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

Table 2: Level of Speaker Initiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Untutored</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tutored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(15.3)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(62.7)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee-Induced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3. Level of appropriateness

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

Table 3: Level of Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Untutored</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tutored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native norm appropriate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(93.5)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troublesome</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-normative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Linguistic well-formedness

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Linguistic Well-formedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untutored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-like/Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troublesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligible/Failed Attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Adjectival repertoire

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Adjectival Repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Different Semantically Positive Adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untutored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[ t = 2.23^* \quad p < .05, \ df = 16 \]

Replies to Compliments

1. Reply type and its effect on the interaction

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Reply Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reply Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thanks, agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Comment, shift credit, return, downgrade, question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deny, ignore, disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 38.809*  p < .05, df = 2
Table 6 compares the raw numbers and percentages of reply types for learners in both groups. Response types for learners in the untutored group were predominantly acceptance or rejection replies. In essence these learners relied on simple expressions of appreciation and agreement ("thank you" "yes") -- or denial ("no" "that's not true") -- or they ignored the compliment altogether by means of silence, laughter, or by shifting to a new topic. By contrast, learners in the tutored group responded to 67% of the compliments with replies in the deflect category. These learners exhibited skill in using a variety of deflect strategies. Furthermore, their responses were longer and more closely approximated the length of the native speakers' replies. Both the type of reply and its length appeared to have a salutary effect on sustaining interaction and sharing the conversational burden. An example from both groups shows this contrast more dramatically:

**Untutored:**

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

**Tutored:**

(Re: the NNS's beach bag)  
NS: I see them sell these at I like them  
NNS: Really? It's made in Korea, and it I think it's useful and it lasts a long time and during summertime I think I can use this for several summertime at least for 5 years or something.  
NS: yeah  
NNS: so I think it's a good choice  
NS: It would be fun to go to the beach with that  
NNS: yeah
NS: I like the colors.
NNS: Uh huh yeah there's various colors and hard to find just this one.
NS: It's a beautiful bag. I love the colors. I see them selling //it
NNS: //yeah//
NS: //on 40th street and
they have such beautiful colors on the bag and they're handmade too which
is great. I love how they I wish I knew how to do more weaving and knitting
and things like that.
NNS: Oh yeah you do knitting?

Summary and Conclusion

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