

*A Comparative Study on Compliment Response
between Indonesian EFL Students and English Native Speakers*

Maria Febriani Seran, Macquarie University, Australia

Asian Conference on Education 2018
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

While western people use more acceptance continuum on compliment response, Indonesians utter more denial continuum which can somehow put speakers into a face-threatening situation. This study investigated compliment response employed by EFL students and English native speakers. Two research questions were set: 1) How do Indonesian EFL students and English native speakers respond to compliments?. 2) Is there any correlation between Indonesian EFL students' proficiency level and their compliment response utterances in English?. This study involved three groups of participants: 12 English native speakers, 12 high-proficiency and 12 low-proficiency Indonesian EFL university students. The research instruments used in this study were an online grammar test and a set of ten discourse completion tasks. Participants' responses were coded and analysed using Tran's compliment response framework. The study found that native speakers combined some compliment upgrades and appreciation tokens in compliment response; whereas, Indonesian EFL students combined some compliment responses in their utterances, including, appreciation token, return, and compliment downgrade. There is a correlation between students' proficiency level and their compliment response utterances as most high-proficiency EFL students produced utterance more varied and more similar to those employed by native speakers than that used by low-proficiency students. The combination strategies used by EFL students were evidence of L2 knowledge deficiency and the influence of pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. Therefore, EFL teachers should explicitly teach more compliment response strategies to raise students' awareness on English culture and elaborate their speaking to be more competent as close to native speakers as possible.

Keywords: compliment response, EFL high-proficiency students, EFL low-proficiency students, English native speakers.

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

I. Introduction

In L2 communication, not only non-native English speakers carry their knowledge of English language, such as, grammatical structure, vocabulary choice, pronunciation, and intonation, but they also tend to get influenced by their L1 cultures and sometimes transfer their utterance from L1 to L2 (Cedar & Setiadi, 2016, p. 63). The influence of speaker's L1 culture somehow can lead to a face-threatening situation for both speaker and hearer when it comes to respond on speech acts, for example, compliments and compliment response. It is argued that non-native English speakers respond to compliment in a different way due to the L1 cultural and norm diversities which bound their identity and require them to perform differently in specific acts (Phoorcharoensil, 2012, p. 276). Compliments are used by speakers to show their gratitude to the hearer and in return they expect a compliment response uttered by the recipient. Responding to compliments somehow can cause both positive and negative face as one can be considered as immodest or conceited meanwhile at the same time, rejecting the compliment can put someone at risk of face losing and impoliteness (Gajaseni, 1994, as cited in Cedar & Setiadi, 2016, p.64). English native speakers use more acceptance continuum on compliment response; however, few studies on compliment response revealed that Indonesians are using more denial continuum than acceptance continuum on compliment response (Cedar & Setiadi, 2016, p.65).

Although some researchers have studied English compliment responses (CR) used by Indonesian speakers, no previous study has investigated the CRs in relation to the proficiency- level differences of Indonesian EFL learners in which this research seeks to address. The aim of this study is to compare the ways English native speakers and Indonesian EFL students respond to compliment and examine whether there is a correlation between Indonesian EFL learners' different proficiency level and their compliment response in English. Therefore, the research seeks to address the following two questions: 1. How do Indonesian EFL low-proficiency and high-proficiency students and English native speakers respond to compliments in English? 2. Is there any correlation between Indonesian EFL students' proficiency level and their compliment response use in English? Two hypotheses were built upon these two questions as follows: 1. Indonesian EFL students are more prone to denial continuum than acceptance continuum on compliment response. 2. There is a correlation between Indonesian EFL learners' proficiency and their compliment response use in English in that high-proficiency learners' compliment response strategies are more varied and are more similar to those employed by native English speakers than that in low-proficiency learners. This research provides an exciting opportunity to advance EFL teachers and learners' knowledge of cross cultural understanding, learners' awareness on cultural differences and explicit pragmatic instruction.

II. Literature Review

This section briefly discusses theoretical references of pragmatics, cross-cultural studies, compliment and compliment response, and critically reviews relevant studies conducted by earlier researchers.

2.1. *Discourse, pragmatic and cross cultural studies*

Discourse is multiple ways of saying-doing-being-valuing in the appropriate costume and interaction as one does not merely say the right thing grammatically correct, but he also needs to say it at the right time and in the right time (Gee, 1990, p.137). Meanwhile, pragmatics is the study of language in action that explores the meaning beyond the utterances which is embedded on the basis of the social and situational context (Stadler, 2013, p. 1). As each context demands certain functional knowledge and pragmatic competence, the interlanguage speakers, L2 speakers, are expected to possess both competencies in order to be able to take part in communication appropriately at the right time and in the right context (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984 p. 196). Therefore, the cross-cultural studies have been conducted in many contexts to investigate whether the L2 speakers have understood both functional and pragmatic rules of use for a given language. The speech act theory is one of the main cross-cultural pragmatic platforms that concentrates exclusively on specific speech events, such as compliments, apologies, refusals, requests, greeting, complaints, and disagreements (Stadlers, 2013 p.3). As the speech acts events vary from culture to culture, the L2 speakers tend to bring their L1 culture when dealing with those speech act situations which somehow can lead to communication breakdown and face threatening acts.

2.2. *Compliment and compliment response*

This current study investigated one speech act that is compliment response as this speech act is obviously “cultural and sociologically condition” (Jucker, 2009, p. 1612) where compliments that are appropriate in a particular situation for one language community might be inappropriate in a comparable situation for another language community. Holmes (1988, as cited in Phoocharoensil, 2012, p. 276) defined compliment as an explicit or implicit speech act which are attributed to the hearer for some goods, such as possession, characteristics, and skills. Compliment is uttered by speakers to build or foster solidarity through showing admiration or approval (Herbert, 1989, as cited in Istifci, 2017, p. 17). In the same line, Brown and Levinson (1978, as cited in Bowe, Martin & Manns, 2007, p. 53) claimed that the act of complimenting was considered as a positive politeness strategy; thus, appropriate responses to compliments become essential. However, responding to a compliment places the speakers in a dilemma whether to agree with or reject the compliment (Herbert, 1989, as cited in Allami & Montazeri, 2012, p. 467).

To investigate the compliment response studies, some frameworks of compliment response categories have been designed by previous scholars. The classic framework was first proposed by Pomerantz (1978, as cited in Razi, 2013, p. 62) in which she categorised the compliment response into three degrees, acceptance (appreciation token, agreement), rejections (disagreement), and self-praise avoidance mechanisms (praise down-graders, referent shift).

Herbert (1990, as cited in Allami & Montazeri, 2012, p. 466) and Chiang and Pochtrager (1993, as cited in Allami & Montazeri, 2012, p. 466) classified the compliment responses into two levels. On micro level, there were 17 patterns, as follows: appreciation token, politeness formula, comment acceptance, smiling, comment, offering, praise upgrade, comment history, reassignment, return, entreaty,

scale down, question, disagreement, qualification, no acknowledgement, request interpretation. On macro level, the responses were allocated in five classes, they are, acceptance, positive elaboration, neutral elaboration, negative elaboration, denial, and smiling.

Another scholar, Holmes (1989, as cited in Sadeghi & Zarei, 2013, p. 34) offered the taxonomy of CR strategies as follows: accept (appreciation token, agreeing utterance, downgrading, and utterance), reject (disagreeing utterance, question accuracy, and challenge sincerity), evade (shift credit, informative comment, and request reassurance), surprising, smiling, suggestion, wish/hope, and pleasing.

Similarly, these CR frameworks above tend to separate each compliment response into its category. However, it was found that people's utterances on compliment responses are not isolated, rather than placing compliment response somewhere in between acceptances and agreements on the one side and rejections and disagreement on the other sides (Pomerants, 1978, as cited in Tran, 2010, p. 108). Therefore, Tran (2010, p. 106) developed a new framework of compliment that connected each category of compliment response and formed two continuums as follows (see appendix 2 for more explanation).

Compliment upgrade => Agreement => Appreciation Token => Return => Explanation
=> Reassignment => Non-idiomatic response => Compliment downgrade =>
Disagreement => Expressing gladness => follow-up question => doubting (question =>
opting out.

Note:

The red words are categorised as acceptance continuum

The green words are middle continuum

The blue ones are avoidance continuum

Figure 1

2.3 Previous compliment response studies

A large and growing body of literature has investigated compliment response studies in many different contexts. Allami and Montazeri (2012, p. 466) investigated 40 Iranian EFL males and females' compliment responses with the consideration of gender, age, and educational background using discourse completion task (DCT) survey and concluded that most Iranian EFL students accepted compliments. Nonetheless, some utterances were influenced by their culture-specific behavioural norms due to the lack of sufficient pragmatic knowledge. This study supported the present study as it examined the utterances produced by different proficiency level of Iranian EFL students. However, the use of rating treatment as another data instrument could lead to the inconsistent result of participants' response and their own judgement. Instead of using rating treatment, it could be improved by follow-up interview to justify the reasons why they responded to the compliment in the way they had.

Likewise, Phoocharoensil (2012, p. 276) conducted the L2 English compliment responses on four groups of participants: native speakers of American English, native speakers of Thai, High-proficiency Thai EFL learners and low proficiency Thai EFL learners and found that while Americans accepted compliments, Thais used more of the denial end, doubting questions, compliment downgrade responses. Thai EFL learners with high level of proficiency were more inclined to use CR which corresponded to the American norms, whereas learners whose proficiency was lower apparently responded to English compliments far more differently from the America convention. This study was in line with the proposed study as it also studied the correlation between proficiency level and CR strategies in English. Besides, this study was similar to the study of Allami and Montazeri as it used DCT survey as the data instrument. Nonetheless, the weakness of this study is that the DCT scenarios in this study were not clear, particularly as, social status and social distance were not emphasized. Consequently, the proposed study will improve the DCT scenarios in the way the social status and distance are clearly stated.

Furthermore, Razi's (2012, p. 61) contractive study of compliment responses among Australian English and Iranian Persian speakers conducted by Razi (2012, p. 61) showed that although both Iranian EFL students and Australians preferred to use CR strategies, such as, accept- evade- reject, the accept strategy was less used by Iranians than that in Australians. This finding was the opposite of Allami and Montazeri's study.

In a case study on the use of compliments in Persian and English, Sadeghi and Zarei (2013, p. 30) found the Iranian Persian EFL learners applied accept-evade-reject strategies in both English and Persian DCT survey. This result of the study contradicted to Allami and Montazeri's study; however, Sadeghi and Zarei's study supported the study of Razi (2012, p. 61). Besides, the result of the study was lack of research implication on the pedagogical practice.

A small-scale compliment response study in North Cyprus by Sucuoglo and Bahcelerli (2015, p. 3286) reached another conclusion where the non-native speakers (NNS) did not produce the target-like compliment response due to the influence of L1 culture and tended to apply silence when the compliments were given from the strangers. The finding of this study confirmed the prior study of Allami and Montazeri (2012). The strength of this study is that the researchers conducted a follow-up interview after giving the DCT survey for the participants to find out participants' justification on what they wrote in the DCT survey.

In recent study, Cedar and Setiadi (2016, p. 63) examined Indonesian EFL learners and Thai EFL learners on compliment responses in English and reported that Indonesians were more prone to deny compliments, while, Thai learners tended to accept compliments. The weakness of this study is that although the researchers administered the oxford placement test to the participants to categorise students' proficiency level, the researchers did not mention how students of certain proficiency level produced their compliment response performance.

III. Research Methodology

3.1. Participants

This study involved three groups of participants as follows, a group of 12 English native speakers, a group of 12 low-proficiency Indonesian EFL students, and a group of 12 high-proficiency Indonesian EFL students. These two groups of Indonesian EFL learners are second and third-year university students in majoring English Education at Widya Mandira Catholic University, Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. Meanwhile, native English speakers in this study are the researcher's friends on Facebook who are Australians, Americans and British.

The participants were recruited through the researcher's Facebook account where research invitation with the attachment of DCT questionnaire link was sent online. Those who were willing to be the research participants would click the link on the survey. Indonesian EFL learners were instructed to work on all sections, while, English native speakers were asked to respond on section 1 and section 3 only. The questionnaire can be accomplished in approximately 25 minutes for both native speakers and non-native speakers.

3.2. Research instruments

The study used an online DCT questionnaire. The DCT questionnaire consisted of three sections as follows. Section one contained the research consent upon participants' willingness in taking part in the study, subjects' identity information whether they are considered as native speaker or non-native speakers, and the research instruction. Section two was a test of 10 English grammar questions and section three provided 8 compliment response scenarios.

Ten grammar questions taken from Barron TOEFL exercise were used to categorise Indonesian EFL students' proficiency level. Meanwhile, the DCT questionnaire contained 8 items which measured the variables of compliments topics, such as possession, skill/performance, appearance, and personality traits, with the consideration of social distance (either close or distance), and relative power (equal, high). The design of DCT scenarios were modified from the DCT survey of two previous studies, such as Phoocharoensil's study (2012, p. 287) and Allami and Motazeri's study (2012, p. 478). Although many criticisms have been raised regarding the DCT due to the unnatural occurring data and the lack of turn-taking elements, this test allows the researchers to control the language that appears in the setting context and to collect a large sample of data in a short period of time (Arcidiacono, 2013, p. 23; Martinez-flor, 2011, p. 53).

3.3. Data collection

The study applied a coding analysis where all the responses were coded and measured its percentage of occurrence and later described. Participants' responses were analysed using Tran's compliment response framework as it was assumed that Indonesian EFL students might use the combination of compliment response on their utterances. Therefore, the data was best explained using Tran's framework to answer these two core research questions.

As for students' proficiency level, Indonesian EFL students' responses on the grammar test were categorised into two groups. Those who gained score 6 to 10 were classified as high-proficiency students, whereas, those who received point below 5 were considered as EFL students of low-proficiency.

IV. Result and discussion

Based on the data collection, there were 384 compliment response items produced by three groups of research participants. The data was coded into each continuum; acceptance continuum, middle continuum and the avoidance continuum. Surprisingly, the researcher also found 4 other categories which were not classified by Tran in her CR taxonomy, they are, hope, joking, suggestion, and offering. The following section reviews and discuss the research findings.

4.1. Comparison between Indonesian EFL low-proficiency and high-proficiency students and English native speakers' compliment responses in English.

No	CR strategies	EFL low-proficiency		EFL high-proficiency learners		English Native Speakers	
		Frequency	Percentage of CRs (%)	Frequency	Percentage of CRs (%)	Frequency	Percentage of CRs (%)
Acceptance continuum							
1	Compliment upgrade	31	22.3	13	10.24	16	13.68
2	Agreement	3	2.17	4	3.14	5	4.28
3	Appreciation Token	30	21.58	37	29.14	34	29.05
Total category of acceptance		64	46.05	54	42.52	55	47.01
Middle continuum							
4	Return	5	3.7	11	8.67	6	5.12
5	Explanation	14	10.06	12	9.45	15	12.83
6	comment history	9	6.46	3	2.36	3	2.56
7	Reassignment	2	1.44	7	5.52	5	4.27
8	Non-idiomatic response	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total middle continuum		30	21.66	33	26	29	24.78
The avoidance continuum							
9	Compliment downgrade	10	7.2	10	7.88	9	7.7
10	Disagreement	4	2.86	3	2.37	3	2.57
11	Expressing gladness	9	6.46	18	14.17	8	6.85
12	follow-up question	0	0	0	0	4	3.41
13	doubting	12	8.62	4	3.14	5	4.28
14	opting out	0	0	0	0	1	0.85
Total denial continuum		35	25.14	35	27.56	30	25.66
Other continuum							
15	hope	6	4.31	4	3.14	0	0
16	joking	1	0.71	0	0	1	0.85
17	suggestion	2	1.42	1	0.78	1	0.85
18	offering	1	0.71	0	0	1	0.85
Total other continuum		10	7.15	5	3.92	3	2.55
Overall Total		139	100	127	100	117	100

Table 1. Percentage of compliment response among three participant groups

From the table above we can see that there were 139 items, 127 items and 117 items employed by two groups of Indonesian EFL students and English native speakers respectively. What is interesting in this data is that three groups of research participants produced varying frequencies in acceptance continuum, middle continuum, denial continuum and the additional continuum.

In general, these three groups were found to accept compliments. However, the percentage of acceptance continuum was slightly higher in English native data than

that in Indonesian EFL data. English native speakers responded to compliment with 47.01% of acceptance, i.e. appreciation token, compliment upgrade, and agreement. Meanwhile, Indonesian EFL low-proficiency and high-proficiency students achieved 46.05% and 45.52% respectively. This finding supports the number of earlier studies, such as, Razi's (2012, p. 61), Phoocharoensil's (2012, p. 276), Sucuoglo and Bahcelerli's (2015, p. 3286) study where English native speakers accepted compliments more often than non-native English speakers did. This finding, in some ways, contradicted that of Cedar and Setiadi's (2016, p. 67) study that Indonesian EFL students were more prone to denial continuum. This could emerge as the result of Indonesian EFL learners' educational background, that is English major; therefore, they presumably already acquired certain functional knowledge and pragmatic competence to be able to take part in L2 communication appropriately (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984, p. 196).

Interestingly, this present study found that both groups of Indonesian EFL students also responded to compliment by combining one compliment with other compliment response strategies. For instance.

- Indonesian EFL low-proficiency student: *Thank you so much bestie, I need time to find shoes like this.* (appreciation token- compliment downgrade)
- Indonesian EFL high-proficiency student: *Thank you, dear. I'll keep up the good work.* (appreciation token-hope)

This result proves that influence of L1 occurred in L2 interaction where Indonesian EFL students accepted other speaker's compliment by thanking them while at the same time justifying their utterance in order to be seen as being modest. This finding was consistent with Istifci's (2017, p. 21) study which found that non-native English speakers used CRs combination strategies in their utterances.

In terms of middle continuum, these three groups produced significantly different rates. English native speakers and Indonesian EFL high-proficiency students used 29% and 26% of this strategy respectively.

For example:

- English native speaker (NS 6): *Thanks! Love your scarf* (Return)
- Indonesian EFL high-proficiency learner (HP 6): *Thank you, that's a very sweet of you.* (Return)

Meanwhile, Indonesian EFL low-proficiency students less favoured this CR middle continuum (21.66%). This finding supported Cedar and Setiadi's (2016, p. 69) findings where there was an internal conflict faced by complimentees by either accepting the compliment with the risk of showing off or denying the compliment with the risk of impoliteness.

As shown in table 1, it was noticeable that Indonesian EFL high proficiency learners produced high percentage of denial continuum (27.56%), meanwhile, English native speakers and low-proficiency students shared quite similar overall percentage of this strategy by 25.14% and 25.66% respectively. These findings lend support to the past studies of L2 English CRs (e.g, Phoocharoensil, 2012, p. 276; Cedar & Septiani, 2016, p. 69). Despite high percentage of acceptance continuum employed by Indonesian EFL students, there were still some degrees of avoidance continuum found in their utterance due to the value of humility and modesty in L1 culture.

For example:

- Indonesian EFL high-proficiency learner (HP 10): *Sir, I am eternally to you for your attention towards me as one of your students. I am very thankful that you are my teacher* (explanation- expressing gladness)
- Indonesian EFL low-proficiency learner (LP 8): *Yes sir, i already save a lot of money for this* (Explanation)

This study also found another continuum, such as, hope, joking, suggestion, and offering which were not included in Tran's CR strategies. These four findings were categorised on the macro level of compliment response strategies in Holmes' CRs taxonomy (1989, as cited in Sadeghi & Zarei, 2013, p. 34). These four CRs strategy were mostly preferred by Indonesian EFL low-proficiency students (7.15%), compared to 3.92% and 2.55% of this strategy in Indonesian high-proficiency students' and English native speakers' data. The findings of four other CR strategies further supported the idea of earlier studies (Sadeghi & Zerai, 2013, p. 34; Istifci, 2017, p. 21; Cedar & Setiadi, 2016, p. 69). These categories were used to accept compliment indirectly but at the same time concerned about others' condition.

For example:

- Indonesia EFL low-proficiency student: *Thanks... why you don't try this hair style too? i think it would be great too.* (appreciation token- suggestion)

It was clearly seen, as demonstrated above, that both groups of Indonesian EFL students were more prone to accept compliments and combine their CR strategies to show modesty than the English Native speakers did. Whereas, the English native speakers evidently used compliments far more other than the Indonesians. Having said that, the middle continuum and denial continuum were more preferred by Indonesian EFL low-proficiency students than that employed by English native speakers and Indonesian EFL high-proficiency students. This findings were the result of lack of L2 cultural knowledge and L1 pragmatic transfer which will be discussed in the following section. To summarise, these above findings have contradicted the first hypothesis, which claimed that Indonesian students would go toward the denial continuum.

4.2 Indonesian EFL learners' CR use

This current study also aimed to examine whether there is a correlation between the use of CR in L2 English and learners' proficiency. As seen in table 1, Indonesian learners of high proficiency level apparently employed CR pattern resembling those in English native speaker forms, 54 times and 55 times. With in-depth investigation, the data indicated that the high-proficiency learners uttered 10.24% of compliment upgrade, whereas, the English native speakers produced 13.68% of this strategy. As for agreement, high-proficiency learners generated 4% of the strategy which was 1% less than that uttered by English native speakers (5%). Despite this, both groups brought slightly similar rate of appreciation token, 29.14% and 29.05% respectively. In terms of middle continuum, the high-proficiency student showed slightly similar rate toward comment history (2.36%) and reassignment (5.52%) to English native speakers' rates of these two strategies, (2.59% & 4.27% respectively). It is worth noticing that the percentage of avoidance continuum toward

disagreement and doubting was 2.37% and 3.14% achieved by high-proficiency learners. These proportions slightly resembled the same CR categories produced by Native speakers, 2.57% and 4.38% respectively. Furthermore, high-proficiency learners used less additional strategies, such as hope (3.14%) and suggestion (0.78) compared to English native speakers who employed 0.85% each for hope, joking, and suggestion, and used 2.55% of offering.

In contrast, Indonesian EFL learners of low-proficiency level responded to English compliment in a noticeably different manner from English native practice. That is, 22.3% of them used compliment upgrade which was the highest rate among these three groups. Nonetheless, only 21.5% of low-proficiency learners applied appreciation token in their compliment response, compared to 29.05% in English native data. This group also made up 2.17% of agreement which was three times lower than English native speakers' agreement rate, 5%. As for middle continuum, particularly return, explanation, comment history and reassignment, the low-proficiency learners employed the higher rate of comment history, 6.46% compared to 2.50% in Native speakers' data. Return was rarely used by this group as it was only 1.44%, compared to English native data, 4.27% and high proficiency student data, 5.52%. In terms of denial continuum, low-proficiency learners and English native speakers shared quite similar proportion of expressing gladness, 6.46% and 6.85 respectively. Nonetheless, it was noticeable that compared to English native speakers and high-proficiency students' rate of doubting, low-proficiency produced the highest rate of doubting strategy to deny compliment (8.62%).

In summary, the findings above supported the second claim that there was a correlation between Indonesian EFL learners' proficiency and their compliment response use in English. High-proficiency learners used compliment response strategies, for instance towards the acceptance continuum, comment history, reassignment, avoidance continuum and other additional continuum, which were more varied and were more similar to those employed by native English speakers than that used by low-proficiency learners. The higher proficiency in L2 the learners have, the higher-likelihood for L2 learners to have CR performance closer to the native speakers' norms (Phoocharoensil, 2012, p. 281). The following section discussed the influence of L1 pragmatic transfer in L2 interaction and students' lack of L2 knowledge.

4.2. Evidence of lack of L2 knowledge and pragmatic transfer

There were two reasons which caused Indonesian EFL learners of low-proficiency level respond to English compliment differently from English native practice, they are, lack of L2 cultural practice and the pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2.

The deficiency of adequate L2 cultural practice can be showed in the data where low-proficiency students overused the appreciation token, such as, thanking. This finding was in relation to Allami and Motazeri's study (2012, p.476) that students who were lack of L2 knowledge would find difficult to deal with real context and favourably choose to thank other people as compliment response instead of modifying their utterances.

Furthermore, Indonesia society also values modesty and want to be seen humble when responding to compliments (Cedar & Setiadi, 2016, p. 64). It was apparent that although many low-proficiency students tried to modify their compliment response, they still brought their L1 culture in L2 interaction; thus, they frequently employed the denial continuum, such as, doubting and disagreement, in order to be seen as modest.

In the contrary, students of high-proficiency less relied on L1 transfer and used more strategies which were closer to English native practice.

V. Pedagogical implication

Based on these finding above, two significant pedagogical implications are suggested for EFL English teachers.

First, EFL teachers should focus not only on the linguistics knowledge but also the pragmatic knowledge. EFL teachers are advised to introduce pragmatic aspects to EFL students through providing the authentic materials to the class, such as, English movies, videos, clips which allow learners to learn natural English use.

Second, when English teachers use authentic material to teach pragmatics, they are advised to design the English lesson based on the teaching pragmatic framework proposed by Martinez-flor and Uso-Juan (2016, as cited in Taguchi, 2011, p. 297) where it has six stages of pragmatic instruction: researching-reflecting- receiving-reasoning- rehearsing- revising. The first two stages are to allow students to understand pragmatic concepts through analysing the L1 pragmatic data. Teachers can use text conversation between Indonesian person meets or greets other people, like family, strangers. In the third and fourth stage, the teacher introduces the L2 text which shows how the native speaker greets other people. Teacher can engage students to both texts by comparing the L1 pragmatic data to L2 pragmatic data and examining the similarities and differences between two cultures. More L2 communicative activities and feedback are followed in stage six.

The consideration of teaching pragmatic is crucial in EFL class, as it not only raises learners' awareness on L2 target culture, but also allows learners to reflectively think and respect their L1 culture as well as enrich their knowledge of global cultural diversity.

VI. Conclusion

The study shows the similarities and differences between the group of English native speakers and the other groups of Indonesian EFL learners' CRs in terms of strategy use. In general, Indonesian students accepted compliments, but, students of high-proficiency level tended to respond to compliment in a way closer to the target-language culture, compared to low-proficiency students who still applied the L1 culture in L2 interaction due to L2 transfer and lack of L2 exposure. Therefore, providing a lesson through a teaching pragmatics framework can be one of many ways to introduce and exchange cross-cultural knowledge and allow learners to put the grammar in use, make their utterance more natural and say the right thing at the right time and in the right context.

Despite its fruitful contributions, the current study still has some limitations. First, although Indonesian EFL students took the grammar test designed by the researcher, the grammar test result did not simply represent students' overall proficiency level because there was a high possibility that students could look up the answers by consulting a dictionary, communication devices, and friends. It is suggested that future studies may recruit students who already took official TOEFL test to gain more valid data on students' proficiency. Lastly, the study applied DCT survey that has been criticized regardless of its advantage; thus, the future studies may apply more data collection instruments, such as, follow-up interview to discover more aspects of CRs use.

Acknowledgement:

The author wishes to extend her deepest gratitude and sincerest thanks to Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) for giving financial assistance to pursue her master degree.

References

- Allami, H., Montazeri, M. (2012). Iranian EFL learners' compliment responses. *SYSTEM*, 40(2012), 466-482. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.10.010>
- Arcidiacono, F. (2013). *Pragmatics: Quantitative Methods*. Chichester: Willey-Blackwell.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1984. Requests and Apologies. A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Bowe, J., Martin, K., & Manns, H. (2007). *Communication across cultures: mutual understanding in global world*. Cambridge Port Melbourne, Vic: Cambridge University Press.
- Cedar, P., Setiadi, A. (2016). Performance of Indonesian EFL Learners and Thai EFL Learners on Compliment Responses in English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. 5(7), 63-76.
- Istifci, I. (2017). Comparison of Chinese and Turkish EFL learners on the use of compliment responses. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 14-29.
- Gee, J. (1990). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. Hampshire: The Farmer Press.
- Martinez-flor, A. (2011). Research methodologies in pragmatics: Eliciting refusals to requests. *Estudios de lingüística inglesa aplicada*, 11(2011), 47-87.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2012). L2 English Compliment Response: An Investigation of Pragmatic Transfer. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(6), 276-287, Doi: 10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.276
- Razi, A. (2013). A constractive study of compliment responses among Australian English and Iranian Persian speakers. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70(2013), 61-66. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.038.
- Stadler, S. (2013). *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Chichester: Willey-Blackwell.
- Sucuoğlu, E., Bahçelerli, N.M. (2015). A study of compliment responses in English : a case of North Cyprus. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174(2015). 3285-3291. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.995.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and Issues. *Annual review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(2011), 289-310
- Tran, G.Q. (2010). Replying to compliments in English and Vietnamese. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 30(2010), 104-130

Zarei, G.R., Sadeghi, E. (2013). Investigating the Use of Compliments in Persian and English: A Case Study of Iranian EFL Students. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 2(2), 30-49.

Contact email: febrianiseran14@gmail.com

Appendices

Appendix 1

Questionnaire:

Section 1: Background Information

Who do you describe yourself?

- a. Native English Speaker
- b. Non-Native English Speaker.

Note: If you are a native English speaker, Ignore section 2 and go forward to section 3. If you are a non-native English speaker, please do the task on section 2 and section 3.

Section 2: Grammar Test

Instruction: there are 10 multiple questions below and you are asked to choose one correct answer only based on your grammar knowledge.

1. Almost everyone fails..... the driver's test on the first try
 - a. Passing
 - b. To have passed
 - c. To pass**
 - d. In passing
2. To relieve pain caused by severe burns, prevent infection, and treat for shock,..... immediate steps
 - A. Taking
 - B. To take
 - C. Taken
 - D. Take**
3. In general, by the second year of production, the price of a new piece of technology.... Significantly
 - a. Will decreased
 - b. Has decreased
 - c. Will have decreased**
 - d. Will has decreased
4. A vacuum will neither conduct heat nor....
 - a. Transmit sound waves**
 - b. Transmitting sound waves
 - c. Sound waves are transmitted
 - d. The transmission of sound waves
5. orangutans live alone
 - a. near all
 - b. almost all**
 - c. the all
 - d. the most all
6. The crime rate has begun to decline in New York City due to efforts on the part of both government and private citizens to curb...
 - a. Them**
 - b. Him
 - c. Its

- d. It
7. It is not clear how much students learn..... television classes without supervision and monitoring.
- A. For watching
- B. From watching**
- C. By watch
- D. To watch
8. Some ancient units such as the day, the foot, and the pound,..... today
- a. Are still in use**
- b. That are still in use
- c. Which are in use still
- d. Still in use
9. Canada does not require that U.S citizens obtain passports to enter the country, and.....
- a. Mexico does neither**
- b. Mexoci doesn't neither
- c. Neither Mexico does
- d. Either does Mexico.
10. While trying to build a tunnel through the blue ridge mountaints,....
- A. Coals was discovered by workmen at the construction site
- B. Workmen discovered coal at the construction site**
- C. The construction site was where coal was discovered by workmen
- D. It was the construction site where workmen discovered coal

Section 3: Discourse Completion Task Survey

Instruction: for this task, you are asked to read carefully these 8 scenarios below and imagine that you are involved in these particular situations. Write down your response/reply/answer on what the other speakers have said to you. There are no right or wrong answers.

DCT Survey

1. After having finished the dinner you had prepared for your family, your sister tells you, "*You're such a great cook.*"
What will you say to your sister?
2. Your boss comes over to your house and her/his eyes fall on your beautiful garden. She says "You've grown such lovely flowers"
What will you respond to your boss?
3. Your best friend notices that you've bought a new pair of shoes. She/he tells you, "*These look good on you and even the colours great on you.*"
What will you respond to your best friend?
4. Your boss saw your new laptop in your office and tells you, "*That's a nice laptop you've got there!*"
What will you reply to your boss?
5. Your classmate notices that you've had your hair cut. She says, "you look great in this new hair style."

What will you say to your classmate?

6. You have changed your dressing style this year. On noticing that, friend's parent tells you "this color suits you better. What will you respond to your friend's parent?"

7. You have always tried to get to the class on time. One day your lecturer tells you, "*You are one of my best students because of your punctuality.*" What will you say to your lecturer?

8. Your same-aged cousin always comes to you for advice when in trouble. Once s/he tells you, "*You always give the best advice. You're great.*" What will you say to your cousin?

Appendix 2: Tran's CR Taxonomy

- a. Compliment upgrade: the complimentee agrees with and increases the complimentary force.
- b. Agreement: the complimentee agrees with the complimentary force by providing a response which is "semantically fitted to the compliment"
- c. Agreement token: the complimentee may agree with the compliment assertion with simple "yes" or "yeah".
- d. Appreciation token: the complimentee recognises the status of the other speaker's previous utterance as a compliment and shows appreciation for it.
- e. Return. The complimentee reciprocates the act of complimenting by paying back the compliment to the complimenter
- f. Explanation/ comment history. The complimentee impersonalizes the complimentary force by giving further information which may frequently be irrelevant about the object of the compliment.
- g. Reassignment. The complimentee redirects the praise offered by the complimenter to some third person or to something else
- h. Non-idiomatic response: the complimentee implies that she does not agree with the compliment assertion.
- i. Compliment downgrade: the complimentee qualifies the praise force.
- j. Disagreement: the complimentee directly disagrees with the praise force.
- k. Disagreement token. The complimentee may disagree with the compliment assertion with a simple "no"
- l. Expressing gladness: the complimentee expresses his/her gladness that the complimenter likes the object of the compliment
- m. Follow-up question: the complimentee responds to the compliment with a question which elaborates the compliment assertion
- n. Doubting. The complimentee responds to the compliment with a question which corresponds to the request for repetition and or expansion of the compliment assertion.
- o. Opting out. The complimentee responds to the compliment with mere lau