

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses background of the study and some related and relevant theories in the form of theoretical framework and review of previous studies. This chapter also comprises the research questions, objectives of the study, scope and delimitations of the study.

1.1 Background

In everyday conversation, someone will use certain utterances, either directly or indirectly to convey their meaning. These utterances can be expressions of requests, speeches to apologize, or speeches to avoid or refuse. These utterances are usually framed with a certain impression to show polite behavior, such as thank you, greeting, flattery or praise, and sayings that express attention or attention to others, one of which is compliments and compliments responses.

Interesting things when it comes to online chatting are the use of words to compliment people as well as how they respond to it. There are several studies by diverse experts talking about compliments, for example (Buey, 2009). Some experts even focus on the gender point of view in giving as well as receiving compliment (Herbert, 1990). In the research of Herbert (Herbert, 1990), his found that compliments from men are generally accepted, moreover by men. Meanwhile, women commonly responded with several types of sentences when they were given compliments. These findings are based on the discussion of differences between male and female in speech acts as well as the sociolinguistic aspect of compliment behaviors.

As researcher have mentioned chronologically above, it turns out that the topic about compliment giving and responses has been a common issue. The conducted research is found both in offline and online settings. Several experts on their research even focuses on the way different gender deliver compliments. However, the advancement of research in this area needs to be executed because language changes and varies as time keeps moving forward. In addition, furthermore, no research has taken a focus on the dynamics of compliments and compliment responses within Twitter's fan-artist community. Thus, a research on the topic of compliments and compliment responses in the setting of fan-artist community is interesting to focus on

Twitter is currently one of the most engaging microblogging applications in the world. The amount of Twitter users increases during COVID-19 as it provides a place for its users to engage with people around the world. It currently has over 330 million active monthly users across the world and 80% of which access the tool by gadgets (Smith, 2020). As a global microblogging application, Twitter allows its users, through its post feature named Tweet, to engage and exchange ideas and opinions real-time. A Tweet is a 280 character-limited post which can also attach hyperlinks, photographs, video, and polls (Rosell-Aguilar, 2020). Of tweets, users can react through reply, retweet, quote retweet, and like features. These features allow users to engage and share their opinion on certain topics.

Twitter facilitates massive online chatting with diverse topics which allows its users to communicate anytime, anywhere, and every day. It is relevant to the idea that online chatting has become a culture nowadays (Slama, 2010). One of the most spoken opinions is the word compliments from the fan artist. the phenomenon of giving

compliments and compliments responses can show how the interaction and closeness that is owned by the artist and fan-artist community on Twitter. Not only that, but researchers can also find out the types of compliments given by fan artists to artists, and also how artists give compliments responses.

Among the many studies on compliments and compliments responses, research on how someone compliments and compliments responses on social media, especially Twitter, is the point that researchers consider quite interesting to discuss, including among the fan-artist community whose students come from various regions and countries the variety of culture. This allows researchers to get data about how the realization of the laudatory response among the fan-artist is associated with regional/country background variables, gender, and level of familiarity of the praiser with the compliment responder. Therefore, this research fills a research gap by adding a study of compliments and compliments responses at social media on the literature of compliments.

This research is expected to provide new knowledge in the study of pragmatics, especially regarding compliments and responses to compliments. As well as can reveal the use of rules-language in a speech community. Practically, this research is expected to provide an overview of compliments and compliment responses. Besides that, it is also hoped that it can be used as a reference and also a guideline when studying speech acts of praise responses for language learners. Also can improve our understanding of the function and meaning of the language used in a community on social media.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This sub-chapter comprises some related and relevant theories by several experts about compliments and compliment responses that are applied in this study.

They are as follows:

1.2.1 Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics is a combination of sociology and pragmatic. According to Kasper & Rose in (Purnomo & Khalawi, 2019) stated that “Socio-pragmatics is the interface of sociology and pragmatics and refers to the social perceptions of participant interpretation and performance of communicative action”. Similarly, Anna Tronsborg in (Haryanti, 2016) stated that “Sociopragmatics concerned with the analysis of significant patterns of interaction in particular social situations in a particular social system, and it emphasizes the interactive aspect and the acknowledgement of the social context”. So, the researcher concludes that sociopragmatics is a science that examines conditions, context, or more specifically discusses how a language is used. Sociopragmatics has a close relationship with sociology because of a person's social factors such as age, ethnicity, religion, gender, occupation, and other factors. These factors become an important basis in influencing someone in language.

Researchers use sociopragmatics because sociopragmatics refers to the analysis of interaction patterns in certain social situations and or certain social systems. Sociopragmatics not only prioritizes the language but also the social environment that supports the language. So, in other words, sociopragmatics is the meeting point between sociology and pragmatics. It is obvious that sociopragmatics is closely related

to sociology. However, sociopragmatics, similar to sociolinguistics, studies language in relation to society, requiring data or subjects of more than one individual. The object of sociology is not language, but society, and with the aim of describing society and behavior. The object of pragmatics is speech with the aim of finding the intention behind the speech. And the object of sociopragmatics is the intention of an utterance by paying attention to aspects of the language society.

Problems in sociopragmatics are not only related to the intent of the utterance (general pragmatics), but must also pay attention to the social aspects behind the emergence of the utterance. In different cultures, a speech act will have different values both in terms of politeness or manner of speech acts depending on the culture that underlies the speakers. Linguistic problems in this study can also be based on differences in social systems (such as age, caste, occupation, education) by paying attention to the purpose and situation where or how the speech act exists, as a consideration of factors that influence the emergence of speech acts.

In this study, research was conducted which included in the category of sociopragmatic research. The aim is to describe the verbal behavior of various dialog interactions between fan-artists and artists on social media Twitter. The research implies the sociolinguistic and pragmatic because in the realm of linguistics discipline research, sociopragmatic studies are a “new” approach. This study arose because of dissatisfaction with pragmatic studies which were limited to speaker's meaning and sociolinguistic studies which relied solely on language variations within a social group. This is what ultimately becomes the reason for the need for a study of speakers' intentions related to the pragmatic view of life and the study of speakers' intentions.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that sociopragmatics is a branch of pragmatics whose study emphasizes non-linguistic aspects, limited to the use of language in certain social conditions, which is bound by local conversations.

1.2.1.1 Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is a blend of sociology and linguistics. Sociology is a science about humans in a community or public. Meanwhile, linguistics is a field of science that studies language or takes language as its object. Fishman in (Chaer & Agustina, 2004) argues that sociolinguistics is related to the details of language use such as descriptions of the use of certain languages or dialects based on speakers, topics, and background of the conversation. Furthermore, (Ruslan, 2021) stated that sociolinguistics is an interdisciplinary science that studies the relationship between language and its use in society. So, it can be concluded that sociolinguistics can be said to be an interdisciplinary field of science that studies language in relation to the use and function of language in a society or group.

1.2.1.2 Pragmatics

The definition of pragmatics is interpreted differently by experts. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics. Pragmatics is a science of linguistics concerned with the use of language. According to experts, like Levinson (Purnomo & Khalawi, 2019) stated that “Pragmatics is the study of language use, that is the study of the relation between language and context”. Furthermore, Yule in (Sartika, 202) stated that “Yule (1996) defined pragmatics into four parts, namely: (1) pragmatics is the study of the meaning of speakers; (2) pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning; (3) pragmatics is the

study of how people become more communicative; and (4) pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distances”. Based on the understanding of several experts regarding pragmatics, the researcher concludes that pragmatics is the science of language that studies goals and language impact associated with the context, or usage of language adapted to the topic of conversation, objectives, participants, place, and means. As sociolinguistics, pragmatics too assumes that language (speech) is not mono style. Pragmatic boundaries are the rules for the use of language in terms of form and meaning associated with the intent of the speaker, context, and circumstances.

1.2.2 Compliments

In this research, researchers will use the theory of compliments from (Wolfson, 1989) and (Holmes, 1988). The researcher decided to combine the theories of compliments from (Wolfson, 1989) and (Holmes, 1988) because, the researcher felt that it is not only important to know the types of compliments, but also need to know the syntax of the form of compliments, so that the researcher knows how the syntactic form of the speech act of compliments, to avoid the wrong selection of compliments.

According to (Wolfson & Jodd, 1983) states that compliments are one of many types of speech acts that have main function as the establishment of solidarity between the speaker and the addressee. Furthermore (Holmes, 1988) stated that a compliment is defined as:

“A speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually person addressed, for some good

(possession, characteristics, skills, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer.”

She also points out the function of giving compliment is to reduce social distance by increasing the solidarity between the compliment giver or the speaker and the addressee. Compliments is offered to the addressee to pass the “good” value either directly or indirectly, as illustrated by (Holmes, 1988) below.

Context : R’s old school friend is visiting and comments on the one of children’s manners.

C : *What a polite child!*

R : *Thank you. We do our best.*

Wolfson (1989) has formulated four types of objects of compliments. They are as follows:

1. Possession. The speaker compliments the addressee on his/her (new) possession, such as clothing, or ornaments, etc.

i.e.: Your new phone is very techy.

2. Skill/Ability/Performance. The speaker compliments the addressee on the result of his/her skill or effort, including cooking, writing, drawing, singing, etc.

i.e.: I think you are a great singer. Trust me!

3. Appearance. The topic of complimenting is hair, face, or overall appearance.

i.e.: She looks bubbly with her new hair.

4. Personality/Friendship. The compliment is mainly about addressee’s morally positive points such as kindness, good championship, and general features.

i.e.: You are such a gentleman.

5. Others. Unspecified object(s) of compliments that do not belong to the four types above.

In relation to this research, the suitable objective of compliment type here is the compliment upon skill.

In addition, (Manes & Wolfson, 1981) found out that the structures of compliments are similar—85% of the compliments they studied consist of four main syntactic patterns:

1. NP be/look (intensifier) ADJ
e.g.: Your raincoat is really nice.
2. I (intensifier) like/love NP
e.g.: I really like your hair.
3. PRO (be) (intensifier) ADJ/NP
e.g.: That's a neat jacket.
4. (intensifier) (ADJ) NP
e.g.: Really cool earrings!

However, (Holmes, 1988) in the next two years, revised the syntactic patterns of the compliments into six types. They are as follows:

1. (a) NP be (intensifier) ADJ
e.g.: That coat is really great.
(b) be LOOKing (intensifier) ADJ
e.g.: You're looking terrific.
2. I (intensifier) like/love NP
e.g.: I simply like that skirt.

3. (a) PRO (be) a/an (intensifier) ADJ/NP

e.g.: That's a very nice coat.

(b) PRO (be) (intensifier) (a/an) ADJ/NP

e.g.: That's really great juice.

4. What a (ADJ) NP!

e.g.: What lovely children!

5. (intensifier) (ADJ) NP

e.g.: Really cool ear-rings.

6. Isn't NP ADJ!

e.g.: Isn't this food wonderful!

1.2.3 Compliment Responses

In this research, researchers will use the theory of compliments responses from (Herbert, 1986). Herbert as one of the first linguistic experts who took a focus on the topic of compliment responses, classified two general types of compliment responses: (1) agree with the speaker and (2) avoid self-praise. Through her wide range of data in Pomerantz's research on compliment responses, twelve types of compliment responses are classified as below (Herbert, 1986):

1. Appreciation Token. A spoken or unspoken acceptant towards the compliment, which acceptance is not specifically tied to semantics of the stimulus. *i.e.*:

C : Your arts are so mesmerizing!

CR : *Thank you.*

2. Comment Acceptance. The speaker accepts the complimentary force and returns with relevant comment on the topic being complimented. *i.e.:*

C : Your art from last month was mind-blowing!

CR : *Thank you, I also like that piece of work.*

3. Praise Upgrade. The speaker accepts the compliment and asserts that the complimentary force is not sufficient. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *It gives a better detail than my previous one, doesn't it?*

4. Comment History. The speaker offers one or more comments on the object complimented. The comments are less personal, i.e. they shift the complimentary force from the speaker. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *I learned it from a workshop I attended last month.*

5. Reassignment. The speaker agrees with the assertion of compliment, which is transferred to the third person(s) or to the object itself (e.g. It really knitted itself). *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *My brother helped me improving a lot.*

6. Return. The praise is shifted or returned to the first speaker. *i.e.:*

C : I will always love your drawings.

CR : *I also enjoy seeing your drawings.*

7. Scale Down. The speaker disagrees with the complimentary force, pointing to some flaws in the object or claiming that the praise is overstated. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *It's still far from yours.*

8. Question. The speaker questions the sincerity/appropriateness of the compliment.

i.e.:

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *Do you really think so?*

9. Disagreement. The speaker asserts that the object being complimented is not worthy of praise as in the first speaker's assertion is in error. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *I don't think so.*

10. Qualification. The speaker merely qualifies the original assertion, usually with *though, but, well, etc.* It is like disagreement, but weaker. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *Yes, I figured it out, but it's still far behind from other artists.*

11. No Acknowledgement. The speaker gives no indication of having heard the compliment, either responding with an irrelevant comment such as topic shift or not giving response at all. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *[silence] [no response]*

12. Request Interpretation. The speaker, consciously or not, interprets the compliment as a request rather than a simple compliment. *i.e.:*

C : I like your new drawing technique.

CR : *Do you want me to share the tips to you?*

Herbert (1986) classified the twelve compliment responses into three big scopes as seen in Table 1.1 below:

Table 1.1 Classification of compliment responses and the examples

Source: (Herbert, 1990) in book Sex-based differences in compliment behavior

No	RESPONSE TYPE	EXAMPLE
A		
AGREEMENT		
1.	Acceptance	Appreciation Token Thanks; thank you; [smile]
		Comment Thanks, it's my favorite too.
		Acceptance Really brings out the blue in my eyes, doesn't it?
2.	Comment History	I bought it for the trip to Arizona.
3.	Transfers	Reassignment My brother gave it to me.
		Return So's yours.
B		
NONAGREEMENT		
1.	Scale Down	It's really quite old.
2.	Question	Do you really think so?
3.	Non acceptances	Disagreement I hate it.
		Qualification It's all right, but Len's nicer.
4.	No Acknowledgement	[silence]

C	OTHER INTERPRETATIONS	
1.	Request	You wanna borrow this one too?

1.3 Review of Previous Study

In recent decades, linguistic experts have developed a long-standing attention in the analysis of compliments and compliment responses through various object observation. Studies on compliments and compliment responses have been a common topic for pragmatics and sociolinguistics researchers both in face-to-face and online platform settings. In terms of online compliment giving and responses, the media used in the preceding research include platforms with massive users such as Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and YouTube. It is because those and many more applications provide users the ability to communicate and reach verbally with anyone in real-time, which leads users to the exposure of giving and getting compliments, including the ones that focus on gender differences on giving and getting compliments. The following three paragraphs are three recent example studies of respective settings.

Sakirgil and Cubukcu (2012) in a study about type of compliment's object and types of responses in both English and Turkish language, have found out that both language groups show almost similar results. Both English and Turkish speakers show high frequency of accepting as a form of compliment response. Meanwhile, the lowest frequency of response falls to providing account category. However, when it comes to the type of compliment's object, the study found out that both group differ in some ways. The topic of Turkish speakers' compliment object ranks from (1) possession, (2)

physical features, (3) general appearance, (4) performance or skill, to (5) attribute. On the other hand, the topic of English speakers' compliment object ranks from (1) performance/skill, (2) possession, (3) physical features, (4) general appearance, to (5) attribute. This research is very helpful for researchers to be a reference regarding the types of compliments in English and Turkish. But even so, there are differences regarding previous research with this study. The previous study only used the theories by Pomerantz (1978) and Golato (2005), and this study used the theories of three theories, namely (Wolfson, 1989), (Holmes, 1988), and (Herbert, 1986). The shortcomings of the previous study did not examine the compliments response, so the researcher used syntactic patterns and also compliments response to complement the shortcomings in the previous study.

A study by Sucuoğlu and Bahçelerli (2014) took a focus on how different sociocultural environment affects one's way in giving response to compliments. Sucuoğlu and Bahçelerli, through their study specifically on pragmatic transfer, observed the differences between native and non-native English speakers in ELT program on how they respond to compliments in some model setting scenarios. The findings of the study show that non-native speakers of English did not produce target-like compliment responses as their culture knowledge affected their responses. Non-native speakers tend to not accept compliments without justification while native speakers can do that. In terms of the gender preference, Turkish students as the non-native speakers tend to accept compliments from female than male, especially from stranger ones. This study exposed that it is not enough to build learners' linguistic competence and it will be beneficial to develop their sociocultural, which will in turn

develop their understanding of the frames of interaction and rules of politeness within the target culture. This study is very helpful for researchers to be a reference regarding the types of compliments response of native and non-native Turkish ELT students in North Cyprus. Nevertheless, there is a difference between the previous research and this research. The previous study only used Herbert's Taxonomy of Compliment responses (Herbert 1986), and this study used three theories, namely (Wolfson, 1989), (Holmes, 1988), and (Herbert, 1986). The shortcomings of the previous study that did not examine the types of compliments and also the syntax of compliments, so the researcher used syntactic patterns and also the types of compliments to complement the shortcomings of the previous study.

Placencia et al. (2016), in their paper, talked about the compliment responses at online platform, Facebook. Their study examined the compliment responses made on Facebook by a group of women within a Facebook network in the US. In contrast to many face-to-face compliment interaction studies, this study figures out that despite the big amount of compliments received by the respondents, they only offer only about 19% compliment responses of the given compliments which differ from (Maíz-Arévalo & García-Gómez, 2013) study. It suggests a strong influence of the medium on social norms. Nevertheless, the result of their study is in line with many preceding studies that native English speakers, or in their words “English-speaking communities”, have bigger tendency to accept compliments rather than reject them. The participants of this study used several methods of accepting compliments; showing appreciation, ‘Like’-ing compliments, agreeing with compliments, downgrading compliments, returning compliments, and finally, responding to compliments with simply an emoticon. The

important conclusion from the study is that Facebook users have different expectations of compliment response behavior on Facebook, in comparison with face-to-face interaction. This research is very helpful for researchers to be a reference regarding the types of compliments responses made on Facebook. But even so, there are differences regarding previous research with this study. The previous study only used the theory of Taxonomy of responses based on Holmes (1986), and this study used three theories, namely (Wolfson, 1989), (Holmes, 1988), and (Herbert, 1986). The shortcomings of the previous study that did not examine the types of compliments and also the syntax of compliments, so the researcher used syntactic patterns and also the types of compliments to complement the shortcomings of the previous study.

1.4 Research Questions

In order to establish a better knowledge on the compliment and compliment response dynamics within fan-artist community in Twitter, I propose three main questions for this study to obtain a significant result. They are as follows:

1. What are the types of compliment's objects received by the fan-artists?
2. What are the types of compliment responses offered by the fan-artists?

1.5 Objectives of the Research

The purpose of this study is to establish a better knowledge on the compliment and compliment response dynamics within fan-artist community in Twitter. The detail of it is as follows:

1. To explain the types of compliment's objects received by the fan-artists.
2. To find out the types of compliment responses offered by the fan-artists.

1.6 Scope of the Research

To be able to achieve a good result and answer the research questions, this study will focus on finding out the compliments and compliment responses within fan-artist community in Twitter. In order to execute well, researcher collected approximately 25 samples of fan-arts from ten (10) different Twitter users who actively post their fan-arts (drawings). Of 25 samples, the compliments and compliment responses are classified and then analyzed based on the three research objectives with the support of the previous theories above.

