the Complex AP structures (see also Table 3 lines 4 and 6).

4.4.1.3. Compliment - Ignoring Pair

The third pair category observed in the data is the Compliment - Ignoring Pair (see Table 5). When a Complimenting Act doesn't get a respond in terms of a Speech Event, the Compliment is considered to have gotten a void response, hence creating a Compliment - Ignoring Pair. There are only two examples of such a turn in the Turkish data. Table 5 represents the frequency and the related turns in the data for this pair. One of the examples is a Plain AP and the other one is an example of the Complex AP structure.

Table 5

Compliment - Ignoring Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
$\begin{matrix} m \\ \text{Plain AP} \end{matrix}$	1	$\begin{matrix} S_1: [\text{compliment}] \\ S_2: [\text{ignoring}] \end{matrix}$	1	T27
	2	$\begin{matrix} S_1: [\text{compliment}] \\ S_2: [\text{ignoring} + \text{directing the compliment to} \\ \text{someone else}] \end{matrix}$	1	T5
TOTAL			2	

This section illustrates the specific pairs that were observed as Compliment - Ignoring Pairs on Excerpt Ti₆.

Excerpt T10

- 82 S₁ : *Emelle Eda bugün maşallahsınız **. [compliment]
 "Emel and Eda you are to be praised today."
- 83 S₂ : *Bütün iltifatlar Eda 'ya.* [compliment]
 "All the compliments to Eda."
- 84 S₁ : *Hanginize iltifat edeceğimi şaşırdım.* [reassuring]
 "I'm confused in deciding to which one of you
 I shall compliment."
- 85 S₃ : [ignoring]
 "ignoring nonverbally."

The exchange above is an example for the Compliment - Ignoring Pair. The speaker compliments in line 82 and one of the complimentees act as a complimenter and directs the compliment to the hearer. The first speaker consolidates the compliment by talking about the compliment in line 84. Nevertheless, all the different Complimenting Acts in lines 82, 83 and 84 go void. The hearer doesn't provide a Compliment Response to the Compliment, thus creating the Compliment - Ignoring Pair.

*maşallah is a formulaic utterance unique to Turkish and to some other Semitic languages. It could also be translated as 'Praise Be,' 'By God,' 'Praise to God'. It is also demanded in situations where the removal of bad luck, or 'the nazar -evil eye', is called upon.

4.4.1.4. Compliment - Rejecting Pair

Another pair observed in the data is the Compliment - Rejecting Pair (see Table 6). When a Complimenting Act or move is responded by a Rejecting Act or move the turn is defined as the Compliment - Rejecting Pair. As the name suggests, the force of the Compliment is rejected by the hearer. It should be noted that the Rejecting Move is not always necessarily an open rejection; it could be a non verbal rejection as well. There is only one example of the Compliment - Rejecting Pair in the Turkish data.

Table 2

Compliment - Rejecting Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
$\frac{m}{o/o}$ (ti Ph	1	S ₁ : [compliment] S ₂ : [rejecting]	1	⁷ 4 8
TOTAL			1	

This section illustrates the specific pairs that were observed as Compliment - Rejecting Pair on excerpt Ti₇.

Excerpt Ti₇

- 137 S₁: *Abicim ne kadar yakışıklı olmuşsun*
bu gömlekle, çok yakışmış. [compliment]
 "Brother, how handsome you look in this shirt.
 It suits you well."
- 138 S₂: *Hee hee hee. Yaa.* [rejecting]
 "Hee hee. well."

The turn above is the only example of Compliment - Rejecting Pair for the Turkish Complimenting Speech Event. The speaker compliments the hearer in line 137 and the hearer responds with a Rejecting Move in line 138. As may be seen from the exchange the hearer rejects the force of the compliment in the second pair-part of the AP. The scarcity of such pairs may suggest that in Turkish interlocutors do not generally prefer to reject a compliment.

4.4.1.5. Compliment - Providing Account Pair

The last pair observed in the data is the Compliment - Providing Account Pair (see Table 7). Providing Account is a Compliment Response in which the hearer gives an explanation about the object of the compliment. Thus this creates the Compliment - Providing Account Pair in the Complimenting Speech Events. There is only one example of Compliment - Providing Account Pair in the Turkish data. However,

Providing Account as an act or move could be also observed in other APs as a supportive act in Complex AP structures (also see Table 3 lines 2, 6 and Table 3 line 2).

Table 7

Compliment -Providing Account Pair

				Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
Complex APs	APs with Supportive Acts	1	S ₁ : [compliment] S ₂ : [providing account + downtoning]	1	T ₂₈
		TOTAL		1	

This section illustrates the specific pairs that were observed as Compliment - Providing Account Pair on Excerpt Tig.

Excerpt T₁₈

- 86 S₁: *Helen'e pantolon yakışmış.* [compliment]
"Pants suit Helen very well."
- 87 S₂: *Evet, çok yakışıyor.* [compliment]
"Indeed, very much."
- 88 S₃: *İçime tayt giyiyorum, bol yoksa.* [providing account +
"I wear tights inside, otherwise they are loose." downtoning]

In the exchange above, the hearer responds to the Compliment with a Providing Account Act in line 88. She gives an explanation about the object of the compliment. Thus, the content of this Complimenting Speech Event is detected as the Compliment - Providing Account Pair.

4.4.2. Speech Acts Realizing Discourse Acts

The Turkish data has been further analyzed in another level. In this section the realization of different Discourse Acts of Compliments and Compliment Responses are

identified and explained in terms of Speech Acts. According to the analysis, there are 13 different Discourse Acts that have been realized by a number of different Speech Acts.

4.4.2.1. Realization of Complimenting

The analysis of the Compliments in Turkish suggested that in Turkish, Compliments as Discourse Acts are always realized by Praising Speech Act. However it is worth noting that the Praising Acts occurs differently in accordance with the Object of the Compliment. So if the Complimenter is complimenting on the general appearance of the complementee, then the Discourse Act of Complimenting is realized by Praising the Appearance Speech Act. On the other hand, if the Object of the Compliment is a possession such as a handbag, then the Discourse Act of Complimenting is realized by Praising the Object Speech Act.

This section illustrates the specific Praising Speech Acts enabling the realization of the Discourse Act of Compliment on excerpts 19 to 21.

Excerpt T₁₉

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 127 | S ₁ : <i>Duygu token accayip yakışmış.</i>
"Duygu, your hairpin suits you greatly." | [compliment by <i>praising the object</i>] |
| 128 | S ₂ : <i>Tokam. Teşekkür ederim.</i>
"My hair pin. Thanks." | [accepting by thanking] |

Excerpt T₂₀

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 135 | S ₁ : <i>Çok genç görünüyorsunuz böyle.</i>
"You look very young like this." | [compliment by <i>praising the appearance</i>] |
| 136 | S ₂ : <i>Çok naziksiniz.</i>
"You are very kind." | [accepting by returning compliment] |

Excerpt T10

- 139 S₁: *Hocam sordum,* [pre-sequence]
ekonomi mi diplomasi mi diye?
 "Professor, I asked economy or diplomacy."
- 140 S₂: *Sen ne güzel taktik yapmışın.* [compliment by *praising the*
"You used a very good tactic." *work done*]
- 141 S₁: *Evet.* [accepting by agreeing]
 "Yes."

In the turns above, it can be seen that the Compliment Discourse Acts in lines 127, 135 and 140 are realized by different varieties of the Praising Speech Act, namely Praising the Object, Praising the Appearance and Praising the Work Done.

4.4.2.2. Realization of Accepting

In the framework of the analysis it has been observed that the Accepting Discourse Act is realized by 12 different Speech Acts. While the majority of the Accepting Act have been observed to be realized by the Speech Act of Thanking, there are also other acts that directly or indirectly cause the realization of the Accepting Discourse Act, such as Returning Compliment Act or Speech Act of Agreeing as listed below in Table 8.

Table 2

Speech Acts Realizing Accepting

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	thanking	^T 3, ^T 4, ^T 6, ^T 7, ^T 8, ^T 12, ^T 13, ^T 16, ^T 17, ^T 18, ^T 19, ^T 24, ^T 29, ^T 35, ^T 37, ^T 38, ^T 40, ^T 42, ^T 43, ^T 44, ^T 46, ^T 50	22
2	agreeing	^T 2, ^T 33, ^T 34, ^T 49	4
3	asking for confirmation	^T 26, ^T 39	2
4	expressing affection to the speaker + thanking	^T 23, ^T 30	2
5	returning compliment	^T 41, ^T 47	2
6	demanding a prayer of protection (formulaic utterance) (maşallah)	^T 22	1
7	agreeing + self appraisal	T14	1
8	expressing appraisal + questioning the origin of the object of the compliment	T15	1
9	agreeing + focusing on the doer + expressing gladness	T31	1
10	providing prayer of protection (formulaic utterance)	^T 32	1
11	repeating the appraisal	T36	1
12	thanking + offering the object of compliment to the complimenter	T11	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Accepting from excerpts no. 21 to 32.

Thanking:

The example below represents how Accepting as a Discourse Act is realized by Thanking Speech Act.

Excerpt T₂₁

- 14 S₁: *Esen hocam çok şık olmuşsunuz.* [compliment by praising the appearance]
 "You look very smart Miss Esen."
 15 S₂: *Mersi.* [accepting by *thanking*]
 "Thanks."

Agreeing:

The example below shows how an Accepting Act is realized by an Expressing Agreement Speech Act.

Except T22

- 3 S₁ :*Bu çantamı çok seviyorum.* [pre-sequence]
 "I love this bag of mine."
- 4 S₂ :*Çok güzel bir çanta, derisifalan çok güzel* [compliment by praising the
 "Yes, it is a beautiful bag, object]
 the leather is really beautiful."
- 5 S₁ :*Biliyorum, Kolombiya yapımı, inek derisi* [accepting by *agreeing*]
 "I know, it's made in Colombia, cow leather."

Askingfor Confirmation:

The example below represents how an Accepting Act is realized by an Asking for Confirmation Speech Act.

Excerpt T₂₃

- 115 S₁ :*Pek güzelsin bugün.* [compliment by praising the
 "You are very beautiful today." looks]
- 116 S₂ :*Ayy öyle mi ?*
Herkes öyle diyor.
Yüzüm güzel de ondan. [accepting by *askingfor*
 "Oh, is that so? Everybody says so. confirmation]
 It's because I have a beautiful face

Expressing Affection to the Speaker and Thanking:

The example below shows how Accepting is realized by an Expressing Affection and a Thanking Speech Act.

Excerpt A;₂₆

- 91 S₁: *Saçların çok güzel.*
Belki canın sıkkın
biliyorum ama saçların çok güzel. [compliment by praising the
 "Your hair is beautiful. appearance]
 I know maybe you feel depressed, but you hair is very beautiful."
- 92 S₂: *^yy yerim seni, yerim seni. Teşekkür ederim.* [accepting by expressing
 "Ohh, I am gonna eat you. Thank you." affection to the speaker +
 thanking]

Returning Compliment:

Below is an example for the realization of an Accepting Act by a Returning Compliment Speech Act.

Excerpt T₂₅

- 135 S₁: *Çok genç görünüyorsunuz böyle.* [compliment by praising the
 "You look very young like that." appearance]
- 136 S₂: *Çok nazıksınız.* [accepting by returning
 "You are very kind." compliment]

Demanding a Prayer of Protection:

Below is the example for the realization of an Accepting Act by a Demanding a Prayer of Protection Speech Act.

Excerpt A;₂₆

- 69 S₁: *Ne güzel kullanıyorsun Seda.* [compliment by praising the
"You drive beautifully Seda." skill]
- 70 S₂: *Maşallah de lan, nazara gelmeyek.* [accepting by *demanding a*
"Say Maşallah dude, we don't need bad luck." *prayer of protection*]

Agreeing and Self Appraisal:

The example below represents how an Accepting Act is realized by Agreeing and Self Appraisal Speech Acts.

Excerpt T27

- 43 S₁: *Ama kolyen de konuşuyo.* [compliment by praising the
"And your necklace talks itself" object]
- 44 S₂: *Yaa, hu di mi? Ben de çok severek aldım.*
Fas 'tan almıştım. [accepting by *agreeing +*
"Yeah, huh huh, doesn't it ? I too bought it with love, *self appraisal*
from Morocco"
- 45 S₁: *Ha benim de öyle bir şey vardı severek aldığım* [post sequeunce]
"I had something like that I bought lovingly"

Expressing Appraisal and Questioning the Origin of the Object of the Compliment:

Below is an example for Self Appraisal and Self Questioning the Origin of the Object of the Compliment Speech Acts, as they enable the realization of the Accepting Act.

Excerpt A;₂₆

- 46 S₁: *Aa ne güzelmiş bu broş.* [compliment by praising the
"Ohh what a beautiful broche that it." object]
- 47 S₂: *Yaa ben onu nereden aldım?*
severek aldım ama, gezide miydi ? [accepting by expressing
"Well, I bought it because I loved it, appraisal + questioning
but where, while traveling ?" the origin of the object of
compliment]

*Focusing on the Doer and Expressing Gladness:*Excerpt T₂₉

The example below is a representation of the Focusing on the Doer + Expressing Gladness Speech Acts as the cause of the realization of Accepting Act.

- 93 S₁: *Çok güzel olmuş, çok güzel olmuş.* [compliment by praising the
"It turned out beautiful, very beautiful." appearance]
- 94 S₂: *Evet, doktor çok kaliteli,*
çok beğendim, memnun kaldım işinden. [accepting by agreeing +
"Yes, the doctor does quality work focusing on the doer +
I'm satisfied with his work." expressing gladness]

Providing Prayer of Protection:

The example below represents how Providing Prayer of Protection Speech Act causes the realization of an Accepting Act.

Excerpt A; 26

- 97 S₁: *Annenizin maşallahı var.* [compliment by praising her
"Praise be to your mom" eyesight]
- 98 S₂: *Aman nazar değmesin.* [accepting by providing
' Be careful, we don't need bad luck" prayer of protection]

Repeating the Appraisal:

The example below represents how Repeating the Appraisal Speech Act causes the realization of an Accepting Act.

Excerpt T₃₁

- 106 S₁: *Maşallah sen ne de güzel bir kızsın.* [compliment by praising the
"And by God what a beautiful girl you are." appearance]
- 107 S₂: *Evet maşallah maşallah.* [compliment by praising the
"Yes, praise be, praise be" appearance]
- 108 S₁: *Ay güzelim ama bir de kafam bassa.* [accepting by repeating the
"Sure I am beautiful, but if only I was smart" appraisal]

Thanking and Offering the Object of the Compliment to the Complimenter:

The example below represents the realization of an Accepting Act by Thanking and Offering the Object of Compliment to the Complimenter Speech Acts.

Excerpt A;₂₆

- 32 S₁: *Ali Osman ne güzelmiş şeyin, kaban.* [compliment by praising the
"Ali Osman, how beautiful is your thing, your coat. object]
- 33 S₂: *Sağ olun hocam,*
size vereyim isterseniz. [accepting by *thanking* +
"Thanks professor, I will give it to you if you want." *offering the object of the*
compliment to the
complimenter]

4.4.2.3. Realization of Downtoning

Downtoning as Discourse Act was observed to be realized by a number of different Turkish Speech Acts. Table 9 represents the different Speech Acts show Downtoning Discourse Acts, namely Criticizing Self, Providing Explanation and some other Speech Acts as listed below in Table 9.

Table 9

Speech Acts Realizing Downtoning

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	criticizing self	T36	1
2	providing explanation	T28	1
3	providing account + directing the focus to the actual doer	T33	1
4	providing account	T37	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Downtoning from excerpts no. 33 to 36.

Criticizing Self:

The example below represents the realization of Downtoning Act by Criticizing Self Speech Act.

Excerpt A; 26

- 106 S₁ : *Maşşallah sen ne de güzel bir kızsın.* [compliment by praising the appearance]
 "And by God what a beautiful girl you are."
 107 S₂ : *Evet, maşallah, maşallah.* [compliment by praising the appearance]
 "Yes, praise be, praise be."
 108 S₃ : *Ay güzelim ama bir de kafam bassa.* [downtoning by criticizing self]
 "Sure I am beautiful, but if only I was smart."

Providing Explanation:

The example below represents the realization of Downtoning Act by Providing Explanation Speech Act.

Excerpt T₃₄

- 86 S₁ : *Helen 'e pantolon yakışmış.* [compliment by praising the appearance]
 "Pants suit Helen very much. "
 87 S₂ : *Evet, çok yakışıyor.* [compliment by praising the appearance]
 "Indeed, very much."
 88 S₃ : *İçime tayt giyiyorum, bol yoksa.* [downtoning by providing explanation]
 "I wear tights inside, otherwise they are loose."

Providing Account and Directing the Focus to the Actual Doer:

The example below represents the realization of Downtoning Act by Providing Account and Directing the Focus to the Actual Doer Speech Act.

Excerpt A; 26

- 99 S₁ : *Güzel işte bunlar, bak ne güzel yapmışsın.* [compliment by praising the
"See, these are very nice, look you've done it beautifully." work done]
- 100 S₂ : *Evet, Alpay yazdırdı; ben de ezberledim.* [downtoning by providing
"Yes Alpay dictated; I memorized" *account + directing the focus other than self*]

Providing Account:

The example below represents the realization of Downtoning Act by Providing Account Speech Act.

Excerpt T₃₆

- 109 S₁ : *Efendim odanız ne kadar hoş ne kadar güzel.* [compliment by praising]
"Sir how nice and beautiful your room is."
- 110 S₂ : *Haa haa, sağolun.*
Yok ya benim odam çok doludur. [downtoning by providing
"Haa, haa, thanks, but my room is full of stuff." *explanation*]

4.4.2.4. Realization of Providing Account

The examination of Providing Account Discourse Act revealed that Providing Account as a Discourse Act is realized only by three different Speech Acts which are Providing History, Providing Explanation and Providing Emotional Value respectively, as listed below in Table 10.

Table 10

Speech Acts Realizing Providing Account

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	providing history	^T 2, ^T 7, ^T 9, ^T 10, ^T 14, ^T 16, ^T 43, ^T 45,	8
2	providing explanation	^T 28, ^T 39	2
3	providing emotional value	^T 19	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Providing Account from excerpts no. 37 to 39.

Providing History:

Below is an example of how a Providing Account Act is realized by a Providing History Speech Act.

Excerpt T₃₇

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 22 | S ₁ : <i>Can, sesin ne güzelmiş senin.</i>
"Can, what a beautiful voice you have." | [compliment by praising the voice] |
| 23 | S ₂ : <i>Sağ olun, koroda şarkı söyledim</i>
"Thanks, I used to sing in a choir." | [providing account by <i>providing history</i>] |

Providing Explanation:

The example below represents how a Providing Explanation Speech Act enables the realization of a Providing Account Act.

Excerpt T₃₈

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 86 | S ₁ : <i>Helen 'e pantolon yakışmış.</i>
"Pants suit Helen very much." | [compliment by praising the appearance] |
| 87 | S ₂ : <i>Evet, çok yakışıyor.</i>
"Indeed, very much." | [compliment by praising the appearance] |
| 88 | S ₃ : <i>İçime tayt giyiyorum, bolyoksa.</i>
"I wear tights inside, otherwise they are loose" | [providing account by <i>providing explanation</i>] |

Providing Emotional Value:

Below is an example for the realization Providing Account Act by Providing Emotional Value Act.

Excerpt T39

- 60 S₁: *Hocam bardağınız çok güzelmiş.* [compliment by praising the
"My professor, your mug is very beautiful" object]
- 61 S₂: *Teşekkürler, bu benle dünyayı gezdi.* [providing account by
"Thanks, this travelled the world with me." *providing emotional value*]

4.4.2.5 Realization of Ignoring

Ignoring of a Compliment as a Discourse Act has been observed to be realized by only two different Speech Acts: one of which is Changing the Focus and the other being a Non-Verbal Act. Table 11 below represents the related turns and the tokens in the data.

Table 11

Speech Acts Realizing Ignoring

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	changing the focus	T5	1
2	non-verbal	T ₂₇	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Ignoring from excerpts no. 40 to 41.

Changing the Focus:

Below is an example of the realization of Ignoring Discourse Act by Changing the Focus Act.

Excerpt A; 26

- 16 S₁ : *Semiha bak, bu resim işte.* [pre sequence]
 "Semiha look, this is the picture."
 17 S₂ : *Aa çok güzel çıkmışsınız.* [compliment by praising the
 "Ohh you guys look beautiful." appearance]
 18 S₁ : *Bizi bırak arkadaki kadın kim ?* [ignoring by *changing the*
 "Forget about us, who's the woman in the back." *focus*]
 19 S₂ : *Teyzem.* [post sequence]
 "My aunt."

Ignoring Non Verbally:

Below is an example for the Non-Verbal Realization of Ignoring Discourse Act.

Excerpt T₄₁

- 82 S₁ : *Emelle Eda bugün maşallahsınız.* [compliment by praising the
 "Emel and Eda you are to be praised today." appearance]
 83 S₂ : *Bütün iltifatlar Eda 'ya.* [compliment by praising the
 "All the compliments to Eda." appearance]
 84 S₁ : *Hanginize iltifat edeceğimi şaşırdım.* [reassuring]
 " I'm confused in deciding to which one of you
 I shall compliment. "
 85 S₃ : [ignoring *nonverbally*]
 "non-verbal"

4.4.2.6. Realization of Returning Compliment

Realization of a Returning Compliment Act is only observed twice in the Turkish data, namely Uttering Formulaic Utterance and Praising as listed below in

Table 12

Speech Acts Realizing Returning Compliment

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	uttering formulaic utterance	T35	1
2	praising the appearance	T40	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Returning Compliment from excerpts no. 42 to 43.

Uttering Formulaic Utterance:

Below is an example of the realization of a Returning the Compliment Act by an Uttering Formulaic Utterance Speech Act.

Excerpt T₄₂

- 104 S₁ : *Canım mavi sana çok yakışıyor,*
ayrıca küpelerin de
ayrı bir güzellik katmış sana. [compliment by praising the
 "Sweetie, blue suits you very well. object]
 Moreover, your earrings adds another beauty to you"
- 105 S₂ : *Teşekkür ederim hayatım o senin güzelliğin.* [returning compliment by
 "Thanks darling, it's your beauty " *uttering formulaic utterance]*

Praising the Appearance:

Below is an example of the realization of a Returning the Compliment Act by a Praising the Appearance Speech Act.

Excerpt A; 26

- 117 S₁ : *Elbisen ne güzel, yakışmış.* [compliment by praising the
" How beautiful is your dress, it suits you." appearance]
- 118 S₂ : *Teşekkür ederim, sana da öyle, yakışmış.* [returning compliment by
" Thank you, yours suits you too." *praising the appearance*]

4.4.2.7. Realization of Demanding Reassurance

Demanding Reassurance as a Discourse Act is only realized by an Asking For Confirmation Speech Act. Table 13 below represents the related turns and the number of the tokens in the data.

Table 13

Speech Acts Realizing Demanding Reassurance

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	asking for confirmation	^T ₁ , ^T ₉ , ^T ₁₀ , ^T ₁₄ , ^T ₂₁ , ^T ₂₅ , ^T ₂₆ , ^T ₃₉ ^T ₄₅ , T50	10

Below is an example of the realization of a Demanding Reassurance Act by an Asking for Confirmation Speech Act.

Excerpt T44

- 30 S₁ : *Çok güzelmiş lan kazağın.* [compliment by praising the
"Dude, your sweater is beautiful." object]
- 31 S₂ : *Güzel di mi? Bass 'tan.* [demanding reassurance by
"Beautiful, right ? From Bass." *asking for confirmation*]

4.4.2.8. Realization of Self Assuring

The realization of Self Assuring as a Discourse Act is observed to be only by an Echoing the Appraisal and Self Confirmation Speech Act. Table 14 below represents the related turns in the data.

Table 14

Speech Acts Realizing Self Assuring

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	echoing the appraisal + self confirmation	T1	1

Below is an example of the realization of a Self Assuring Act by an Echoing the Appraisal and Self Confirmation Speech Acts.

Excerpt T₄₅

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | S ₁ : <i>Güzel olmuş saçlarınız.</i>
"Your hair turned out beautifully." | [compliment by praising the appearance] |
| 2 | S ₂ : <i>Güzel olmuş mu?Arada sırada güzel oluyor.</i>
"Did it? Sometimes it does turn beautifully" | [self assuring by <i>echoing the appraisal + self confirmation</i>] |

4.4.2.9. Realization of Directing the Compliment to Someone Else

Realization of the Directing the Compliment to Someone Else as a Discourse Act is observed to be done by an Asking for Further Information Speech Act, as listed below in Table 15.

Table 15

Speech Acts Realizing Directing the Compliment to Someone Else

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	asking for further information	T5	1

Below is an example of the realization of a Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Act by an Asking for Further Information.

Excerpt A; 2₆

- 16 S₁ : *Semiha bak, bu resim işte.* [pre sequence]
 "Semiha look, this is the picture."
 17 S₂ : *Aa çok güzel çıkmışsınız.* [compliment by praising the
 "Ohh you guys look beautiful." appearance]
 18 S₁ : *Bizi bırak arkadaki kadın kim ?* [directing the compliment to
 "Forget about us, who's the woman in the back?" someone else by *asking for further information*]
 19 S₂ : *Teyzem.* [post sequence]
 "My aunt."

4.4.2.10. Realization of Providing Clarification

Providing clarification as a Discourse Act is realized by a Providing Correction Speech Act. As listed below in Table 16, there is only one example of such an act in the data.

Table 16

Speech Acts Realizing Providing Clarification

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	providing correction	T12	1

Below is the example of the realization of a Providing Clarification Act by a Changing the Focus Speech Act.

Excerpt T47

- 35 S₁ : *Betül, günaydın, n 'aber ? Eteğin ne güzel.* [compliment by praising the
 "Betül, goodmorning, what's up? What a beautiful skirt." object]
 36 S₂ : *Elbise aslında* [providing clarification by
 "It's a dress actually." *providing correction*]
 37 S₁ : *Pardon.* [post sequence]
 "Sorry."
 38 S₂ : *Teşekkür ederim.* [post sequence]
 "Thank you."

4.4.2.11. Realization of Expressing Reservation

Table 17 below represents the related turns and tokens for the realization of the Expressing Reservation as a Discourse Act which is realized by a Demanding Explanation Speech Act.

Table 17

Speech Acts Realizing Expressing Reservation

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	demanding explanation	T18	1

Below is an example of the realization of an Expressing Reservation Act by a Demanding Explanation Speech Act.

Excerpt T₄₈

- 56 S₁ : *Sen de dersin süper anlatıyorsun.* [compliment by praising the
"You also teach really well." teaching skill]
- 57 S₂ : *Öyle mi? Nereden biliyorsun?*
Öğrenciler mi söylüyor? [expressing reservation by
"Really ? How do you know? demanding explanation]
Do the students talk about it?"
- 58 S₁ : *Duyuyom sesini.* [post-sequence]
"I hear your voice."
- 59 S₂ : *Sağ olasin.* [post-sequence]
"Thanks."

4.4.2.12. Realization of Questioning

Questioning as a Discourse Act is realized by the Asking for Explanation Speech Act as listed below in Table 18 with regard to related turns in the data and the tokens.

Table 39

Speech Acts Realizing Questioning

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	asking for explanation	T ₂₀	1

Below is an example of the realization of a Questioning Act by an Asking for Explanation Speech Act.

Excerpt T₄₉

- 62 S₁ : *Hocam ya siz çok iyi bir insansınız.* [compliment by praising the character]
 "Professor, you are such a good human being."
 63 S₂ : *Erken bırakacağım diye di mi?* [questioning by asking for explanation]
 "It's because I am going to dismiss you early, right ?"
 64 S₁ : *Hayır hocam, iyisiniz.* [post sequence]
 "No, professor, you just are good."

4.4.2.13. Realization of Rejecting

Rejecting a Compliment as a Discourse Act is realized by Disagreeing Non-Verbally. Table 19 below represents the related turns and the tokens in the data.

Table 19

Speech Acts Realizing Rejecting

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	disagreeing non-verbally	T ₄₈	1

The example below represents the realization of a Rejecting Act by a Disagreeing Non Verbally.

Excerpt A; 26

- 137 S₁ : *A bicim ne kadar yakışıklı olmuşsun*
bu gömlekle, çok yakışmış. [compliment by praising the
 "Brother, how handsome you look in this shirt. object]
 It suits you well."
- 138 S₂ : *Hee hee hee. Yaa.* [rejecting by *disagreeing*
 "Hee hee, well." *non verbally*]

Below are listed the total types of Speech Acts enabling the given Discourse Acts for Turkish.

Compliment: *praising*

Accepting: *thanking - agreeing - asking for confirmation - expressing affection to the speaker and thanking - returning compliment - demanding a prayer of protection - agreeing and self appraisal - expressing appraisal and self questioning the origin of the object of the compliment - agreeing, focusing on the doer and expressing gladness - providing prayer of protection - repeating the appraisal - thanking and offering the object of compliment to the complimenter.*

Downtoning: *criticizing self - providing explanation - providing account and directing the focus to the actual doer - providing account*

Providing Account: *providing history - providing explanation - providing emotional value*

Ignoring: *changing the focus - non verbal*

Returning Compliment: *uttering formulaic utterance - praising the appearance*

Demanding Reassurance: *asking for confirmation*

Self Assuring: *echoing the appraisal and self confirmation*

Directing the Compliment to Someone Else: *asking for further information*

Providing Clarification: *providing correction*

Expressing Reservation: *demanding explanation*

Questioning: *asking for explanation*

Rejecting: *disagreeing non verbally*

4.5. Functional Representation of Compliment Speech Events in American English Data

The American English data was also analyzed in terms of the contents of the Compliment Speech Event. The analysis of the Speech Events revealed that there are six different pairs or categories regarding the Discourse Acts. Compliment and Compliments Response structures occur in terms of their contents and there are a number of different Discourse Acts that are realized by a variety of different Speech Acts.

4.5.1. Discourse Acts as Adjacency Pairs

The analysis of the speech events revealed that there are six different pairs or categories regarding the Discourse Acts in which Compliment and Compliments Response structures occur in terms of their functions and contents.

4.5.1.1. Compliment - Accepting Pair

The first pair category of the data is the Compliment - Accepting Pair. A very high frequency of Acceptance as a Compliment Response was observed in the data (see Table 20). 35 of the 50 turns propose contents where the Compliment Response is an Accepting Move or act; this makes 70% of the whole data. This may suggest that in

American English compliments are more likely to be responded with an Accepting token.

Table 20

Compliment - Accepting Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
S ₁	m	1	Si : [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting]	16 Â2, A4, As, A6, Ai0, Ai5, Ai7, Ai8, A25, A26, A30, ^33, ^38, ^44, ^49, ^50
		2	Si : [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + providing account]	7 Ai6, Ai9, A29, A34, A37, ^43, ^48
		3	Si : [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + downtoning]	4 Ai3, A22, A32*, A40»
		4	Si: [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + returning compliment]	1 A9W
		5	Si : [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + supporting the compliment]	1 A39W
		6	Si : [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + eliciting details]	1 A20
		7	Si: [compliment] S ₂ : [accepting + downtoning + providing account]	1 A47
	m	8	Si: [compliment] S2 : [demanding reassurance] Si : [reassuring] S ₂ : [accepting]	2 ^24, ^46
		9	Si :[compliment] S ₂ :[demanding reassurance] Si : [reassuring + supporting the C] S2: [accepting +returning compliment]	1 A11
		10	Si: [compliment] S2: [downtoning] Si : [embedded sequence] S2: [accepting]	1 Ai
TOTAL			35	

This section illustrates the specific pairs that were observed as Compliment - Accepting Pair on excerpts no. A₁₀ through A₁₄.

Excerpt A₁₀

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 5 | S ₁ : This was great. | [compliment] |
| 6 | S ₂ : Yeah that was a wonderful meal. | [reinforcing and expanding
the compliment] |
| 7 | S ₃ : Well I am glad you enjoyed it. | [accepting] |

Excerpt A₁₁

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| 11 | S ₁ : Thanks for supper. | [pre sequence] |
| 12 | S ₂ : You're welcome. | [pre sequence] |
| 13 | S ₁ : It was good. | [compliment] |
| 14 | S ₂ : Good. | [accepting] |

Excerpt A₁₂

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------|
| 15 | S ₁ : This is really good cake. | [compliment] |
| 16 | S ₂ : Good. I'm glad. | [accepting] |

It can be seen from the examples above that the Compliments in lines 5, 6, 13 and 16 are all responded to with an Accepting Act in lines 7, 14 and 16. The speakers compliment and the responses are Accepting in all the cases. The high number of Compliment - Accepting Pair in terms of contents may suggest that in American English, Compliments are likely to be responded with an Accepting Act or move in general.

As it may be seen from Table 20, all of the AP structures, which are defined as Plain and Complex, occur in the Compliment - Accepting Pair. Below is an example of the Complex AP structure.

Excerpt A; 26

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|
| 60 | S ₁ : Tori, I think you are so pretty. | [compliment] |
| 61 | S ₂ : Awe. Thanks, Kimi. You're so sweet. | [accepting + downtoning] |
| 62 | Si: It's true. | [reassuring] |

The example above represents an AP with a Supportive Act in Compliment - Accepting Pair. As it could be seen from the exchange, after the Complimenting Act in line 60, the hearer responds with an Accepting Move. However the Speech Event is not limited to end with this single act, the hearer employs another act which is Downtoning in this case. This makes the event a Complex AP. Table 20 lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 represent all the other Complex AP structures for Compliment - Accepting Pair.

Examples of the Compliment - Accepting Pair can also be found as Embedded APs (see Table 20 lines 8, 9 and 10). Below is an example of the Compliment - Accepting Pair in Embedded APs.

Excerpt A14

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------|
| 120 | S ₁ : Your hair looks so cute. | [compliment] |
| 121 | S ₂ : Really? | [demanding reassurance] |
| 122 | S ₁ : I love it. | [reinforcing the C] |
| 123 | S ₂ : Thanks. | [accepting] |

In the example above, after the Complimenting Act in line 120, the Accepting Act doesn't occur until line 123. Other acts go between the first pair-part and the second pair-part of the AP structure, thus creating an Embedded AP structure of the Compliment - Accepting Pair.

4.5.1.2. Compliment - Rejecting Pair

One of the other categories observed in the data is the Compliment - Rejecting Pair (see Table 21). There are four examples of the Compliment - Rejecting Pair in

terms of contents in the American English data. Two of them are Plain APs and two are Complex APs.

Table 21

Compliment - Rejecting Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
Plain AP _m	1	Si: [compliment] S ₂ : [rejecting]	2	A7, A27
$\begin{matrix} m \\ \% \\ * \\ \ddot{U} \\ o \end{matrix}$ $\begin{matrix} m \\ 1 \\ \mathfrak{D} \\ tt \\ O \\ \& \\ CO \\ '1 \\ m \\ S \end{matrix}$	2	S ₁ : [compliment] S ₂ : [ignoring + directing the compliment to someone else]	2	A35, A36
TOTAL			4	

Below is an example for the Compliment - Rejecting Pair.

Excerpt A₁₅

- 74 Si: Are these your great molasses cookies? [compliment]
 75 S₂: They're not very good. [rejecting]
 76 S₁: Oh stop. [post sequence]
 77 S₂: No, really. [post sequence]

The turn above is an example of the Compliment - Rejecting Pair. The speaker compliments the hearer in line 74 and the hearer responds by openly rejecting the force of the AP in line 75. There are only two examples of the Compliment - Rejecting Pair in the American English data. The scarcity of such content may suggest that native

speakers of American English tend to include Accepting or other responses to complimenting behavior instead of Rejecting.

4.5.1.3. Compliment - Downtoning Pair

The third of the pairs observed in the data is the Compliment - Downtoning Pair (see Table 22). When a Complimenting Act or move is answered with a Compliment Response that is basically softening or mitigating the force of the Compliment, it is described as a Downtoning Act. There are only four examples in the data for such a content as it may be seen from Table 22. However, the Downtoning Act could also be observed as supportive acts in other categories (also see Table 20 lines 3, 7, 10).

Table 22

Compliment - Downtoning Pair

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
Plain AP _m	1	Si: [compliment] S ₂ : [downtoning]	4	^A 21, ^A 23, ^A 31, ^A 42
	2	Si: [compliment] S ₂ : [downtoning + questioning]	1	A14
TOTAL			5	

Below is an example for the Compliment - Downtoning Pair.

Excerpt A; 26

- 57 S₁: Your hair looks great this morning. [compliment]
 58 S₂: It's kind of greasy. [downtoning]
 59 S₁: No it doesn't look greasy. [reassuring]

The exchange above is an example for Compliment - Downtoning Pair. The speaker compliments the hearer in line 57 and then the hearer responds with a Downtoning Act in line 58 thus making the content of the exchange a Compliment - Downtoning Pair.

4.5.1.4. Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair

Another category realized in the analysis of the data is the Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair (see Table 23). As it is suggested by the name of the content, the act of the response is basically Returning a Compliment. There are two examples of such a pair in the data, both of which are Plain APs. However, the Returning Compliment Act is also observed to act as supportive acts in other categories of the exchanges (also see Table 20 lines 4, 9).

Table 23

Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair

	Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
1 Si: [compliment]	2	As, A28
^ S ₂ : [returning compliment]		
TOTAL	2	

Below is an example of the Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair:

Excerpt A17

- 22 S₁: Your picture is so pretty. [compliment]
 23 S₂: You're so sweet. [returning compliment]

In the exchange above, the speaker compliments the hearer in line 22 and the hearer responds by a Returning Compliment Act, thus creating a Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair.

4.5.1.5. Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair

The fifth category observed in the data is the Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else (see Table 24). When the hearer directs the Compliment to another person the pair is described as Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair. This pair also includes a mitigation force similar to the Downtoning Act. However this time, the force of the Compliment is not only toned down but also aimed at another person, possibly the actual object or the hearer. There are three examples of this pair and all of them are Plain APs.

Table 24

Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else

			Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
Plain APs	1	S ₁ : [compliment] S ₂ : [directing the compliment to someone else]	3	A3, A12, A45
	TOTAL		3	

Below is an example for this Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair.

Excerpt A₁₈

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 8 | S ₁ : This was so good Jack. | [compliment] |
| 9 | S ₂ : Sheryl made the sauce. | [directing the compliment to
someone else] |
| 10 | S ₁ : It is so good. | [supporting the
compliment] |

In the example above, after the complimenting behavior in line 8, the hearer directs the compliment to the actual doer of the object, thus creating a Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair.

4.5.1.6. Compliment - Providing Account Pair

The last act observed in the data in terms of content is the Compliment - Providing Account Pair (see Table 25). As was explained earlier Providing Account is an act where the hearer gives an explanation as an answer. There is only one example of the Compliment - Providing Account Pair, which happens to be an Embedded AP. However, Providing Account Act could also be observed as supportive acts in other categories (also see Table 20 lines 2, 7).

Table 25

Compliment - Providing Account Pair

				Frequency	Related Turns in the Data
S ₁	S ₂	1	S ₁ : [compliment] S ₂ : [demanding specification] S ₁ : [affirming + demanding account] S ₂ : [providing account]	1	A41
TOTAL				1	

Below is an example for compliment Providing Account Pair.

Excerpt A; 26

- | | | |
|------|---|------------------------------------|
| 107 | S ₁ : They are really good Laura. | [compliment] |
| 108 | S ₂ : The potatoes? | [demanding specification] |
| 109 | S ₁ : Huh huh, where did you get the recipe? | [affirming + demanding
account] |
| 110. | S ₂ : From our friend's recipe book. | [providing account] |

As it may be seen from the example, after the Complimenting Act in line 107 the hearer doesn't give a Compliment Response in line until 110 as the second pair-part of the AP. Since there are other acts involved in between the two pairs, the exchange is an example of an Embedded AP for the Compliment - Providing Account Pair.

4.5.2. Speech Acts Realizing Discourse Acts

The speech act analysis of American English data revealed that there are ten different discourse acts that are realized by a number of different speech act. They are all identified and explained separately via table for each discourse act below.

4.5.2.1. Realization of Complimenting

The analysis of the Compliments in the American English suggested that in American English, Compliments as Discourse Acts are realized by two major Speech Acts, which are the Praising Speech Act and the Expressing Liking Speech Act. A majority of the Compliments have been observed to be realized by the Praising Speech Act and the rest are the Expressing Liking Speech Act. It should be noted that the Praising Acts occur differently in accordance with the Object of the Compliment. Thus, if the Complimenter is complimenting on the appearance of the Complimentee, then the Discourse Act of Complimenting is realized by the Praising the Appearance Speech Act. Then again, if the Object of the Compliment is a skill, such as driving, then the Discourse Act of Complimenting is realized by a Praising the Skill Speech Act. Below is the table representing the different Speech Acts that enable the realization of the Compliment as a Discourse Act.

Table 2ó

Speech Acts Realizing Complimenting

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	praising	A i, A2, As, A4, As, A6, A7, A ₈ , A9, AJO, A n, A i 2, A i 3, A i 4, A i 5, A j 8, A20, A21, A22, A23, A25, A26, A27, A28, A29, A30, A31, A33, A34, A35, A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41, A42, A43, A44, A46, A47, A50	42
2	expressing liking	[^] 16, [^] 17, [^] 19, [^] 24, [^] 32, [^] 45, [^] 48, [^] 49	S

This section illustrates the specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Compliment on excerpts 20 to 22.

*Praising:*Excerpt A₂₀

- 1s S₁ : This is really good cake. [compliment by *praising the food*]
- 16 S₂ : Good. I'm glad. [accepting by agreeing + expressing content]

Excerpt A₂₁

- II S₁ : Your hair's really pretty. [compliment by *praising the appearance*]
- 1s S₂ : I know, right? [accepting by agreeing]
expressing Liking:

Excerpt A₂₂

- 43 S₁ : Wow. I love that shirt where'd you get it? [compliment by *expressing liking*]
- 44 S₂ : Thanks, I found a sale at Collezione. [accepting by agreeing]

Excerpt A;₂₆

Below is the example of the realization of an Accepting Discourse Act by an Agreeing Speech Act.

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 103 | S ₁ : It is really good. | [compliment by praising the food] |
| 104 | S ₂ : Yeah. | [accepting by <i>agreeing</i>] |

Agreeing and Expressing Content:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting by an Agreeing and Expressing Content Speech Acts.

Excerpt A₂₅

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 15 | S ₁ : This is really good cake. | [compliment by praising the food] |
| 16 | S ₂ : Good. I'm glad. | [accepting by <i>agreeing</i> + <i>expressing content</i>] |

Providing Explanation:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act by a Providing Explanation Speech Act.

Excerpt A₂₆

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | S ₁ : Your shirt is so cute | [compliment by praising the object] |
| 2 | S ₂ : Ohh please, it's old. | [downtoning by mentioning a negative aspect] |
| 3 | S ₁ : You and Anna have the best clothes. | [reinforcing by expanding the compliment] |
| 4 | S ₂ : I have three things like that I can wear to work. | [accepting by <i>providing explanation</i>] |

Thanking and Self Appraisal:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act by a Thanking and Self Appraisal Speech Acts.

Excerpt A₂₇

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 41 | S ₁ : Don't you have a nice, springy outfit on. | [compliment by praising the physical appearance] |
| 42 | S ₂ : Thanks, I try sometimes. | [accepting by <i>thanking</i> + <i>self appraisal</i>] |

Thanking and Expressing Self Content:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act as a Discourse Act by a Thanking and Expressing Self Content Speech Act.

Excerpt A₂₈

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|
| 46 | S ₁ : I love your house. | [compliment by expressing liking] |
| 47 | S ₂ : Thanks we were so happy to find one in this neighborhood. | [accepting by <i>thanking</i> + |

expressing self content]

Thanking and Offering the Object of the Compliment:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act by a Thanking and Offering the Object of the Compliment Speech Act.

Excerpt A₂₉

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 72 | S ₁ : Stuffing was good | [compliment by praising the food] |
| 73 | S ₂ : Thank you ,you can take
some home if you like | [accepting by <i>thanking</i> +
<i>offering the object of the</i>
<i>compliment</i>] |

Thanking and Asking for a Comparison:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act by a Thanking and Asking for a Comparison Speech Acts.

Excerpt A₃₀

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 84 | S ₁ : Your hair looks nice. | [compliment by praising the appearance] |
| 85 | S ₂ : Well thanks. Better than normal ? | [accepting by <i>thanking</i> +
<i>asking for a comparison</i>] |
| 86 | S ₁ : No.. | [post sequence] |

Agreeing, Positively Assessing the Compliment and Thanking:

Below is an example of the realization of an Accepting Act by an Agreeing, Positively Assessing the Compliment and Thanking Speech Acts.

Excerpt A; 26

- 91 S₁: Nice job with the memo, Jane. [compliment by praising the work done]
- 92 S₂: Well I think it covers it. Thanks. [accepting by *agreeing* + *positively assessing the compliment* + *thanking*]

Providing History:

Below is an example for the realization of Accepting by a Providing History Speech Act.

Excerpt A32

- 93 S₁: That's a pretty sweatshirt [compliment by praising the object]
- 94 S₂: I got it at Younkers [accepting by *providing history*]

4.5.2.3. Realization of Downtoning

Downtoning as a Discourse Act has been observed to be realized by a number of different Speech Acts. Table 28 below represents the different Speech Acts that enable the realization of a Downtoning as a Discourse Act which appeared to be Mentioning a Negative Aspect in majority and some other Speech Acts.

Table 28

Speech Acts Realizing Downtoning

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	mentioning a negative aspect	A1, A23, A21, A32, A40, A47	6
2	providing account	A13, A14, A31	3
3	disagreeing	A35, A36, A42	3
4	praising the complimenter	A22	1

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Downtoning from excerpts no. 33 to 36.

Mentioning a Negative Aspect:

Below is an example of the realization of a Downtoning by Mentioning a Negative Aspect Speech Act.

Excerpt A₃₃

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 89 | S ₁ : I like your necklace | [compliment by expressing liking] |
| 90 | S ₂ : It keeps coming unhooked, but thank you. | [downtoning by <i>mentioning a negative aspect</i>] |

Providing Account:

Below is an example of the realization of a Downtoning by Providing Account Speech Act.

Excerpt A₃₄

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 38 | S ₁ : Your hair looks cute. | [compliment by praising the appearance] |
| 39 | S ₂ : Ohh I didn't do anything special | [downtoning by <i>providing account</i>] |
| | Well what do you like about it? | [post sequence] |
| 40 | S ₁ : It looks wavy. | |

Disagreeing:

Below is an example of the realization of a Downtoning Act by Disagreeing Speech Act.

Disagreeing:

Below is an example of the realization of a Rejecting as a Discourse Act by a Disagreeing Speech Act.

Excerpt A37

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 95 | S ₁ : You did a nice job with the | |
| | trim around the windows | [compliment by praising the
work done] |
| 96 | S ₂ : It's not all that great | [rejecting by <i>disagreeing</i>] |

Mentioning a Negative Aspect:

Below is an example of the realization of a Rejecting by Mentioning a Negative Aspect Speech Act.

Excerpt A38

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 74 | S ₁ : Are these your great molasses cookies? | [compliment by praising the
food] |
| 75 | S ₂ : They're not very good. | [rejecting by <i>mentioning a
negative aspect</i>] |
| 76 | S ₁ : Oh stop. | [post sequence] |
| 77 | S ₂ : No, really. | [post sequence] |

Mentioning a Negative Aspect and Contradicting:

Below is an example of the realization of a Rejecting by Mentioning a Negative Aspect and Contradicting Speech Acts.

This section illustrates specific Speech Acts realizing the Discourse Act of Providing Account from excerpts no. 42 to 43.

Providing History:

Below is an example of the realization of Providing Account by a Providing History Speech Act.

Excerpt A4₂

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 50 | S ₁ : I like your hair. | [compliment by expressing liking] |
| 51 | S ₂ : Thanks, I just got it cut. | [providing account by <i>providing history</i>] |
| 52 | S ₁ : It looks good. | [post sequence] |
| 53 | S ₂ : Thanks. | [post sequence] |

Providing Origin:

Below is an example of the realization of a Providing Account by a Providing Origin Speech Act.

Excerpt A4₃

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 107 | S ₁ : They are really good Laura. | [compliment by praising the food] |
| 108 | S ₂ : The potatoes ? | [embedded sequence] |
| 109 | S ₁ : Huh huh, Where did you get the recipe? | [embedded sequence] |
| 110 | S ₂ : From our friend's recipe book. | [providing account by <i>providing origin</i>] |

Excerpt A; 26

- 28 S₁ : Wow, you got your hair cut, it looks great [compliment by praising the appearance]
- 29 S₂ : Really? [demanding reassurance by *asking for confirmation*]
- 30 S₁ : Yeah, I love it. [post sequence]
- 31 S₂ : Ohh you are kind, thanks. [post sequence]

4.5.2.9. Realization of Eliciting Details

Eliciting Details as a Discourse Act has been observed to be realized by an Asking for a Reason Speech Act. Table 34 below represents the occurrence of the Speech Act in terms of related turns in the data.

Table 34

Speech Acts Realizing Eliciting Details

		Related Turns in the Data	Tokens
1	asking for a reason	A20	1

Below is the example of the realization of Eliciting Details by an Asking for a Reason Speech Act.

Excerpt A₄₆

- 54 S₁ : You're the best husband in the world [compliment by praising the attribute]
- 55 S₂ : Why's that? [eliciting details by *asking for a reason*]
- 56 S₁ : You just are. [post sequence]

4.5.2.10. Realization of Questioning

As it may be seen from Table 35 below the realization of a Questioning as a Discourse Act is only observed to be occurring by Asking for Explanation.

Table 35

Excerpt A; 26

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 107 | S ₁ : They are really good Laura. | [compliment by praising] |
| 108 | S ₂ : The potatoes? | [demanding specification by
<i>asking for clarification</i>] |
| 109 | S ₁ : Huh huh, Where did you get the recipe? | [embedded sequence] |
| 110 | S ₂ : From our friend's recipe book. | [providing account by
providing origin] |

Below are listed the total types of Speech Acts enabling the given Discourse Acts.

Complimenting: *praising - expressing liking*

Accepting: *thanking - agreeing - agreeing and expressing content - providing explanation - thanking and self appraisal - thanking and expressing self content - thanking and offering the object of the compliment - thanking and asking for a comparison - agreeing, positively assessing the compliment and thanking - providing history*

Downtoning: *mentioning a negative aspect - providing account - disagreeing - praising the complimenter*

Rejecting: *disagreeing - mentioning a negative aspect - mentioning a negative aspect and contradicting*

Directing the Compliment to Someone Else: *mentioning the target complementee -
attributing to the other conditions*

Providing Account: *providing history - providing origin*

Returning Compliment: *praising the complimenter*

Demanding Reassurance: *asking for confirmation*

Eliciting Details: *asking for a reason*

Questioning: *asking for explanation*

Demanding Specification: *asking for clarification*

4.6. The Description of Objects of Compliments

The data was also analyzed in terms of the Objects of the Compliments. The Objects of Compliments are analyzed and described in terms of their content.

Compliments are appraisals that are directed to an interlocutor or a possession of the interlocutor. Both are defined as the Object of Compliment. The data suggested two major categories of the Object of Compliments which are Praising the Object and Praising the Hearer respectively.

When a Compliment is paid to an Object, it generally praises the Object itself other than the Hearer. The Object as the Object of the Compliment can be anything that a complementee owns.

Table 37 below represents a comparison of frequency distribution of American English and Turkish Object of Compliments. As it may be seen from the table, Americans tend to direct their praises to the Hearer since 72% of the American English data suggested such an occurrence. On the other hand, Turkish interlocutors have a more balanced complimenting behavior in terms of Object of the Compliments. 48% of the Turkish data suggested Praising the Object and 52% Praising the Hearer.

Table 37

Frequency Distribution of American English and Turkish Object of Compliments

	American English		Turkish	
	Tokens	%	Tokens	%
Praising the Object	14	28	24	48
Praising the Hearer	36	72	26	52
TOTAL	50	100	50	100

Below are examples of both of the categories from excerpt A₁ to A₄ and from T₁ to T₂.

Excerpt A₁

- 41 S₁: Don't you have a nice, springy outfit on. [object as the object of the compliment]
 42 S₂: Thanks, I try sometimes.

The excerpt above is an example of a Compliment directed to an Object. In line 41, the complimenter praises the possession which is an Object. Below also are other examples where the Object of the Compliment is an Object.

Excerpt T₁

- 32 S₁: *Ali Osman ne güzelmiş şeyin, kaban.* [object as the object of the compliment]
 "Ali Osman, how beautiful is your thing, your coat
 33 S₂: *Sağ olun hocam, size vereyim isterseniz.*
 "Thanks professor, I'll give it to you if you want."
 34 S₁: *Sağ ol.*
 "Thanks."

As it may be seen from the turn above the Object of the Compliment is an accessory, a jacket in this exchange, which can be counted in the Object category of the Object of Compliments.

Excerpt A₂

- 46 S₁: I love your house. [object as the object of the compliment]
 47 S₂: Thanks we were so happy to find one in this neighborhood.

The turn above is another example where the Object of Compliment is an Object. As it may be seen in line 46, the speaker is complimenting a possession of the Hearer, which is a house in this case, thus an Object.

On the other hand, there are also Compliments that are directly given to the Hearer. In this case the Hearer is being praised rather than his Object. Below are three examples where the Object of Compliment is the Hearer.

Excerpt A₃

- 48 S₁ : You really look nice today [hearer as the object of the
compliment]
- 49 S₂ : Thank you very much.

Excerpt A₄

- 63 S₁ : By the way, that was a great email you sent. [hearer as the object of the
compliment]
- 64 S₂ : Well, I think it was a little too long,
like a thesis paper.
official email writer.
- 65 S₁ : No, it was good and I'm now making you our

Excerpt T₂

- 72 S₁ : *Saçların çok şirin olmuş ama* [hearer as the object of the
"You hair is very cute, though." compliment]
- 73 S₂ : *Ayy sağ ol canım.*
"Oh, thanks sweetie."

In the examples above, it can be seen in lines 48, 63 and 72 the speakers all compliment different aspects of the Hearers which are appearance in excerpt A₃, and excerpt T₂, and performance in excerpt A₄. All of the Objects of the Compliments are the Hearer in these cases, since the praise is directed to the Hearer himself or herself not to a possession of the hearer.

As it has been suggested earlier, Compliments are categorized in two groups regarding the content being praised. It is either the Hearer being complimented as a person or a possession of a Hearer as an Object.

Looking closely at the Praising the Object category it is realized that only possessions come as a sub-category the Object of the Compliment in Turkish. Below is an example where the Object of the Compliment is a possession.

Excerpt T₃

- 29 S₁ : *Aa ne güzel gözlükleriniz.* [possession as the object of
"Ohh, how beautiful are your glasses." the compliment]
- 30 S₂ : *Öyle mi? Versace ha ha ha.*
"Really ? Versace ha ha ha."

It is seen in the exchange above that the Object of the Compliment is a possession, which are a pair of glasses in this case. Thus the Complimenter is directing the Compliment to the Object not to the Hearer.

The other category of the Object of the Compliments is the Praising the Hearer category, which has five sub-categories: General Appearance, Appearance, Performance, Attribute and Skill respectively. Table 38 below represents all of the Object of Compliment categories in details for Turkish.

Table 39

Objects of Compliments for Turkish

			Frequency	Per cent
Praising the object	possession	Accessory	12	50
		Clothing	9	38
		Cup	1	4
		Room	1	4
		Surname	1	4
Total			24	100 %
Praising the hearer	general appearance	general feature	6	24
		clothing	1	4
		picture image	1	4
	appearance	Hair	6	24
		body parts	3	12
	performance	writing email	1	4
		taking notes	1	4
		Working	1	4
		teaching	1	4
	attribute	Voice	1	4
		personality	1	4
		Eyesight	1	4
	skill	driving	1	4
Total			26	100 %

Below is an example in which the Object of Compliment is an Attribute in Turkish.

Table 39

Objects of Compliment for American English

			Frequency	Per cent
Praising the object	possession	Clothing	7	50
		accessory	3	21
		House	2	15
		wall paint	1	7
		baby bed	1	7
Total			14	100 %
Praising the hearer	general appearance	general feature	4	11
		clothing	2	5
		picture image	1	3
	appearance	Hair	9	25
	performance	writing email / memo	3	8
		playing game	1	3
	attribute	taste in books	1	3
		being a spouse	1	3
	skill	Cooking	13	36
		Trimming windows	1	3
Total			36	100 %

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

In this research, it was attempted to identify, describe and analyze the structures, functions and contents of Complimenting Speech Event of Turkish and American English. This was done qualitatively and quantitatively by means of Conversational Analysis with regard to the 50 different exchanges for each language.

This chapter includes the conclusion and the discussion of the findings that were presented in the previous section. The conclusions are presented in relation to each research question. Research results were compared with findings revealed in the same field. The chapter ends with the implications of the study and the recommendations for future studies.

5.2. Evaluation of Research Questions

In this study, the following research questions were sought to be answered.

- ***Research question 1: How are Compliment Speech Events structured in terms of Discourse Acts in Turkish?***

The analyses resulted in two different AP structures for the Compliment Speech Event in Turkish. These are Plain APs and Complex APs. It should be noted that Complex APs further fall into two categories which are APs with Supportive Acts and Embedded APs in the Turkish data. A great majority of the AP structures were Plain APs. This may mean that in Turkish, interlocutors tended to provide simple answers in their exchanges, if not due to their level of linguistic proficiency. There are also a number of structures that fall into the APs with Supportive Acts sub-category. As it was already explained in the previous section this kind of structure involved more than one act in the Compliment Response. Since there are a number of examples of such a structure in Turkish, it could be stated that in Turkish language provides a rich variety

of Compliment Responses. Embedded APs on the other hand are relatively low in number, which means Turkish interlocutors do not employ other acts between the first pair-parts and the second pair-parts of the APs. This may suggest that speakers of Turkish are direct in their Compliment Responses.

- **Research question 2:** *How are Compliment Speech Events structured in terms of Discourse Acts in American English?*

The structures mentioned in the Turkish data are also observed in American English. American English exchanges include Plain APs the most. This may imply that in American English, interlocutors are very direct and short in their exchanges. However, there are also quite a number of Complex APs in which the second pair-part of the APs included other acts or moves as well as the major Compliment Response. This also may mean that American English interlocutors tend to be rich in their Compliment Responses. Additionally, there are Embedded APs in American English. However, they are low in number, which suggests that American English speakers are quite direct in their Compliment Responses.

- **Research question 3:** *What are the functions and contents of Discourse Acts constituting Compliment Speech Events in Turkish?*

As far as the functions and contents of Compliment Speech Events in Turkish are concerned, the analysis of the data suggested two major component categories. The higher level of the content is Discourse Acts, and on a lower level, Speech Acts enable the realization of the Discourse Acts.

In terms of Discourse Acts the data showed five different pairs of complimenting behavior in Turkish. The majority of the pairs turned out to be *Compliment - Accepting* Pair. This may mean that Compliment Responses in Turkish are likely to be resulting in a positive reaction. There are other contents in terms of Discourse Acts as well, such as the *Compliment - Demanding Reassurance* Pair, in which the interlocutors ask a question in order to reassure the force of the Compliment. There are a limited number of examples of such a pair. The other sets are as follows:

Compliment - Ignoring Pair, Compliment - Rejecting Pair and Compliment - Providing Account Pair.

The analysis resulted in a number of Speech Acts that enable the realization of Discourse Acts. Each of the different Discourse Acts in Turkish are observed to be realized by various Speech Acts. However, The Compliment Discourse Act is observed to be realized by the Praising Speech Act only. Other Discourse Acts, such as Accepting, on the other hand, are realized by a number of different Speech Acts. The majority of which are Thanking and Agreeing. There are also other Speech Acts that directly or indirectly enable the realization of the Accepting as a Discourse Act. A unique Speech Act that enables the realization of Accepting as a Discourse Act in Turkish which is observed to be the Demanding a Prayer of Protection Speech Act. In some cases the Accepting Act is realized by more than one Speech Act. Other Discourse Acts are also observed to be realized by different Speech Acts in Turkish. Providing Account as a Discourse Act is found to be realized by three different Speech Acts, the majority of which is a Providing History Speech Act. This may suggest that Turkish interlocutors tend to provide a background of the Object of the Compliment in their Compliment Responses. Other Discourse Acts are observed to be realized by single Speech Acts. Looking into Demanding Reassurance as a Discourse Act, it is realized that Demanding Assurance as a Discourse Act is only realized by Asking for Confirmation Speech Act. This may suggest that Demanding Assurance in Turkish has a very formulaic nature.

- **Research question 4:** *What are the functions and contents of Discourse Acts constituting Compliment Speech Events in American English?*

The contents of Compliment Speech Event that are observed in Turkish data are also observed in American English data. The analysis of the American English exchanges in terms of contents regarding the Discourse Acts suggested that there are six different pairs of Compliment Speech Event in American English. While the majority of these pairs turned to be *Compliment - Accepting Pair*, there are also other pairs observed in the data. Other pairs include *Compliment - Rejecting Pair* in which the Compliment is openly rejected in the Compliment Response, *Compliment - Downtoning Pair*, *Compliment - Returning Compliment Pair*, *Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else Pair* and *Compliment - Providing Account Pair* respectively.

It was observed in the data that the Discourse Acts were revealed by Speech Acts. In terms of Speech Acts that enable the realization of the Discourse Acts the data showed a number of different Speech Acts in American English. Each of the different Discourse Acts are observed to be realized by various Speech Acts. The Discourse Act of Compliment is shown to be realized by the Praising Speech Act as well as the Expressing Liking Speech Act. The other Discourse Acts, such as Accepting are found to be realized by the Thanking Speech Act the most. This may suggest that interlocutors in American English have a tendency to include a prescribed Compliment Response while accepting a Compliment. Other Discourse Acts such as Downtoning are observed to be realized by a Mentioning a Negative Aspect Speech Act the most. It should be noted that a Mentioning a Negative Aspect Speech Act is also observed to enable the realization of Rejecting as a Discourse Act. Thus, the analysis of the data clearly shows that the same Speech Act can work differently in the realization of different Discourse Acts. Additional Discourse Acts are basically seen to be realized by single Speech Acts such as the realization of a Questioning as a Discourse Act by the Asking for Explanation Speech Act.

Research question 4: What are the types of Objects of Compliments in both languages?

Both Turkish and American English suggest that Objects of Compliments are either the Hearer or an Object. However in Turkish, interlocutors tend to praise the object more than American English speakers do. This may suggest that Turkish culture gives more prominence to possessions than the hearers themselves. It should be noted though, that there are examples of hearer directed compliments in Turkish. Moreover American English has more of a tendency towards complimenting the hearer. 72% of American English Compliments are hearer-directed, whereas this number is relatively lower in Turkish, whose hearer Compliments are only 52%.

5.3. Discussions and Conclusions Comparing the two Languages in terms of Structure and Content

The analysis of the data in terms of structure and content both suggested some differences as well as similarities between Turkish and American English. Regarding

the similarities, the analysis suggested a majority of structures in terms of Compliment Speech Event are similar. The frequencies of Plain APs are found to be same in both Turkish and American English. The analysis suggested that 56% of the exchanges are Plain APs in both languages. This equality may suggest that the Compliment Speech Event is quite stereotypical and limited to short and single Compliment Responses in both languages. In terms of Complex APs, both Turkish and American English suggested similar frequencies. APs with Supportive Acts are found to be 38% in Turkish and 36% in American English. These results imply a very minor difference between the two languages. The percentages suggest that both languages are quite similar in the way that the Compliment Responses are structured. However, the analysis of the data suggested that Embedded APs include some differences in terms of frequency. Embedded APs in American English have a higher frequency than the Turkish Embedded APs. The data suggested five Embedded APs for American English and three for Turkish. Even though the Embedded APs are small in number, there is still a difference between the two languages in relation to Embedded APs. Also it is noteworthy that in both languages out of a hundred exchanged only eight out of are Embedded APs. This is quite low in overall number. The scarcity of such a structure may suggest that in both languages interlocutors tend to directly respond to Compliments instead of employing other acts between the two pair-parts of the APs. This may suggest that the structures of Compliment Speech Events are mostly Plain APs or APs with Supportive Acts in both languages.

The comparison of the Compliment Speech Events' content in both languages suggested some similarities as well as some differences in terms of Discourse Acts. Starting with the similarities, three of the pairs are found to be the identical in both languages. These are *Compliment - Accepting* Pairs, *Compliment - Rejecting* Pairs and *Compliment - Providing Account* Pairs. All of the mentioned pairs are present in both languages. This may suggest that interlocutors in both languages have common Compliment Responses that can even be labeled as standard Compliment Responses. The similarities seem to accord with the results of other researches, such as Pomerantz (1978), Herbert (1989), Holmes and Brown (1987) and Nelson, Al-Batal and Echols (1996), who all suggest that Accepting or Rejecting are found in American English as well as other languages such as Arabic and Spanish. Thus it could very well be suggested that these common Compliment Responses are also to be found in Turkish,

signifying universality in the Turkish Compliment Speech Events as well. Providing Account also is suggested to be present in different languages and in American English, as Golato (2003) names the Discourse Act of Providing Account as commenting on history for German and American English. Another study conducted by Herbert (1986) also places commenting on history as a Compliment Response category, which is the second part of the Compliment Speech Event. As a consequence, this research sets forth that Providing History is present in Turkish as a Compliment Response as well as other languages. The differences, on the other hand, are also present. There are three pairs that are different between the two languages. Looking into the analysis, it is observed that Turkish has the *Compliment - Ignoring* Pair and the *Compliment -Demanding Reassurance* Pair whereas American English exchanges include the *Compliment - Downtoning* Pair, the *Compliment -Returning Compliment* Pair, and the *Compliment - Directing the Compliment to Someone Else* Pair. These differences are in terms of Compliment Responses. It is worth mentioning that the *Compliment - Ignoring* Pair is only to be found among Turkish exchanges, whereas *Downtoning*, *Returning Compliment* and *Directing the Compliment to Someone Else* can be found in Turkish Compliment Responses but functioning differently such as a Supportive Act. Thus it should be noted that those different Acts, except *Ignoring*, are all present in both languages. However, they are not used as the initial Compliment Responses of the Compliment Speech Events, but as Supportive Acts after the initial responses. In general, American English tends to include more pair kinds than Turkish. In the data, Turkish has five different pairs, whereas American English had six pair.

The second level of the data analysis describing the realization of Discourse Acts by different Speech Acts suggested some differences as well as similarities between the two languages. It is worth noting that, in the data, Turkish has thirteen Discourse Acts, whereas American English has eleven Discourse Acts. However, only the major acts will be discussed in this section. The first Discourse Act to be examined is *Complimenting*, which was realized only by the Praising Speech Act in Turkish. On the other hand, Complimenting in American English was realized by two different Speech Acts, namely the Praising Speech Act and Expressing Liking. This is a minor difference, since Expressing Liking is a very formulaic Speech Act. Thus, both of the languages share similar characteristics in terms of realization of the Complimenting Discourse Acts. Another Discourse Act worth mentioning because of the differences is

Accepting. Each language has a wide variety of Speech Acts that directly or indirectly enable the realization of Accepting as a Discourse Act. The Thanking and Agreeing Speech Acts are the only common Speech Acts that enable the realization of Accepting in both languages. They are also high in number in both languages. Thus, the interlocutors in Turkish and American English can very well be said to choose very mechanical or prescribed approaches to Accepting. However, in American English Thanking seems to appear with other Speech Acts, such as the realization of Accepting by Thanking and Asking for a Comparison. There are five different pairs in American English like this; whereas, Turkish only has two instances of this occurrence. Both languages show a very rich amount of Speech Acts that directly or indirectly enable the realization of Accepting. Looking into *Downtoning*, there is only one common Speech Act between the two languages that enable the realization of Downtoning: Providing Account Speech Act. Both in American English and Turkish interlocutors downplay the Compliment by Providing Account regarding the Object of the Compliment. There are also different Speech Acts, such as the Criticizing Self Speech Act in Turkish and Mentioning a Negative Aspect in American English. Since Downtoning is a perlocutionary act, the Speech Acts that enables it can be different and very unique, such as Praising the Complimenter in American English. Another finding that should be discussed is the realization of *Rejecting*. Rejecting is realized Non-Verbally in Turkish which is the only example for this Discourse Act. On the other hand, in American English there is a richer source of Speech Acts that enable the realization of Rejecting. Disagreeing and Mentioning a Negative Aspect are examples of the Speech Acts realizing Rejecting. Another Discourse Act that should be examined is *Returning Compliment*. One of the Speech Acts realizing Returning Compliment in Turkish is found to be quite distinctive to Turkish, which is Uttering a Formulaic Utterance (Maşallah - Praise Be) along with Praising. In American English, on the other hand, it is observed to be Praising only. The only Discourse Act that didn't present any differences between the two languages is *Demanding Reassurance*. The realization of Demanding Assurance was only enabled by Asking for Confirmation Speech Act in both languages.

5.4. Implications for ELT

For learners of a second language to be able to use the target language effectively, they need to develop Communicative and Pragmatic Competence. Speech

Acts and the appropriate usage of Speech Acts are one of the most important aspects of Pragmatic Competence. Because of this, acquisition of the conventions and the effective usage of target language Speech Acts are crucial for learners of English as a second language.

As Holmes points out (Holmes 1988, p. 486), compliments are social lubricants, an important part of social interaction. Moreover, they are tightly bound to culture. For this reason it is important to compare Compliment Speech Events in Turkish and American English. The similarities and differences of the different acts the interlocutors employ should be studied. The analysis and identification of the differences might shed a light such questions: What do learners of English lack in terms of Communicative and Pragmatic Competence? What can be done to help learners acquire target language Speech Act production? The findings of studies which compare two languages might also be of use in developing a foreign language curriculum.

5.5. Recommendations for further research

Studies comparing other Speech Events rather than Compliments of Turkish and American English may be carried out. In addition to this, gender, age, background and power role of the interlocutors can be taken into account. Some of these studies might even compare the components of Speech Events on a lexical and syntactic level. Also the universal patterns of Compliment Speech Event can be further analyzed.

REFERENCES

- Arikdal, A. U. (2006). *A conversational analysis of classroom discourse in elt Context at Çukurova University*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 158-166). London: Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U. P.
- Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 6(2), 31-48.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, P. (1978). Universals in language u sage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness strategies between american english and chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20 (1), 49-75.
- Chiang, B. & Pochtrager, F. (1993). *A pilot study of compliment response of American born English speakers and Chinese-born English speakers*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 803)
- Clark, H. H., & Bangerter, A. (2004). Changing conceptions of reference. In Noveck, I. & Sperber, D. (Eds.), *Experimental Pragmatics* (pp. 25-49). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clayman, S. E., & Maynard, D. W. (1995). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In P. ten Have and G. Psathas (eds.) *Situated order: studies in the social organization of talk and embodied activities*. Washington: University Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Creese, A. (1991). Speech act variation in British and American English. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 7(2), 37-58.

- Cohen, A. D. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18 (2), 253-267.
- Daikuhara, M. (1986). A study of compliments from a cross-cultural perspective: Japanese vs American English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 2(2), 103-134.
- Demo, D. (2001). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Retrieved October 21, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0107demo.html>
- Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Fraser, B. (1975). Hedged performatives. Cole and J.L.Morgan (Eds), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech acts*. (pp. 187-232). New York.
- Funk, I.K. & Wagnalls, A.W. (1968). *Standard college dictionary*. New York : Funk & Wagnalls Publishing Company.
- Garfinkel, H. (1974). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Golato, A. (2002). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.(5), 547-571.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 90-121.
- Golato, A. (2002). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 547-571.
- Goodwin, C. & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 283-307.
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbert, R.K. (1986). Say "thank you" - or something. *American Speech* 61, 76-88.
- Herbert, R. (1989). The ethnography of English compliments and compliment responses: A contrastive sketch. W. Oleksy (Ed.), *Contrastive pragmatics*, 3-35, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Herbert, R. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. *Language in Society*, 19, 201-224
- Holmes, J. (1986). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 28(4), 485-508.
- Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: a sex-preferential politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 445-465.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.

- Holmes, J. & Brown, D. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(3), 523-546.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence, In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-93). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Huth, T. (2006). Negotiation structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2025-2050.
- Kroon, C. (1995). *Discourse Particles in Latin*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben Press
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). *Conversation Analysis: Studies From the First Generation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Liddicoat, A., (2007) *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum
- Manes, J. (1983). Compliments: A mirror of social values. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 82-95). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Manes, J. & Wolfson, N. (1981). The Compliment formula. In F. Coumas (ed), *Conversational Routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 115-132): The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- McCarthy, M. (1991), *Discourse analysis for language teachers: what is discourse analysis?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, G., Al-Batal, M., & Echols, E. (1996). Arabic and English compliment responses: Potential for pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 17 (4), 411-432.
- Olateju, Moji A. (1998). *Patterns of Interaction in the Science and Humanities ESL Classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(3), 287-306.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 79-112). New York/San Francisco/London: Academic Press.

- Richards, J. C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992), *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Richards, J., Platt, T. & Weber, H. (1985). *A Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Ruhi, Ş. (2006). Politeness in compliment responses: A perspective from naturally occurring exchanges in Turkish. *Pragmatics* 16(1) .43-101
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1992). Toward an analysis of discourse . In Coulthard, M. (Ed.), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-34). London: Routledge.
- Sharifian, F. (2005). The Persian cultural schema of Shekastehnafsi: A study in compliment responses in Persian and Anglo Australian speakers. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 13(2), 338-361.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). *Discourse as an Interactional Accomplishment: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sacks, H. (1979). Hotrodder: a revolutionary category. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 7-14). New York: Irvington.
- Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289- 327.
- Schmidt, R. W. & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 129-157.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 59-82), New York Academic Press.
- Searle, J.R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5, 1-23.
- Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Srenstrom, A.B. (1994): *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London: Longman
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 117-124.

- Wolfson, N. (1984). Pretty Is as Pretty Does. A Speech Act View of Sex Roles. *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: Pienum Press.
- Wolfson, N. (1983). An Empirically Based Analysis of Complimenting in English. In Wolfson, Nessa/Judd, Elliot (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Rowley, (pp. 82-95). Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Wolfson, N. & Manes, J. (1980). The compliment as a social strategy. *Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication*, 13(3), 391-410.
- Yu, M. (2005). Sociolinguistic competence in the complimenting act of native Chinese and American English speakers: A mirror of cultural value. *Language and Speech*, 48(1), 91-119.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name : Can ŞAKIRGİL
Place of Birth : Antakya
Date of Birth : 23. 10. 1984

E-mail : cansakirgil@gmail.com, cansakirgil@cag.edu.tr

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

2008-2011 Master of Arts, Çukurova University, The Institute of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching Department, ADANA
2007-2008 University of Florida, Graduate classes at the Department of Linguistics, FL, USA
2005-2006 Fall semester, Bachelor of Arts, Provinciale Hogeschool Limburg, Hasselt, Belgium
2002-2007 Bachelors of Arts, Çukurova University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department, ADANA
1995-2002 Hatay Osman Ötken Anatolian High School, HATAY
1990-1995 Ali Sayar Primary School, HATAY

WORK EXPERIENCE

2009- Lecturer at Çağ University, Mersin
2007-2008 Fulbright Language Teaching Assistant at Center for European Studies, University of Florida, FL, USA