POLITENESS IN COMPLIMENT RESPONSES: A PERSPECTIVE FROM NATURALLY OCCURRING EXCHANGES IN TURKISH¹

Şükriye Ruhi

Abstract

This paper analyses a corpus of compliment responses in Turkish according to the conversational maxim approach (Leech 1983, 2003) and the face-management approach (Brown and Levinson 1987) with a view to extending the conceptualisation of self-presentation in theorising on politeness. It observes that the two theories ground politeness on consideration for alter and give precedence to politeness in the sense of displaying deference and solidarity at the expense of self-politeness, described in the present study as speaker need for display of competence, self-confidence, and individuality in interaction, besides the need for non-imposition.

Regarding the maxim approach, the paper argues that conversational implicatures triggered by a variety of responses ultimately tie to the Tact Maxim and more specifically to the Sympathy Maxim in the Turkish context. The analysis reveals that compliment responses may override the Politeness Principle, that self-presentational concerns are crucial motivating factors, and that face concerns need to be incorporated into the model. From the perspective of the face-management approach, the study supports the claim in O'Driscoll (1996) and Spencer-Oatey (2000) that the notions of positive and negative face as need for community and autonomy need to be disentangled from the theory's conceptualisation of face as public self-image. With the incorporation of a number of self-politeness strategies, the face-theoretic analysis builds on this distinction and integrates it with the concept of interactional imbalance by extending an analytic framework adapted from Bayraktaroğlu (1991). The paper concludes with suggestions on how the two theories may complement each other.

Keywords: Turkish compliment responses, (Im)politeness, Self-politeness, Face

1. Introduction

Politeness is a construct that has been appealed to widely in explaining language use and has been conceptualised in a number of different ways: As verbal behaviour that

¹ This study was partially supported by Middle East Technical University Research Grants (Nos. BAP-2002-05-03-01 and BAP-2003-05-03-01). The observation sheet employed in the data collection is an extended form of that in Sifianou (2001). I would like to thank Maria Sifianou for sharing the original version with me, Gürkan Doğan and my students during the academic years 1999-2000 for collaborating in the collection of the first data set, and my students of the academic years 2000-2002 for the subsequent sets. Heartfelt thanks go to Mehmet Özcan for coordinating the conversion of the third data set into electronic form and to Margaret Sönmez for her careful reading of an earlier version of the paper. I am also especially grateful for the very helpful critical comments and suggestions of the anonymous reviewer at *Pragmatics*. Naturally, all remaining faults are mine.

maintains harmonious relations (Leech 1983); as verbal and non-verbal behaviour that enables individuals to maintain face (Brown and Levinson 1987); or as social practice consisting of rights and obligations that impact on people's interactional strategies (e.g., Fraser 1990). Although the construct has been groundbreaking in accounting for linguistic behaviour, politeness theory is not without its problems and current literature shows many examples of theoretical debate and empirical studies that question formulations of politeness on meta-theoretical and cross-linguistic bases, with most of the criticism being levelled at the face-management approach.

Criticisms of Brown and Levinson's theory revolve around the

- (a) Anglo-Saxon bias in defining (aspects of) face (e.g., Wierzbicka 1991);
- (b) ambivalence of the politeness strategies regarding the kind of face that these attend to and the inconsistencies between studies that employ the model (e.g., Meier 1995);
- (c) description of nearly all speech acts as face-threatening and the related idea that politeness functions primarily to redress face threat (e.g., Kasper 1990)
- (d) focus on hearer-oriented politeness at the expense of the speaker (e.g., Chen 2001);
- (e) bias in the model towards of the polite end of the continuum in interaction (e.g., Culpeper 1996); and
- (f) little attention it devotes to the socio-psychological context in communication (e.g., Fraser 1990; Eelen 2001).

Critiques of Leech's maxim model have been restricted more to reviews of his book length publication, *Principles of Pragmatics* (1983), and to state-of-the-art articles (e.g., Fraser 1990). It is only more recently that we observe extensive debate on the model. On point (a), Wierzbicka (1991) maintains that the same bias is present in the maxim model. On the issue of ambivalence, scholars have noted the difficulty of working out which maxim(s) apply for a given utterance (e.g., Fraser 1990). In relation to (c), Fraser (1990) and Watts (2003) argue against the classification of speech acts as being inherently polite or impolite. Chen (2001) remarks that the maxim model is also hearer-oriented. Finally, given its similarities with the Brown and Levinson model, Eelen (2001) maintains that the maxim model shares the same drawback in (e) and (f) above.

We are thus witnessing an increasing number of studies that propose either revisions and extensions of these theories or new orientations towards an understanding of linguistic interaction (e.g., Culpeper 1996; Spencer-Oatey 2000; Chen 2001; Watts 2003).

Among the speech acts studied to date, the compliment response is central to furthering our understanding of politeness since it is an act that responds to display of genuine or routine concern for others. It thereby allows for an investigation of the interrelationship between factors that influence the performance of (im)politeness. Despite its theoretical significance, a survey of research on the speech act reveals that a large majority of studies investigate cross-cultural and cross-linguistic similarities and differences in preferred response strategies (e.g., Barnlund and Araki 1985; Liu 1995). There are only a few studies on the act that evaluate various aspects of the face-

management and the maxim models and devote attention to theoretical implications (cf., Chen 1993; Spencer-Oatey, Ng and Dong 2000; Yu 2003).

From the prevalent descriptive orientation in research one might infer that accounting for compliment responses is unproblematic. However, the literature reveals discrepancies even among analyses based on the same theoretical orientation (cf., for example, Baba 1996; Henderson 1996). Furthermore, a number of researchers display disagreement in justifying their choice of theoretical stance. Chen (1993), for instance, compares the maxim and face-management approaches in the context of American English and Chinese compliment responses and concludes that the former provides a more comprehensive explanatory framework for investigating cultural divergences. Baba (1996: 28), on the other hand, maintains that the maxim approach does not consider cultural constraints.

Such disparate evaluations and/or interpretations of the theories within research on the same speech act call for further scrutiny of both the speech act and the theories. Furthermore, while the focus of research on compliment responses has been on the issue of the universality of politeness, it is possible that differences in argumentation arise because of the nature of the data employed. Several studies have relied on data collected through discourse completion tasks (e.g., Chen 1993). It is therefore possible that differences of opinion over the models stem from the fact that discourse completion tasks do not allow for a consideration of the details of everyday interaction.

By examining an extensive corpus of Turkish compliment responses gathered through the ethnographic method, the primary goal of the present study is to extend the conceptualisation of self-presentation in politeness theory to account for linguistic communication in real life data. This focus on a culture that has a long history of cultural and linguistic contact with both western and eastern cultures will allow us to look into theoretical considerations in politeness theory and go beyond the issue of cross-linguistic universality, which has received much more attention than the former in research on complimenting.

This study will discuss its data according to the two theories against the backdrop of the criticisms summarised in points (b)-(f) above. I will consider aspects of face without going into the issue of ethnocentricity. As such, the study partially replicates the comparative study of the two theories that Chen (1993) carried out in the context of American English and Chinese compliment responses. However, the aim of the study is not to set one theory against the other, but rather to investigate how existing debates on politeness can shed light on speaker concerns in naturally occurring talk.

At a more specific level, the study proposes a re-analysis of certain response types and focuses on a number of responses that are theoretically problematic. It looks into the two theories and existing revisions and critiques in order to account for these responses. The study observes that the two theories ground politeness on consideration for alter and thus give precedence to politeness in the sense of displaying deference and solidarity at the expense of self-politeness. Self-politeness will be defined as including speaker need for display of self-confidence and/or individuality in interaction, besides the need for non-imposition. Regarding the maxim approach, the paper argues that the Agreement and Modesty Maxims are not the only motivating factors in choice of response strategy and that conversational implicatures triggered by a variety of responses ultimately tie to the Tact Maxim and more specifically to the Sympathy Maxim, in the Turkish context. The analysis reveals that compliment responses may override the Politeness Principle and that self-presentational concerns are crucial

motivating factors. This suggests that self and alter's face concerns need to be incorporated into the model.

From the perspective of the face-management approach, the study supports the claim that the derivative notions of positive and negative face as need for community and autonomy need to be disentangled from the theory's definition of face (O'Driscoll 1996; Spencer-Oatey 2000). With the incorporation of a number of self-politeness strategies, the face-theoretic analysis builds on this distinction and integrates it with the concept of interactional imbalance by developing a scheme adapted from Bayraktaroğlu (1991), to accommodate the socio-psychological factors involved in the compliment event.

The study focuses on a qualitative analysis of the corpus; however, a quantitative, descriptive overview is provided for cross-cultural comparison. The description does not dwell on topic, gender, social status or distance variables in complimenting, except when required to explain the samples. Neither does it deal with responses to sarcastic and ironic compliments. Section 2 overviews definitions of complimenting and describes the response strategies in the first adjacency pair, using a coding scheme adapted from Holmes (1986, 1995), Herbert (1990), and Chen (1993). Exchanges that run over multiple turns are examined in Section 3 only insofar as they lend insight into the first response. Section 3 discusses the corpus in the light of the two theories according to both the standard and the revised forms of the models, and borrows from the Rapport Management model (Spencer-Oatey 2000) to investigate how self-politeness can be conceptualised. The section first analyses the data from the perspective of the maxim approach and incorporates the conclusions thus arrived with an examination of the data from the perspective of the face-management approach. The paper concludes with a summary and suggestions on how the two theories may complement each other.

2. Complimenting

This section first dwells on aspects of the compliment (C, hereafter) in Speech Act Theory and sociolinguistics that impinge on the description of the compliment response (CR, hereafter). Sections 2.2 and 2.3 describe the data analysis procedures and the types of CR strategies in Turkish, respectively, with some information on aspects of the Turkish language and culture.

2.1. *The compliment turn*

In Speech Act Theory, Cs appear in Austin's classification under the class of 'behabitives'. Austin describes this class as reactions "to other people's behaviour and fortunes," embodying "expression of attitudes to someone else's" conduct or qualities (1962: 159). More specifically, he views Cs as a means of expressing sympathy along with congratulations, condolences and felicitations. Later descriptions in Speech Act Theory follow the same line. Bach and Harnish, for example, group Cs as a subcategory of congratulations along with condolences and felicitations (1979: 52). They thus fall under their class of acknowledgements, which express some positive or negative attitude towards others. Even though Searle (1976) does not mention Cs in his

categories of illocutionary acts, they would probably be grouped under 'expressives', which communicate the speaker's attitude to a certain state of affairs.

While Cs have been grouped with congratulations, little comparison has been made between the two acts. Searle (1969: 67) describes congratulations as expressing the speaker's pleasure regarding some event related to the hearer (cf. also Bach and Harnish 1979). While the same positive reaction is also relevant in Cs, Cs present personal assessments of a situation. Searle's (1976) criteria for classification of speech acts would also bring them into the class of 'representatives' (assertives) since Cs express the speaker's belief in a proposition. For example, a C such as 'What a beautiful picture!' expresses both a positive reaction and an assessment of the object, and may be responded to with, say, 'Yeah' or 'Do you really think so?'. In other words, one can agree or disagree with the proposition in the C. Since expressives are mainly reactions to a situation, it should not be possible to utter an agreement or disagreement. In response to a congratulation on having received a prize in a contest, for example, it is possible to deny the worth of the achievement, but it is not possible to deny having received the prize. This brief excursion into the semantics of Cs is not to deny their social function but to reveal the source of the latitude recipients of Cs have in formulating their responses: The complimentee (Cee, hereafter) may respond to either the assertive or the expressive illocutionary force of the utterance.

Studies in sociolinguistics have shifted focus to the perspective of the interlocutors regarding the social functions of the speech event. Holmes (1986: 485), for example, identifies the C as a positively affective speech act, where the speaker "explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some 'good' (possession, characteristic, skill, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and hearer." Wierzbicka remarks that Cs are usually intended to make others feel good and are performed for maintaining "good interpersonal relationships" (1991: 87). Wolfson, too, notes that they serve as "social lubricants" (1983: 89). A further significant description of Cs, underscoring the give and take nature of complimenting, is Kerbat-Orecchioni's characterisation of the act as a verbal gift (reported in Herbert 1990: 219). Arguing in favour of adopting a more culturally neutral stance in the description of the function of the act, Henderson (1996: 195) maintains that complimenting can best be viewed as part of the "social negotiation" of relationships.

Compared to studies in Speech Act Theory, we observe that sociolinguistic studies have primarily focused on the affective function of Cs "to convey feelings and reflect social relationships" (Holmes 1995: 3). To further illustrate this point, Holmes (1995) notes that cultural values and sociolinguistic variables such as gender and status may lead to the assignment of different functions to the act and remarks that Cs may display solidarity or function as power play. Thus, while studies in Speech Act Theory have focused on working out the illocutionary force of the C based on its propositional content and the intention of the speaker to express sympathy, gladness, etc., sociolinguistic studies have concentrated on the manner with which they shape social role relationships. In sum, despite their multifunctional features, Cs have primarily been viewed as affective acts that address interlocutors' needs to maintain/construct positive, harmonious relationships in interaction. In this sense, the C-CR speech event provides a rich arena for the investigation of issues in politeness theory.

2. 2. Data collection and method of analysis

The corpus of this study consists of 830 compliment exchanges gathered over two different periods to check against gender bias in data collection. The samples were gathered with the collaboration of undergraduate students enrolled in language programs, the majority of whom were the author's students and had been informed that the data would be kept confidential. An observation sheet was used to record each exchange, with information on social setting, social status and distance, role relationships, gender, marital status, age, and employment of interlocutors. The sheet also had a section for additional comments relevant to the speech event.

The compliment event can continue over several turns in Turkish, especially when the complimentee initially downplays, evades or rejects the C. Thus the accuracy of the data depends on the memory capacity of data collectors. For the initial set of 660 exchanges, the data collectors were predominantly female undergraduate students. Twenty-eight of the samples in this set were excluded due to missing information on a number of sociolinguistic variables or the presence of an ironic C. A further set of 199 exchanges, for which the gender of the data collectors was controlled, yielded more or less similar frequency distributions in same gender and cross-gender complimenting, with a tip over to a greater number of exchanges between female speakers. It was deduced that the gender of the data collector is not a confounding factor in the social settings from which the samples were drawn. The corpus includes complimenting in a variety of settings - workplaces, service encounters, educational environments, gatherings among friends, and family contexts in urban settings.

Where the author was a participant observer, post-interaction interviews were held with the complimentee and the complimenter (Cer, hereafter) in a number of cases. Informal discussions with language experts, research reports written by undergraduate students on the social significance of complimenting in Turkish culture, and a further set of samples comprising 614 exchanges, in which the data collectors provided their understanding of the C and the CR, was also used to enable a richer discussion of the data.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the quantitative description of the data is restricted to the first turn of the Cee. The semantic coding of the CRs follows Holmes' (1986, 1995) threefold division into acceptance, deflection/evasion, and rejection. The coding shifts/adds some categories into the three major strategies, most of which are from Herbert's (1990) and Chen's (1993) classifications (e.g., *praise upgrade*, *joke*, and *request interpretation*). The three-way distinction in Holmes (1986, 1995) was preferred over Herbert's binary classification into agreement and non-agreement as the latter leads to a rather confusing analysis of CRs. For example, informing about the object of compliment, which is classified as an agreement in Herbert (1990: 208-211), is better handled as a form of evasion.

A number of terms from Herbert (1990) also replace those in Holmes (1995) since they reflect a lesser degree of interpretation by the analyst (e.g., *question* instead of *request reassurance/repetition*). In addition, the label *return* is used as a cover term for CRs that pay back a C either on the same topic or on an inferentially related topic to that of the C. The former type has been named *return proper*, while the latter has been classified as *reciprocation*, as it expresses something good for or about the Cer. To illustrate, responses that are in the form of formulaic wishes have been analysed as reciprocations (e.g., *afiyet olsun* 'may it do you good', the cultural equivalent of *bon*

appétit). CRs that interpret the C as a requestive speech act form a minor category and, following Herbert (1990: 209), these are described as *request interpretation*.

The classification further distinguishes between responses that employ one strategy and those that employ several. This distinction is reflected in Tables (1)-(4) as qualified and non-qualified CRs. Qualified responses are divided into three: Those that are neutral do not lead to a strengthening of the illocutionary force of the CR; intensified CRs strengthen the illocutionary force; weakened CRs contain contradictory illocutionary forces. For example, if thanking is accompanied by an expression of gladness, the CR is classified as an ‘intensified appreciation token’ since both strategies fall under accepting (e.g., ‘Thanks! I’m glad you think so’). In weakened CRs the illocutionary force of the strategies contradict each other, but not so much as to lead to a change in the major category of the response. An appreciation followed by a downgrade, for example, qualifies as a weakened appreciation under accepting (e.g., ‘Thank you, I tried to do my best’)

If a multiple-strategy CR incorporates strategies that are in conflict in terms of illocutionary force, the CR is coded for the strategy that expresses the stronger illocutionary force along the scale of acceptance vs. non-acceptance. For example, a CR including an appreciation token (e.g., ‘thank you’) and a rejection (e.g., ‘but I don’t really like it’) is classified as a rejection. On the other hand, a ‘question+thanking’ response is classified as weakened acceptance since the appreciation cancels the rejection implied by the question. In other words, the strategy that has a greater weight in propositional content regarding the Cee’s judgement of the C is considered to affect the ultimate interpretation of the response by the Cer.

Some clarification is due here on one formulaic response strategy in Turkish, which functions simultaneously as a reciprocation and a credit shift because the utterance explicitly shifts the C to the Cer (e.g., *O sizin güzelliğiniz*; lit. ‘That is your beauty’; ‘Beauty is in the eye of the beholder’). In such CRs, the Cee reciprocates the act of saying something good about the Cer, hence its value as a reciprocation. But it also shifts the credit to the Cer, thereby achieving the interpretation of a deflection since it implies a weaker belief in the truth of the assessment. Therefore the strategy has been coded under this major category as ‘shift to Cer’ (see Table 3).

2.3. CRs in Turkish

Tables 1-4 summarise the major categories of CRs. Some notable statistics on the major categories and examples of each sub-category are provided in Sections 2.3.1-2.3.3. Relevant details on some aspects of the Turkish language and culture are included to facilitate the discussion of particular turns of expression and the distribution of response types.

Table 1 Distribution of major strategies and (non-)qualified CRs

	Accepting	%	Deflection	%	Rejection	%	Request interpretation	Total	% of (non-)qualified CRs in data
Non-Qualified	295		119		99		3	516	62,17
Qualified								314	37,83
(neutral)	18		8		19			45	5,42
(intensified)	93		4		14			111	13,37

(weakened)	99		2		57			158	19,04
Total no. and %age in data	505	60,85	133	16,02	189	22,77	0,36%	830	
Total no. and %age of qualified CRs in each major category	210	41,58	14	10,53	90	47,62			

Accepting makes up for 60,85% of the total number of responses, with appreciation tokens forming the largest sub-category (28,92%) (see Table 2 below). One can safely deduce that acceptance is by and large the preferred response type. However, close to 20% in the group are weakened, and deflections/evasions and rejections make up a sizeable proportion of the total data (38,79%). Complimenting in Turkish, then, is a rather lengthy ritual requiring negotiation of assessments. The complexity of the act is also reflected by the fact that qualified responses constitute more than a third of the data. The weakened acceptances, together with deflections and rejections comprise half of the CRs (50,72%). It is also likely that lengthy responses function as contributions to conversational topic development. My observation is that several of these function as shifts to new conversational topics. I will comment on such features of the interaction where information is available.

Despite the sizeable proportion of weakened responses, a number of CRs that occur at the two ends of the scale of acceptance vs. rejection (i.e., praise upgrades, agreements, and disagreements) are non-qualified or intensified. These constitute 15,66% of the corpus. The presence of such responses is interesting given the tendency to weaken the expression of agreement or disagreement. The number may be statistically insignificant, but the fact that they do occur suggests that weakening of the illocutionary force in CRs cannot be identified as the single norm in Turkish. Neither can they be treated as random occurrences.

2.3.1. *Accepting*

The distribution of sub-strategies under accepting is shown in Table 2. As mentioned above, appreciation tokens form the largest sub-category. Verbal appreciation is the preferred response to a C in Turkish, but it is also one that exhibits a sizeable number of qualified responses of all three kinds, and it resembles agreements and disagreements in this respect.

Table 2. Strategies in Accepting

	Praise upgrade	Agreement	Return		Offer	Appreciation			Joke	Laughter	Total	% of (non-)qualified CRs in category
			Return	reciprocate		Appreciation token	Smile	kiss/hug				
Non-qualified	27	8	15	7	2	130	76	8	12	10	295	58,42
Qualified											210	41,58
(neutral)						18					18	3,56
(intensified)	9	23	19	1	3	38					93	18,42
(weakened)	9	30	5	1		54					99	19,6
Total no.	45	61	39	9	5	240	76	8	12	10	505	
% in total no. of CRs	5,43	7,35	4,69	1,08	0,6	28,92	9,16	0,96	1,46	1,2	60,85	

1. *Praise upgrade.* The complimentary force of the C is increased. Excluding one uttered by a student in response to an instructor's praise, about a third of the samples occur among equal status acquaintances while all others are between intimates - close friends or family members. Laughter is present in some of the exchanges, either in the Cee's response or in the reaction of the Cer. It is thus reasonable to assume that most are performed in a jocular fashion. Sample (1) occurs between friends, where the Cer expresses her admiration on how the Cee always manages to stay slim:²

- (1) Cer: *M, bu işin sırrı ne? Yiyip yiyip de kilo almıyorsun*
 'M, what's the secret to this? You eat and eat, yet never put on weight'
 Cee (jocularly): *Galiba çok hareketliyim. Kahretsin ben mükemmelim*
 Maybe very active-SING. Damn.it, I perfect-SING
 'Maybe, it's because I'm very active. Damn it, I'm perfect'
 Cer: (smiles)

Quite a few upgrades also lead to ironic rejoinders implying that the Cee is boasting (cf. line 3 below). My personal observation is that a praise upgrade does not lead to negative evaluation in friendly relations and that they add a fun element to interaction unless the response is typical of the Cee. Nonetheless, I would argue that the response type cannot be classified as a joke and that it is possible for the joking tone to serve as sugar coating for the semantic content.

- (2) 1 Cer: *Bugün yine çok güzelsiniz hanımefendi* (*hanımefendi*: 'lady'; deferential
 'You are again very beautiful today my lady' form of address to women)
 2 Cee: *Teşekkür ederim. Her zamanki halim canım*³
 Thank do-AOR-SING. Every time-REL state-POSS dear-POSS
 'Thank you. I am always like this, *canım*'
 → 3 Cer: *Ah. Pek de alçak gönüllüünüz!*
 'Oh, we are very modest too!' (we: refers to the Cee)

2. *Agreement.* The Cee accepts the complimentary force. The distribution of qualified agreements is rather surprising since, despite the predominance of weakened samples, there are a sizeable number of intensified ones, which bring them close to upgrades (e.g., 'Of course, it's my job'). It appears to be the case that there are idiolectal differences in uttering an agreement since we observe that unequal status is the only controlling factor for intensified agreements.

One feature of some of the direct agreements is the use of a moderate agreement marker, *ya*, 'Yeah' which is more a pragmatic particle than a literal 'yes' in Turkish. In

² Since the present study does not focus on the Cs in the data, only translations are provided for these. The translations follow closely the wording in Turkish. Where necessary, idiomatic equivalents have also been given. Literal translations of formulaic language, idiomatic politeness expressions and address terms have been provided where possible. Some have been retained in the original since any form of translation would have misrepresented the semantics of the expressions. The letters F and M in the samples replace first names of females and males, respectively. For readers who are unfamiliar with Turkish, suffice it to note that it is a pro-drop, scrambling, all-suffixing, T/V language. The abbreviations used in the glosses are listed in Appendix 2.

³ *canım*: 'my life/soul'. As a term of address, its closest equivalent is 'my dear/dear' but the expression has lost its semantic content especially in expressions of disagreement, persuasive talk, etc., where it functions as a mitigator or a supportive marker depending on prosody. Therefore only its uses as a term of address have been translated into 'my dear/dear'.

sample (3), for example, the Cee expresses mild agreement with the C uttered in praise of a simple dinner, which happened to consist of the Cer's favourite dishes:

- (3) Cer: *Bu akşam ziyafet var*
 'We're going to have a feast this evening'
 Cee: (smiling) *Ya*
 'Yeah'

This response sometimes occurs with paralinguistic features such as a soft tone or averted gaze. It implies that the hearer acknowledges the viewpoint of the speaker rather than indicating agreement with the proposition. It is therefore weaker in semantic content compared to strong assertives such as 'That is so' or 1st person assessments such as 'I like it too'.

Some agreements appeal to 3rd person opinion or transfer the credit after the agreement. Such reassignments are ambiguously positioned between weakening and upgrade, especially when they involve reference to family members or intimates. Nonetheless, I have classified them as cases of weakenings since they transfer the credit. An agreement implied through reference to 3rd person opinion might convey overtones of boasting in its English translation as in sample (4), but native speakers do not interpret it as such since the speaker's opinion is nested into that of others. It thereby allows the speaker to appear appropriately modest about the assessment. In (4), where the Cer expresses a positive assessment of the Cee's relationship with her boyfriend, the weakening of agreement is also accomplished through the choice of *sağol* as an appreciation token, which expresses a semantically stronger sense of gratitude (see discussion on appreciation tokens below).

- (4) Cer: *Erkek arkadaşınla birbirinize çok yaklaşıyorsunuz*
 'Your boyfriend and you make a very nice match'
 Cee: *Sağol. Herkes öyle söylüyor*
 Alive.well-be. Everybody like.that say-PROG
 'Thanks. Everybody says so'

Indirect agreements often involve humour as in sample (5), which illustrates a case of verbal play in complimenting. The exchange occurs among friendly colleagues during a tea break and turns into the form of an *atışma* (lit., 'throw at each other'), which is a traditional, highly stylised form of repartee performed by folk singers to the accompaniment of music (see lines 4 and 6).

- (5) 1 Cer1: *Yarın Sevgililer Günü. Arabanın üzerine güller atacağım*
 'Tomorrow is St. Valentine's Day. I am going to throw roses over your car'
 2 Cer2: *Anlamadım! Neden güle gül atıyorsun*
 'What do you say! Why throw roses over a rose?'
 → 3 Cee (to Cer2): *Oo ben sizin yanınıza geleyim*
 Oh I you-GEN side-POSS-DAT come-OPT.SING
 'Oh I let me come next to you'
 4 Cer1: *Ben sana gül diyemem, gülün ömrü az olur*
 I cannot call you a rose; the lifetime of a rose is short'
 5 Cee (to Cer1): *Oo ben sizin yanınıza geleyim*
 Oh I you-GEN side-POSS-DAT come- OPT.SING
 'Oh I let me come next to you'
 6 Cer1: *Elimize sazları verin* (saz: traditional, stringed musical instrument)
 'Give us our saz-PLU'

It will be noticed that the CRs in sample (5) have the form of implied agreement (see lines 3 and 5), which are hard to recognise out of context, but they could also have been categorised as jokes given the fun element in the event.

Quick repartee and other forms of verbal play are highly valued both for their own sake and for the vividness and attitudinal warmth they create in verbal interaction in Turkish. In the present corpus, creative language use appears more conspicuously in the C turns, where non-formulaicity is as common as formulaicity. A previous study carried out on the C turn in 634 of the exchanges reveals that 36,59% of the Cs are syntactically and semantically non-formulaic and fall outside the formulas identified in Manes and Wolfson (1981). Such Cs consist of creative rewording of frozen metaphors, poetic expressions, and anecdotes illustrating the Cee's accomplishments (Ruhi 2002).

3. *Return/Reciprocate*. The Cee either returns a C on the same topic or reciprocates the positive assessment by saying something good for/about the Cer or a related person. Example (6) is an interesting case of a reciprocation to a C on the food prepared by the Cee. It intensifies the appreciative element by saying something good about the Cer's deceased mother. It also reflects a frequently employed manner of indirect complimenting and responding to a C in Turkish. The indirectness of the return, however, does not weaken the illocutionary force of the CR. Native speakers judge such utterances as enhancing the hearer's positive attributes since family is an important ingroup in the culture (Tezcan 1974: 79-88, *passim*). They imply that the hearer is in some way responsible for the good, however illogical the credit attribution may sound.

- (6) Cer: *Eline sağlık teyze. Çok güzel olmuş*
 'Health to your hands aunt. It [the food] is very nice'
 Cee: *Afiyet olsun M. Annen de çok güzel yapardı*
 Health be- OPT.SING. Mother-POSS also very nice do-AOR-PAST
 'Bon appétit M. Your mother used to cook very well too'

4. *Offer*. An offer may be of something material (e.g., food, clothes) or immaterial (e.g., help at work). All offers are accompanied by thanking or formulaic wishes (e.g., *afiyet olsun* 'may it do good to your health' in the case of Cs to food). Sample (7) illustrates a non-literal form of an offer in response to a C on the Cee's jacket and functions as a formulaic joke in several regional dialects of Turkish: The Cee offers to give the complimented item so that Cer may have a picture of him/herself taken with it. Even though the offer is not genuine, the element of humour achieves the illocutionary force of an acceptance.

- (7) Cer: *Montun çok güzelmiş*
 'Your jacket is very nice'
 Cee: *Vereyim de fotoğraf çektir*
 Give- OPT.SING also photograph take-CAUS
 'Let me give it to you so that you can have your photo taken [with it]'

5. *Appreciation*. A verbal or non-verbal appreciation token is performed. A word of caution is due here concerning the inclusion of smiles as a form of appreciation. Native speaker remarks on the meaning of a smile are positive regarding its appreciative force. Several of my informants noted that the best response to a C is a warm smile; yet a few entries also indicate paralinguistic features such as 'averted gaze', 'embarrassed'

and ‘cold smile’. This suggests that the samples could be either acceptance or rejection. However, given the limitation of written recording, the samples have been included under accept.

Among the types of qualifications, intensifiers form a little more than a third of the set and weakeners comprise close to half. Intensifiers include terms of endearment and expressions indicating gladness. The preferred weakening strategies are questions, reciprocations that shift credit to the Cer, and the formulaic expression, *iltifat et-PROG-AGR* (lit., ‘you are doing a compliment’; ‘you are complimenting’; see line 2 in sample (8) below). The formula does not imply flattery. Rather, it carries the meaning that the Cer is treating the Cee with kindness and courtesy. Thus the formula is functionally close to a reciprocation but since it does lead to the implicature that the Cee is downgrading the assessment, it has been categorised as a weakener.⁴ This is evident from the presence of second Cs such as ‘I’m telling the facts/truth’ or ‘I’m serious’. The formula appears to be preferred by the older generation whereas younger adults are increasingly using *abartma* ‘don’t exaggerate’ in friendly relations.

(8)	1	Cer:	<i>Gülünce çok güzel oluyorsun. Her zaman gülmelisin</i>
‘You look lovely when you laugh. You should always laugh’
→	2	Cee:	<i>Teşekkür ederim, iltifat ediyorsun</i>
Thank do-AOR-SING, compliment do-PROG-SING
Thank you, you are complimenting [me]
	3	Cer:	<i>Hayır. Çok ciddiym</i>
‘Noo. Really, I’m serious’

Taking stock of the qualifications in intensified and weakened appreciations, it is possible to deduce that appreciation tokens focus on acknowledging the good will of the Cer. Furthermore, as corroborated by comments of data collectors in the third set, thanking formulae are felt to be inadequate both for expressing appreciation of the C and for achieving smooth continuation/shift in a discourse topic.

Turkish has three semantic formulas for thanking: *teşekkür et-AOR-SING/PLU* ‘I do my gratitude; *sağol-* ‘be alive.well’; and *mersi*, from the French *merci*. Since the third formula occurs in the present corpus in only one exchange, I will comment on the sociopragmatics of only the first two formulas. Disregarding sociolinguistic factors such as individual communicative styles, gender, and dialectal differences, *teşekkür et-AOR-SING/PLU* is deferential, which explains its less frequent occurrence among intimates, especially among family members. It has a shortened plural form, *teşekkürler* ‘gratitudes’, which is less formal and roughly equivalent to ‘thanks’. The second formula is actually a wish that functions as an appreciation token. It implies a greater degree of indebtedness, which, to be conveyed with the gratitude formula, requires an intensifier or some form of a paralinguistic signal.

6. *Joke*. Jokes often tease the Cer on implicatures derivable from the C or emotions supposedly motivating the performance of a C. In sample (9), for example, the Cer is a father of two daughters, complimenting one of the daughters in the other’s

⁴ When the formula is uttered as the single response strategy, it has been classified as a downgrade in the rejection category since, as noted above, it generates the implicature that the accomplishment is not worthy of a C. However, when it occurs with appreciations, this fairly strong implicature is weakened.

absence by saying that she is the one. This allows the daughter to tease the father by saying that she will tell on him.

- (9) Cer: *Benim kızım bir tanedir*
 ‘My daughter is unique’
 Cee: (laughing) *Bunu ablama bir ara iletirim*
 This-ACC elder.sister-POSS-DAT one interval send-AOR-SING
 ‘I’ll tell this to my elder sister some time’

As a sub-category, jokes are few in number, but their performance does not seem to be constrained by sociolinguistic factors such as social distance, age and gender. We should note that verbal play is often triggered by initial Cs and/or CRs in Turkish, leading one to suspect that the CR was uttered to produce humour in interaction instead of simply acknowledging the C. Of note is that both formulaic and non-formulaic Cs can be responded to with humorous utterances. Therefore Cers in Turkish cannot remain immune to teasing by playing it safe through the use of standardised Cs (The C in (9) is a formulaic expression of praise in Turkish in the form of a frozen scalar metaphor.).

7. *Laughter*. Laughter occurs as a response when the C is found to be somewhat overstated or amusing due to its novel content or style. Sample (10) illustrates such a response in a classroom setting, where the instructor and the students are discussing their reactions to a play:

- (10) Cer: *Çocuklar siz öğretmen olamazsınız, şair olursunuz*
 ‘Children, you won’t be able to become teachers, but poets’ (children: students of Cer)
 Cees: (loud laughter)

2.3.2. Deflection/Evasion

The deflection/evasion category constitutes the smallest group of CRs (16,02%). We observe that the largest sub-category in this group is legitimate evasion, questions being the next in order (see Table 3). An important feature of deflections is the presence of only a handful of topic shifts, which implies that there is a strong tendency to acknowledge the performance of a C even if this is through non-acceptance.

Table 3. Strategies in Deflections/Evasions

	Deflection				Evasion		Total	% in category
	Shift credit		Question	Comment history	Topic shift	Legitimate evade		
	to Cer	to 3 rd P/T						
Non-qualified	10	12	38	5	7	47	119	89,47
Qualified (neutral) (intensified) (weakened)							14	10,53
		2	1			5	8	6,01
		2				2	4	3,02
		2					2	1,5
Total no.	10	18	39	5	7	54	133	
% in total no. of CRs	1,2	2,18	4,69	0,6	0,84	6,51	16,02	

Key: to 3rd P/T – shift to 3rd person or aspect of the C topic

8. *Shift credit.* Turkish speakers may shift credit for the positive attribute to a third person, an aspect of the complimented object/Cee, or the Cer.

8.1 *Shift to Cer.* The credit for the C is assigned to the Cer, thus achieving a culturally specific form of credit shift and reciprocation in Turkish CRs. These responses also co-occur with appreciation tokens. In Section 2.2, I had discussed the reason why credit shifts to the Cer were coded as a kind of reassignment even though they simultaneously perform a reciprocation. Most reciprocate-reassign CRs have a fairly formulaic semantic and syntactic structure and others bear some similarity to downgrades. To compare the two kinds of reciprocation, let us examine (11) and (12):

- (11) Cer: *Bugün çok tatlısınız*
 ‘You look very sweet today’
 Cee: *O sizin tatlılığınız*
 That you-PLU-GEN sweetness-PLU
 ‘That is your sweetness’
- (12) Cer: *Zevkine hayranım. Bu kazak için teşekkürler*
 ‘I admire your taste. Thanks a lot for the sweater’
 Cee: *Rica ederim, daha güzeline layıksın*
 Request do-AOR-SING, more beautiful-POSS-DAT worthy.of-SING
 ‘Not at all, you are worthy of much nicer [things]’

Sample (11) shifts the credit on her appearance to the Cer but does not downplay the complimentary force. In sample (12), the Cee is responding to an expression of gratitude for a gift that she gave to the Cer.⁵ A C on her taste precedes the gratitude and the Cee slightly denigrates the complimented object. It is therefore likely that the denigration is also triggered as an attempt to put the Cer out of debt for the gift.

8.1. *Shift to 3rd person or topic.* Credit shifts in Turkish are usually to a 3rd person rather than an aspect of the C topic or a less remarkable attribute of the Cee. This form of credit attribution in Turkish is probably due to the importance attached to maintaining strong emotional ties with ingroup members (Kağıtçıbaşı 1996; see also the discussion on returns). It also accounts for the presence of reassignments to the Cer in both equal and unequal status relations. Native speakers also, however, remark that such credit shifts may actually contain hints of culturally acceptable self-enhancement owing to the importance attached to ties and affinities with ingroup members. Thus, the credit shift to a family member for the C on tidiness in sample (13) was perceived by several native speakers as being rather close to an acceptance due to the marked wh-structure and the emphatic additive discourse marker, *de* ‘also’ (If paralinguistic features had been available, it would probably have qualified as a praise upgrade):

- (13) Cer: *F, ne kadar düzenlisin. Her şeyin yerli yerinde*
 ‘F, what a tidy person you are. Everything is where it should be’
 Cee: *Ne de olsa annemin kızıyım*
 What also be-COND mother-GEN daughter-POSS-SING
 ‘After all I am my mother’s daughter’ (i.e., I take after my mother)

⁵ I owe this point to the reviewer.

9. *Questions*. The sub-category includes information-seeking questions and “reverse-polarity questions[s]” (Koshik, cited in Golato 2002: 552). The first type constitutes a request for clarification. Repairs follow such questions such as the one in line 3 in sample (14), where the Cer first compliments the Cee on her ability to appear beautiful and funny at the same time:

- (14) 1 Cer: *Sana birşey söyleyeyim mi? Hem güzel hem de komik olmayı nasıl beceriyorsun?*
 ‘Shall I tell you something? How do you manage to be beautiful and funny at the same time?’
- 2 Cee: *Nasıl anlamadım* [comment of data collector: It is clear that she understands what is meant.]
 How understand-NEG-PAST-SING
 ‘How, I don’t understand’
 ‘What do you mean?’
- 3 Cer: *Yani genelde bayanlar güzel görünmek için hep susar ama sen çok güzelsin ve çok hoş sohbetsin*
 ‘I mean, generally women remain quiet to appear beautiful, but you are both beautiful and very nice to talk to’

The questions in the second type are equivalent to either ‘Really?’ or ‘Is that so?’. The second sequence of C-CR in this type is distinguished from information-seeking questions by Cs that intensify the complimentary force of the first C (see line 3 in sample (15) below).

- (15) 1 Cer: *Saçlarına bayılıyorum*
 ‘I adore your hair’
- 2 Cee: *Cidden mi?*
 Seriously Q
 ‘Really?’
- 3 Cer: *Gerçekten bence çok güzel. Hep böyle bir saçım olsun istemişimdir*
 ‘I really think it’s very beautiful. I have always wanted hair like this’

10. *Comment history*. Besides being employed as the single response strategy, comment histories also appear with other sub-categories under acceptances and rejections, and they function to achieve smooth shifts in conversational topic. When used alone, comment histories do not acknowledge the complimentary force of the C. They give information on the C topic and constitute a very small percentage of the data (0,60%). The information may be about the source or some aspect of the C topic as in example (16):

- (16) Cer: *Kazağın çok güzelmiş*
 ‘Your pullover is very nice’
- Cee: *Yeni aldım*
 New buy-PAST-SING
 ‘[I] bought it just recently’

11. *Topic shift*. Topic shifts in Turkish disregard the complimentary force and either pick up a related topic or continue with the major topic in the discourse. They thus create slots in the conversation that allow the Cer or other participants to co-construct the conversation. In other words, abrupt shifts in topic are avoided in interaction. Sample (17) is one such case, where prior to the implicit Cs, the Cers had

been inquiring about the Cee's recent work. The participants in the conversation are close colleagues in different academic settings and had often urged the Cee to publish work on child literature. The Cers' exclamatory remarks ('That's what I would call news!/That's really news!') are complimentary in nature since they imply a positive assessment of the Cee's work. The Cee then builds on this common ground to give the background to her work.

- (17) Cee: *Çocuk yazını hakkında bi kitap yazacağım*
 Child literature about-POSS-LOC one book write-FUT-SING
 'I'm going to write a book on child literature'
 Cer1/Cer2: (simultaneously) *Ben buna haber derim!//İşte bu haber!*
 'That's what I would call news!/That's really news!'
 → Cee: *Bi duyuru vardı. Size de gelmiştir. Bi sürü konu vardı. Dilekçe yazdım*
 One announcement exist-PAST. You.PLU-DAT too come-PAST.EVID-COP.
 One.many topic exist-PAST. Application write-PAST-SING
 'There was an announcement. It must have come to you too. There were several topics.
 I sent in an application form'

12. *Legitimate evasion.* The CRs in this sub-category frequently occur after remarks that contain an additional speech act other than complimenting or when the complimentary force is contained within the question itself. As noted by other researchers too, Cs with questions enable the Cee to sidestep acknowledging the C. In sample (18), for example, the Cee responds to the question in the C turn about what she did to make her hair look so nice:

- (18) Cer: *F, saçlarına ne yaptın? Harika görünüyorlar*
 'F, what did you do to your hair? It looks wonderful'
 Cee: (Smiling) *Sadece yıkadım*
 Only wash-PAST-SING
 'I only washed [it]'

2.3.3. Rejection

It was previously noted that a rejection may be accomplished in a rather complex manner in Turkish owing to the employment of strategies that mitigate the illocutionary force of the disagreeing expression. Over a third of the disagreements (40,77%) and about a quarter of the downgrades are weakened in a number of ways (see Table 4). Qualifications that frequently co-occur with these sub-categories are appreciation tokens, reciprocations, comment histories, and interjections implying disagreement. The second sub-category is silence. There are a few samples in the data which report non-communicated responses such as the respondent was "happy but did not say anything", "shocked/surprised" or "embarrassed". We can assume that the data collectors were most probably the recipients of the C in these interchanges. Even so, the samples have been classified as silence since the comments do not provide enough information on non-verbal cues. Downgrades, the third sub-category, have been classified under rejection since the Cee does not indicate any form of agreement with the C. In other words, they do not co-occur with acceptance strategies and often lead to second turn Cs.

Table 4. Strategies in Rejections

	Disagreement	Silence	Downgrade	Total	% in category
Non-qualified	43	20	36	99	52,38
Qualified				90	47,62
(neutral)	7		12	19	10,05
(intensified)	11		3	14	7,41
(weakened)	42		15	57	30,16
Total no.	103	20	66	189	
% in total no. of CRs	12,41	2,41	7,95	22,77	

13. *Disagreement*. Cs may be rejected in a number of ways. For example, the Cee's assessment may be in conflict with that of the Cer. In sample (19) the Cee is not happy that the Cer thinks her eyes are like those of a popular singer:

- (19) Cer: *Gözlerin F'in gözlerine ne kadar benziyor* (F: a famous pop star)
 'Your eyes look so much like F's'
 → Cee: *Ciddi olamazsın*
 Serious be-NEG.AOR.-SING
 'You can't be serious'
 Cer: *Neden?*
 'Why'
 Cee: *Nefret ederim de ondan!*
 Hate do-AOR-SING too that-DAT
 'Because I hate them that's why' (them: the pop star's eyes)

In some cases, the Cee may deem the C socially inappropriate or insincere. In sample (20), for example, the strong rejection is triggered by a photocopying man saying that he is the only person who provides the service for a woman as beautiful as the Cee:

- (20) Cer: *Lütfen bayan bu tarafa*
 'Over here ma'am'
 Cee: *Ben şurada sıradayım, burada çektireceğim*
 I this-DAT line-LOC-SING, here-LOC take-CAUS-FUT-SING
 'I'm in this line; I'm going to have [the photocopy] done here'
 Cer: *Aaa, olur mu? Sizin gibi güzel bir bayanın fotokopisini ben*
çekebilirim ancak
 'Ooh, that's impossible. Only I can do the photocopying for such a beautiful lady like you'
 → Cee: *Ay! Ne kadar yapmacıksınız*
 Ugh! What degree artificial-PLU
 'Ugh! How artificial you are!'

Sometimes a C is rejected because the Cee is in a bad mood. In sample (21), for instance, a C on looks by a friend is rejected in this manner:

- (21) Cer: *Bugün ne kadar çekici ve hoş görünüyorsun*
 'How attractive and nice you look today'
 → Cee: *Bırak Allah'a atıp tutmayı. Bugün kompliman kaldırarak "mood"da değilim*
 Leave God.love-POSS-DAT rant-NEG-ACC. Today compliment take.up mood-LOC
 NEG-SING
 'Stop kidding for God's sake. I'm not in the mood to take compliments today'
 Cer: *İyi, iyi tamam. İnsanlara iyilik de yaramıyor*
 'Okay, okay, alright. It's no use trying to be good and nice to people'
 Cee: (no response)

14. *Silence*. This sub-category is qualitatively different from topic shifts, which may be interpreted by the Cer as the Cee's interest in another matter during the interaction. Silence is likely to be ambiguous for the addressee in the interaction. It is nonetheless possible to deduce from the observation sheets that data collectors were sensitive to the distinction between a topic shift and a long enough pause to be interpreted as silence. My personal observation on several instances of silence, which I was able to crosscheck through post-observations with some informants, is that some are due to the embarrassment or discomfort.

The presence of silence in an interaction where a second assessment is expected is a marked and dispreferred turn often conveying negative evaluation (Pomerantz 1984). It is highly likely that silence as a second part is interpreted as a disagreement or as something that is accountable as the data contain exchanges in which a second C or a question regarding the well-being of the Cee ensue (see 22). This interpretation is reinforced by native speaker comments such as "silence or ignoring a C is accepted as a reaction against the C".

- (22) Cer: *İşte dünyanın en güzel kızı da geldi!*
 'Look, the world's most beautiful girl has come too!'
 → Cee: (no response)
 Cer: *Ne oldu hayatım? O güzel yüzün niye eskisi gibi ılık saçmıyor?*
 'What's the matter my dear? Why isn't your face radiating light as it used to?'
 Cee: *Canım ne olur kusura bakma. Bugün hiç havamda değilim. Bugün güzel iltifatlarını başka zamana sakla*
 My dear, what be-AOR fault look-NEG. Today nothing air-POSS NEG-SING. Today beautiful compliment-PLU other time save
 'Please excuse me my dear. I'm out of sorts today. Save these nice compliments of yours for another time today'

15. *Downgrade*. The Cee may point out some negative aspect of the complimented topic or strongly scale down the complimentary force. As illustrated in (23) below, some downgrades performed when the C topic is an accomplishment are shifts to the Cee's work responsibility or the social appropriateness of the complimented behaviour. In the exchange a student is complimenting a woman with administrative duties in a university setting on her helpfulness:

- (23) Cer: *Abla sen bize her zaman yardımcı oluyorsun* (abla: kinship term of respect for females)
 'Elder sister, you are always a great help to us'
 Cee: *Görevimdir, severek yapıyorum*
 Duty-POSS-COP, like-MANN do-PROG-SING
 'It is my duty; I do [it] with pleasure'

On face value, such shifts are like comment histories. However, acting according to social role obligations is an important value in Turkish culture and interlocutors are expected to attend to each other's needs – whence the implicature that the complimented behaviour is unexceptional.

Downgrades may occur both in equal status and in unequal status relations, the latter of which have been observed to occur bi-directionally. The presence of such downgrades in a variety of speech events, including gift-giving among equals, suggests that status relations alone cannot account for their presence. What may have to be

considered is the way caring and sharing is displayed in interaction. Turkish culture is described as displaying moderate femininity along Hofstede's scales of cultural dimensions, where femininity involves the importance attached to caring and nurturance in relationships (Hofstede 1998: 16-17). In the context of the present corpus, responses that appeal to social role obligations, the praiseworthiness of the Cer in credit shifts, and the frequent expression of formulaic wishes that intensify the illocutionary force in qualified CRs need not necessarily imply that the Cee is just displaying modesty. They also display concern for the other.

16. *Request interpretation.* The Cer interprets the C as a request. It may be that the motive for a C is to procure some material or immaterial good, either through the Cee or through information that s/he may provide (Jaworski, reported in Sifianou 2001: 404-409). Indeed, some CRs that come across as jokes or rejections play on this possibility. Offers, too, may be a response to this motive; however, it would be wrong to conclude that Cs primarily have a procedural function in Turkish. Of relevance here is the low number of comment histories in the corpus and their employment as neutral qualifying strategies, which allows them to function as smooth topic continuations. My informants also mostly consider Cs to be markers of "kindness" offered with "good intentions" even though they do note that they may sometimes function to "get someone to do something." As will be further discussed in Section 3, it is the particular details of the situation and the style of the C that most probably lead to attribution of a requestive intention in complimenting.

Of the three request interpretations, sample (24) occurs between classmates and the C is uttered in the greeting slot of the exchange. The CR marks a negative assessment of the Cer's motive through a formulaic hint, which implies that the addressee has something else to say than what is literally said. The exchange is especially informative since the data collector notes that the Cer only utters Cs when she expects a favour.

- (24) Cer: *Aman efendim bugün ne kadar da güzel olmuşlar*
 'My, my, *efendim*, how beautiful you are today'⁶
 → Cee: *İyi hoş da hayırdır?*
 Good fine too all.is.well?
 'Yeah, well, what's up?'
 Cer: *Birşey yok canım sadece çıkışta benimle kütüphaneye gelir misin diye soracaktım*
 'Nothing really *canım*. I was just going to ask whether you would come with me to the library after class'

3. Politeness theories and CRs

As has been mentioned in the Introduction, two theoretical notions have been critical in examining the sociopragmatics of CRs: Leech's (1983) politeness maxims, which are similar to Pomerantz's (1978) conversational constraints, and Brown and Levinson's (1987: 213-236) notion of interactional imbalance (i.e., "the balance principle"), which

⁶ *efendim*: lit., 'sir/my lady'; a deferential, multi-functional term of address in Turkish, usually occurring in the first turn of greetings, calls, topic initiations, etc. In the exchange, it functions as an intensifier. With relevant non-verbal features, it may have been perceived as being ingratiating or insincere given the fact that the C occurs between classmates.

is operationalised through face-management. This section first overviews the maxim perspective and discusses the present corpus with reference to the maxim model. Section 3.2 analyses the data according to the face-management model. Responses that are motivated by concerns other than those discussed in the literature are focused on, and revisions of the models are investigated to account for such cases.

A significant feature of complimenting is that a C generates a range of actions on the part of the interlocutors towards the maintenance of some form of interactional balance (Herbert 1997). In other words, the act has repercussions both on the speaker and on the hearer, which leads the Cee to make adjustments through the nature of the response. The concept of balance has been approached differently in the literature, yet it remains fundamental to the socio-dynamics of CRs. The point of difference in the maxim and face-management approaches relates to how the balance is theoretically construed.

3.1. *Maxims of politeness and CRs*

The two major arguments in this section are that (1) CRs may be explained mainly as the operation of the Tact and the Sympathy Maxims in the context of the Turkish data; and (2) that the maxim model is deficient in accounting for the self-presentational concerns of speakers where face-maintenance is an important motivating factor in CRs.

3.1.1. *The maxim model*

Leech (1983; henceforth, GL) states that people have illocutionary goals (e.g., complimenting, criticising) and the social goal of maintaining concord in relations. Communicative behaviour is held to be governed both by the Cooperative Principle (Grice 1975; henceforth, CP) and the Politeness Principle (henceforth, PP), which has a constraining effect on the former in order to achieve the social goal. It is argued that the PP accounts for the manner by which speakers strive “to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place” (GL: 82). The PP is defined as the minimisation of “the expression of impolite beliefs” and maximisation of “expression of polite beliefs” about the hearer or other related third parties (GL: 81) and is operationalised as a set of maxims. GL (132-3) explains the maxims in the form of scalar sub-maxims. These are listed below:

1. TACT MAXIM
(a) Minimize cost to *other* [(b) Maximize benefit to *other*]
2. GENEROSITY MAXIM
(a) Minimize benefit to *self* [(b) Maximize cost to *self*]
3. APPROBATION MAXIM
(a) Minimize dispraise of *other* [(b) Maximize praise of *other*]
4. MODESTY MAXIM
(a) Minimize praise of *self* [(b) Maximize dispraise of *self*]
5. AGREEMENT MAXIM
(a) Minimize disagreement between *self* and *other* [(b) Maximize agreement between *self* and *other*]
6. SYMPATHY MAXIM

- (a) Minimize antipathy between *self* and *other* [(b) Maximize sympathy between *self* and *other*]

In accordance with the assumption that speech acts have inherent polite or impolite implications relative to their compatibility with the social goal of maintaining comity, GL identifies illocutionary acts that will reflect the operation of the maxims. GL further notes that Tact and Approbation have greater weight in the calculation of politeness, which implies that the model holds the hearer in the foreground in interaction.

Though it has received scant attention in research on CRs, and indeed, GL himself elaborates on it mainly in relation to the Tact Maxim, an important feature of the model is that the maxims operate on a number of pragmatic scales. These are cost-benefit, optionality, indirection, and vertical and horizontal social distance. These scales portray the manner in which the maxims are followed. In relation to the Tact Maxim, for example, the first scale concerns estimations of “the cost or benefit of the proposed action A to *s*[peaker] or *h*[earer]” and involves computations of incurring debts, creating inconveniences, obligations, etc. that do not necessarily have to be of a material nature. Indirection is “the length of the path [...] connecting the illocutionary act to its illocutionary goal” for the speaker, while optionality is the degree of choice an illocution leaves to the hearer. Finally, vertical social distance concerns power relations while horizontal social distance is related to intimacy relations (GL: 123-6).

A further discussion about these scales, which will become significant for the analysis of CRs, is provided by GL, who remarks on the cost-benefit scale in impositives. He comments that “there also seems to be a tacit assumption that a maintenance of equilibrium is desirable” among interlocutors. He illustrates this with the function of thanks as the “restoration of equilibrium, or at least reduction of disequilibrium, between *s*[peaker] and *h*[earer]” (GL: 129-30). Citing Argyle and Dean (1965) on the role of equilibrium in monitoring distance, GL remarks that maintenance of equilibrium governs “other kinds of communicative behaviour” too.

To conclude the overview, the maxim model conceptualises politeness mainly around a notion of balance in terms of costs and benefits and builds on a “conceptual metaphor related to the world of economy” (Pérez Hernández 1999: 216). Even where politeness is not motivated out of transactional concerns, we observe that a mercantile metaphor of balancing costs and benefits is applied since the very act of engaging someone in conversation presumes cooperation. Intruding into a conversation, for example, may be costly for the speakers already involved in the interaction (GL: 140). One exception to the mercantile metaphor, however, is the Phatic Maxim, which is introduced to account for talk that maintains sociability and extends the common ground between speakers (GL: 141).

3.1.2. *Accepting*

In the analysis in this section and Section 3.1.3, I argue that the politeness maxims do not form watertight categories and that what has been described as striking a balance between the Agreement and the Modesty Maxims may be a rather schematic representation of the socio-dynamics of responding to Cs. It will be shown that the Tact Maxim lies at the root of a variety of CRs and that the Sympathy Maxim is particularly applicable to the conceptualisation of politeness in Turkish. The analysis will also reveal that Cees appeal to the Banter Principle in displaying themselves as self-assertive

and witty persons, who can disregard conventional ways of doing politeness. More significantly, the analysis will reveal that Cees are sensitive to self-presentational issues and that they may disregard the PP in attempts to present themselves in ways that are compatible with their own self-conceptualisations.

In previous analyses, CRs have been explained as being generated mainly through the operation of two conflicting maxims –the maxim to agree and the maxim appear modest (e.g., Chen 1993). Chen (1993) also introduces the Tact and Approbation Maxims into the analysis since they account for offers and returns. Following this account, all non-qualified and intensified responses under accepting (i.e., praise upgrades, agreements, returns, offers, appreciation tokens, jokes, and laughter) would be described as explicitly or implicitly following the Agreement Maxim. Praise upgrades and agreeing expressions, then, are explicit agreements. However, praise upgrades do more than just that. Since they imply that the complimentary force is understated, it is possible for them to imply disagreement with Cer. In other words, they flout not only the Modesty Maxim but also the Agreement Maxim, which makes them doubly impolite.

As has been mentioned in Section 2.3.1, upgrades in the present corpus do not occur in distant relationships and two-thirds of the samples are between intimates, the rest occurring among acquaintances. They often occur in conversational openings in response to Cs on appearance and during mealtimes after praise of food. Some also occur as responses to Cs on skill in sports and academic achievements. My conjecture on their non-occurrence in distant social relations is that upgrades are less conventionalised responses and involve the risk of being misunderstood. It is safe to assume that most upgrades are taken in good nature in intimate relations, but this does not mean that they are always sanctioned.

When performed among intimates and within acceptable limits, they would fall under the Banter Principle. GL remarks that the Banter Principle can be called a “third-order principle” since it can be described as mock-irony, which relies on the hearer’s understanding that what is literally impolite is meant to be polite. From this perspective, upgrades could carry implicatures of camaraderie and intimacy (GL: 145). The argument would run as follows: Upgrades require the Cer to arrive at the conversational implicature that the Cee is flouting the PP because the relationship between the interlocutors is such that the Cer will not be offended.

In his re-assessment of the model, Leech (2003) excludes the Banter Principle from display of politeness, which is restricted to the expression of high regard for “what pertains to h[earer]”. The exclusion arises because of the rationalistic grounding of the model on the semantics of utterances. However, in view of the fact that maintenance of comity necessarily involves an affective dimension, it is hard to maintain that politeness can be investigated to the exclusion of the affective domain. Thus, if the social goal of politeness is to maintain comity, and Banter does just that in appropriate social contexts, the principle can be subsumed under politeness.

Although this analysis appears to be intuitively correct, it is incomplete. Why should speakers go for utterances that might generate evaluations of impoliteness when they can opt for CRs that abide by the PP? The socio-dynamics of an upgrade affords a more detailed examination than can be offered here, but one distinct feature of the response is that it can mark self-assertiveness. My personal observation is that as long as they are not over-used and positive affect exists between interlocutors, upgrades performed in a playful tone are sanctioned in Turkish and do not lead to negative

evaluation. My explanation for this is that self-assertion and self-affirmation, when displayed good-naturedly, are considered positive traits in Turkish culture and tie in with positive evaluations of directness, sincerity, and forthrightness, especially in ingroup communication (Tezcan 1974). In other words, even though modesty is a valued trait in the Turkish context, it may be perceived as insincere in intimate relations. I therefore suggest that upgrades function as markers of ingroup membership, which allow speakers to drop deferential behaviour. The humorous tone with which upgrades are uttered also enables speakers to present themselves as witty persons, who can go beyond formulaic utterances in communication. That said, however, another dimension of the act is that the Cee could also be engaging in a socially appropriate power game, in which case it becomes open to interpretations of impoliteness.

Whether upgrades can be placed within the purview of the maxim theory with respect to these features or not is a critical issue since they call for a definition of politeness that needs to handle speaker concerns about socially sanctioned, appropriate self-presentation. I will return to this issue in the discussion of evasions and rejections.

To turn to jokes, they too have a rather dubious status under the Agreement Maxim. Implicit agreement may certainly be present in jokes. In my view, however, the jokes in the present corpus are better explained either as banter or as display of wittiness. Thus they can function in a manner similar to upgrades. However, if the context of communication is such that some form of acknowledgement is the expected response to a C, responses other than that could imply impoliteness.

A further significant feature of jokes is that they disregard the complimentary force of the first turn and orient towards implicatures derivable from either the propositional content of the C or motivations leading to it. In this respect, it is possible that jokes actually allow the Cee to evade the C without appearing to be conventionally modest if such an interpretation clashes with the Cee's desire to display assertiveness. To which maxim the evasion could be attributed emerges as a problem for the maxim approach. I would not be in favour of suggesting that Modesty is the motivating maxim, as such jokes significantly change the nature of the compliment event into one that pokes fun at the Cer.

Besides the joking mood of the Cee or the trigger provided by non-formulaic Cs (the latter of which is not a necessary condition), the occurrences of jokes where I was an observer often emerged as a personality trait in distant and close relationships. My personal observation on other instances of jokes is that display of wittiness is a motivation for their performance. This assessment is supported by the fact that social distance does not appear to be a variable for this response category.

Let us pass on to a related sub-category, laughter. It might be considered a form of implicit agreement, as it does not challenge the complimentary force. The data on laughter record no sign of discomfort either, so it can be safely assumed that the Cs were well taken. The response may actually be operating under the second sub-maxim of Sympathy (i.e., maximize sympathy between self and other) in that it shows appreciation of the Cer's having produced an 'innovative' form of the speech act.

As has been mentioned above, returns also operate on the Approbation Maxim, and offers operate on the Tact Maxim in addition to implicit agreement (Chen 1993: 63). However, the Generosity Maxim could also motivate offers. In her review of the maxims, Thomas (1995: 162) proposes a re-wording of the Generosity Maxim, which reads as "minimize the expression of cost to other; maximize the expression of benefit to other." This amounts to saying that the Tact and Generosity Maxims are two sides of

the same coin – a point also developed in Leech's (2003) revision of the PP. This re-formulation, I believe, is a better reflection of the nature of offers.

Regarding the response strategies that have been examined thus far, it has been observed that self-presentational issues are important motivating factors, but it is also necessary to investigate the weaker forms of accepting. The weakened agreements in Turkish CRs include reassignments to a 3rd person/topic and appreciation tokens, while neutral qualifications take the form of comment histories that make no reference to the positive attribute. The inclusion of an accepting utterance qualified with reassignment can be explained as a compromising strategy between agreement and modesty. However, my description of appreciation tokens as cases of weakenings may sound contradictory and calls for an explanation.

It is my contention that appreciation tokens – especially those in the form of *teşekkür ederim* 'I do my gratitude' – are distinct in nature from praise upgrades and agreements and afford further scrutiny along the cost-benefit scale. With this analysis and cases of CRs that do not proceed from the politeness maxims, I will show that the description of CRs as striking a balance between the Agreement and the Modesty Maxims may be rather too schematic a representation of the socio-dynamics of CRs.

Along the cost-benefit scale, an appreciation token expresses gratitude (thereby responding to the complimentary force) and disregards the C's assertive meaning. It implies that the recipient acknowledges that the Cer has performed an act that has positive implications for him/her. In this sense, even though indebtedness may not be truly present in the C-CR sequence, the Cee expresses gratitude as a way of balancing the payment of the C. Acknowledgement of this payment places thanking under the Tact Maxim since it maximizes benefit to other. Cross-culturally, acknowledgement of a debt can also be interpreted as a sign of modesty and/or deference. By placing on record gratitude for the expression of something good about him/herself, the Cee avoids presenting himself/herself as the principal maker of his/her good image, hence the implication of modesty. From another perspective, since the response also implies that the Cee acknowledges the goodwill of the Cer, the formula adheres to the second sub-maxim under Approbation (i.e., maximize praise of other). The Cer's second turn in sample (21) – repeated here as (25) – lends support to the validity of the cost-benefit scale in complimenting and strongly suggests that some form of appreciation of goodwill is expected in return (see line 3).⁷

(25)	1	Cer:	How attractive and nice you look today
	2	Cee:	Stop kidding for God's sake. I'm not in the mood to take compliments today
→	3	Cer	Okay, okay, alright. It's no use trying to be good and nice to people
	4	Cee	(no response)

Under this re-analysis, it is also plausible to argue that appreciation tokens re-establish the interactional equilibrium on the cost-benefit scale. This does not rule out an implicit agreement, but it does show that the account solely as abidance to the Agreement Maxim does not reflect its full meaning. It neatly accommodates Kerbrat-Orecchioni's description of Cs as gifts, which are often re-paid through expressions of gratitude. It also justifies why thanking should be considered as a weaker form of acceptance.

⁷ Samples introduced earlier on in the paper are given here only in their translated version.

Concerning the verbal appreciation tokens in the present corpus, it was observed in Section 2.3.1 that Turkish has two expressions translated as ‘thank you/thanks’ – *teşekkür ederim* and *sağol*. The first was described as being more deferential while the second, which is a formulaic good wish, indicates greater indebtedness. The second formula also encodes appreciation of the interlocutor as a return of goodwill; hence, it adheres to the Approbation and Sympathy Maxims. When it occurs as a singleton, it often leads to a second turn C as in sample (26) below. The exchange occurs between a supplier and a customer and illustrates one case where the appreciation token may not have been interpreted as agreement. This suggests that Cers too may perceive them as return of goodwill:

- (26) 1 Cer *Valla abi bu memleketteki en dürüst adam sensin*
 ‘I swear you’re the most honest man in this country’
 2 Cee *Sağol koçum*
 Alive.well-be ram-POSS
 ‘Thanks my ram’
 ‘Thanks my good, strong man’
 → 3 Cer *Valla yalanım varsa taş olayım, aldığın malın parasını günü gününe*
 ödüyorsun. Helal olsun
 ‘I swear, may I turn to stone if this is a lie. You always send the payments for
 the goods you buy promptly. May everything be yours to have and enjoy’

As has been previously noted, the category of appreciation tokens includes expressions of gladness (e.g., ‘I have become happy to hear that’, ‘I have become happy you think so). Different from thanking, such expressions show appreciation of the C by appealing to feelings and shared values. They also distance the speaker from the propositional content. The closest maxim related to these expressions is the Sympathy Maxim.

Leech’s recent reformulation of the theory lends partial support to the analysis of appreciation tokens. He highlights the asymmetrical relation between the first two pairs of maxims (i.e., Generosity/Tact, Approbation/Modesty) and redefines the maxims as pragmatic constraints on communication, which allow the speaker to pursue the Grand Strategy of Politeness (i.e., the former PP). The Principle now reads as placing “a high value on what pertains to” other and a low value on “what pertains to” self (Leech 2003). Thus, Generosity, Approbation, Agreement, and Sympathy are placing higher value on the wants, qualities, opinions, and feelings of other, respectively. Accordingly, Tact, Modesty, Opinion-reticence, and Feeling-reticence are placing low value on wants, qualities, opinions, and feelings of the speaker.

Since the Agreement Maxim is now defined as placing “high value on other’s opinion”, it can accommodate implicatures showing respect to the Cer. This implicature, however, would suggest that the Cee is also following the Generosity maxim since the Cee would be attending to the Cer’s needs. The revised form of the Sympathy Maxim, too, becomes problematic for appreciation strategies expressing gladness since the response relies on the assumption that expression of feelings of self will be valued by the Cer and contradicts its re-definition as placing low value on self’s feelings. I suggest that the second sub-maxim in the original description (i.e., maximize sympathy between self and other) captures the reciprocal nature of politeness generated by the maxim.

Leech (2003) concedes that the constraints “are not a set of distinct [...] maxims, but rather variant manifestations” of the Grand Strategy of Politeness. My re-analysis on

thanking, too, implies that the identification of the maxim/s operative in a CR may not be very clear-cut due to inferential paths leading from one to the other. To further illustrate the point with returns, it is possible to re-analyse these as reflections of the second sub-maxim of the Tact Maxim since they repay Cers by saying something good about them. This analysis is also implicit in Leech's (2003) definition of a C as "transaction of value from *s*[peaker] to *h*[earer]". Since returns transfer value from Cee to Cer, it is possible to say that they are a variant of the Tact Maxim. However, if we turn to Leech's (2003) own interpretation of returns, we observe that he states that "[Returns] are ways of showing you appreciate a compliment, and at the same time you are suitably modest about it." He lists thanking and questions as having the same kind of effect. Clearly, Leech's statement is based on the assumption that conversational implicatures link the maxims to each other. This suggests that accounting for CRs through the Agreement and Modesty Maxims over-simplifies the pragmatics of the act, but more importantly, it also casts doubts on whether it is possible to identify which maxim/constraint the speaker is abiding by.

Spencer-Oatey et al.'s study on speaker evaluations of CRs also raises questions on the relevance of the Agreement Maxim. We also observe that respondents in this study may not link disagreements to modesty and that some explain them as conceit or lack of self-confidence in contexts where the Cee deserves the praise. In accordance with Spencer-Oatey et al., I suggest that appreciations and agreements may not be motivated by the Agreement Maxim but by self-presentational needs or situational constraints (e.g., to avoid sounding insincere by rejecting the C). This reasoning, however, becomes problematic in the maxim/constraint approach in both its original and its revised form since politeness is defined as concern for the other in communication. In other words, the theory does not accommodate the speaker's concerns regarding his/her status in communicative events and his/her relationship with interlocutors.

Leech (2003) underscores the semantic starting point of the model, when he says, "psychological motivations are irrelevant to the pragmatics of politeness". However, while the hidden agendas of speakers may not be the concern of linguistic analysis, the maxims/constraints have been formulated in the form of motivations, or more accurately, conversational implicatures that people may derive from the propositional content. In Thomas's words, the maxims are better seen as "social-psychological constraints influencing the choices" people make in interaction (1995: 168). The Modesty and Agreement Maxims, I would argue, are particularly problematic here. I will address this issue in the discussion of deflections/evasions and rejections below.

To sum up the analysis so far, we observe that the CRs in the acceptance category may be explained through the Tact and Sympathy Maxims; that the maxims are inferentially closely inter-related; that speakers may opt for less deferential forms of responding to Cs by making use of the Banter Principle; and, finally, that the maxims are better conceptualised as socio-psychological constraints on behaviour.

3.1.3. *Deflections/evasions, rejections and request interpretations*

In this section, I will argue that the Modesty Maxim cannot account for all the responses outside the acceptance category and that theorising on politeness needs to accommodate

self-presentational sensitivities. I will also demonstrate that (im)politeness is an emergent feature of interaction and that the socio-psychological features of the interaction impinge on the interpretive acts of the interlocutors.

As was previously mentioned, deflections and evasions have been described as striking a balance between the Agreement and Modesty Maxims, while rejections display modesty (e.g., Chen 1993). Unless there is evidence to the contrary in the ongoing interaction, Turkish speakers are likely to interpret deflections and rejections in a similar manner, as evidenced in the Cer's second turn in (27), which is from a conversation between a student and her advisor on the Cee's thesis:⁸

- (27) Cer: *Beşinci bölüm çok iyi olmuş*
 'The fifth chapter is very good'
 Cee: *Gerçekten mi hocam? Sağ olun*
 Real-ABL Q teacher-POSS? Alive.well be-PLU
 'Really my teacher? Thank you'
 → Cer: (smiling) *İşte böyle de alçakgönüllüdür F* (to 3rd party participant)
 'F is always modest like this'

Within the category of deflections, comment histories, legitimate evasions and topic shifts sidestep the need to attend to the illocutionary force of the C. Whether they are actually interpreted as modesty, however, is difficult to ascertain since these responses achieve smooth shifts away from the complimenting event. The questions and credit shifts to the Cer require further analysis. Sample (27) clearly shows that negative-polarity questions may be interpreted as modesty. However, native speakers also remark that the question may be uttered to understand whether the C is sincere. It appears then that a discourse analytic perspective on interpreting sequences of "C-C rejection/deflection-C-acceptance" as modesty may not fully reflect the interlocutors' interpretations. The shifts to the Cer, on the other hand, pragmatically connect to the Modesty Maxim but also operate on the Approbation Maxim, which as has been previously noted in the case of returns, also links them to the Tact Maxim.

The strategy of silence is open to a range of interpretations. The theory would necessitate its analysis as a violation of the CP since the speaker is being uncooperative by not responding to the comment. If the Cer actually assumes that the Cee is being cooperative, then a number of implicatures may be generated. Concerning cases of silence that are performed with non-verbal cues such as blushing and averted gaze, it is likely that they generate interpretations of modesty, but they may also be a reaction to a C found presumptuous, disturbing, embarrassing, etc. If so, it is difficult to say that the responses follow the PP, unless we assume that silence is a way of showing politeness by refraining from uttering impolite beliefs.

Several instances of silence lead to repairs or queries that would make the silence accountable as in sample (22), repeated as (28) below. They may be functioning as cues that indicate that the C has misfired:

- (28) 1 Cer Look, the world's most beautiful girl has come too
 2 Cee (no response)
 3 Cer What's the matter my dear? Why isn't your face radiating light as it used to?

⁸ I should note that Turkish native speakers also mention the possible role of belief in the 'evil eye' as motivating CRs other than acceptance.

- 4 Cee Please excuse me my dear. I'm out of sorts today. Save these nice compliments of yours today for some other time'

In this manner, rather than being a manifestation of politeness, silence may be a way of performing impoliteness. It thus needs to be investigated from the perspective of the Cee's interactional goals.

As has been suggested above, a close look into the samples of disagreements and silences contradicts the idea that the Modesty Maxim is the sole trigger for rejecting a C. In the following I will take up three exchanges and discuss possible motivations for the rejection. But briefly to summarise the discussion, we observe that cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1962[1957]), unwarranted intimacy and negative affect often trigger such responses. Besides these factors, the details of the particular setting and the psychological state of the interlocutors (e.g., not being in the mood to take compliments, being too busy to be involved in exchanges of goodwill, etc.) can be operative in rejecting a C (see (28) above). We will also see that the exchanges involve significant differences in degrees of (im)politeness.

Let us turn to the exchange in sample (19), repeated here as (29). The disagreement in lines (2) and (4) revolves around what the Cee considers to be beautiful eyes:

- (29) 1 Cer: Your eyes look so much like F's (F: a famous pop star)
 → 2 Cee: You can't be serious
 3 Cer: Why?
 → 4 Cee: Because I hate them that's why

According to the model, the disagreement might be explained as implied adherence to the Quality Maxim, which demands that speakers utter propositions they believe to be true. The explanation, however, leaves much to be said about the response since it is clear that the Cee's reaction is not so much about the validity of the C as the threat that it poses to assessment of self. The second turn in the dialogue gives strong evidence that the Quality Maxim is not particularly relevant to the exchange since the Cee is not so much rejecting a resemblance to the pop star as the idea that such a resemblance is praiseworthy. In this respect, the Cee can be said to be maximising disagreement, a possible implicature being that the Cer has inadvertently violated the Sympathy Maxim by having voiced opinions that go against the Cee's likes and dislikes. The emotive tone of the turn is fairly strong and theoretically significant in that it shows how sensitive people are towards evaluations that contradict their self-conceptualisations.

Sample (20), repeated as (30) below, illustrates a case where the rejection stems from unwarranted intimacy between the service provider and the customer in a photocopying shop:

- (30) Cer Over here ma'am
 Cee I'm in this line; I'm going to have [the photocopy] done here
 Cer Ooh, that's impossible. Only I can do the photocopying for such a beautiful lady like you
 → Cee Ugh! How artificial you are!

The rejection may be connected to the pragmatic scales of horizontal distance and the construct of territory introduced in Leech (2003), which involves assessments of ingroup and outgroup membership. It can be viewed as a case where the speaker feels

that s/he does not need to follow the PP since the Cer is a member of an outgroup. What the CR does in this case is to put on record that the Cer is violating the Quality Maxim by challenging the Cer's sincerity. Along the inferential path, the Cee can also be seen as accusing the Cer of not attending to her need to dissociate herself from the speaker, that is, committing a transgression on the scale of territory. The CR thereby challenges the Cer's competence in appropriate social behaviour.

Finally, sample (31) illustrates a case where negative affect towards the Cer emerges in the interaction, which would lead the Cer to re-interpret the initial silence. The exchange takes place between non-intimate faculty members, following the Cee's explanation of an academic issue:

(31)	1	Cer:	<i>Derya gibisiniz hocam</i>
'You are like the ocean my teacher'	(like the ocean: an idiom implying that a person is very knowledgeable on a matter)
	2	Cee:	(silence)
(...)	
	3	Cer:	(introducing another colleague to Cee)
<i>M hocam da sizin gibi alanında derya</i>
'My teacher M, like you, is also like the ocean'	
→	4	Cee:	<i>Ben sizi iyi tanırım. Siz hep böyle iğneleyici laflar edersiniz</i>
I you-ACC well know-AOR-SING. You always like.this sarcastic remark-PLU
do-AOR-PLU
'I know you well. You always make such sarcastic remarks'	

In the exchange, the Cee also challenges the Cer's sincerity (line 4). However, the motivation appears to be related to his assessment of the Cer as a person who is always sarcastic in his Cs. The response violates the Approbation and the Sympathy Maxims, thereby creating the implicature that the Cee does not have a high regard of the Cer's feelings. That the CR maximizes antipathy between the interlocutors and has a negative impact on the Cer is aggravated by the presence of others during the exchange.⁹

What is significant in the foregoing analysis is that lack of politeness can be connected to both the CP and a counterpart of the PP, that is, the expression of impolite beliefs. This raises the question as to whether it is possible to accommodate impoliteness through another set of maxims in the form of corollaries of each politeness maxim: 'maximize cost to hearer; minimize benefit to hearer; maximize dispraise of hearer; maximize disagreement between self and other; maximize antipathy between self and other'. In this manner, the response in (30) – the photocopying setting – and the Cee's second response in (34) may be accounted for as maximization of dispraise. While this may account for impoliteness, I would say that it misrepresents the attempts of Cees to negotiate or re-represent their image/status and calls for a consideration of the speakers' self-images in interaction.

I should note that the above discussion of rejections (excluding sample (28)) applies the model to cases where politeness is not observed, whereas GL discusses the role of the pragmatic scales in explaining degrees of politeness and does not set impoliteness within the scope of the theory. The samples do suggest that adherence to the Quality Maxim or violation of the PP in CRs and adherence to the PP in Cs in

⁹ The Cer reported being very much offended during the exchange and mentioned that he refused the Cee's offer of a ride in a second encounter on the day of the exchange, making explicit reference to the earlier dialogue as the reason for the refusal (personal communication).

situations where they are unwarranted can produce impoliteness. The CRs in (29) and (30) would be cases of abiding to the CP triggered by the inappropriateness of the C as threat to self-image and role relationships, respectively. Those in (25) and (31) can be viewed as non-observance of the PP leading to possible evaluations of impoliteness (cf. the responses, ‘Stop kidding for God’s sake. I’m not in the mood to take compliments today’ and ‘I know you well. You always make such sarcastic remarks’).

The contrast between the rejections in (28) – where the Cee rejects the C but utters mitigating expressions (‘Please excuse me my dear’) – and (25) and (29)-(31) is significant in terms of a number of points. First, the exchanges reveal that speakers are sensitive to explicit or implicit assessments of self and to the Cer’s perceived insincerity. Second, the mitigating expressions in (28) and their absence in the other exchanges imply that the pressure to accept a C may derive from a number of factors: The pressure to attend to the needs, feeling, and qualities of the addressee, that is, the Tact, Sympathy, and Approbation Maxims.

In a more distinct manner than the CRs above, the request interpretations reveal that hearers respond to utterances based on their judgement of the speakers’ motivation in uttering the C. The Cee thus challenges the sincerity of the C both with respect to the PP and the CP with varying degrees of politeness, and disarms, so to speak, the tact in performing a request. Whether the re-interpretation is perceived as impolite depends on the particular role relationship and the degree of intimacy. However, they distinctly show that hearers are sensitive to being perceived as interlocutors who may be easily manipulated by the face value of utterances. My personal observation on such exchanges is that, even when the request interpretation is performed jocularly and the Cee complies with the request, it explicitly places self in a more powerful position, thereby violating the PP on the vertical social distance scale.

Along with the CRs above, the request interpretations clearly reveal that polite meanings emerge as a result of the assessments and interpretive acts of speakers. The CRs discussed in this section demonstrate that the C is evaluated according to appropriateness, the perception of the Cer’s sincerity, and communicative intentions, either with respect to the ongoing interaction or to past assessments. In this respect, the CR manifests information not only on how the C is perceived, but also on how the speaker wishes to be perceived and perceives the Cer and/or the nature of the interaction.

In sum, the analysis reveals that (im)politeness is an emergent feature of discourse, which an analysis of the single act or the single adjacency pair cannot fully explore. The discussion of the samples also demonstrates that speakers take action to monitor both their perception by others and their role relationships with others.

3.1.4. *Implications of the analysis for the maxim model*

In this section, I summarize the analysis of the CRs and dwell on the specific implications of the analysis with respect to the criticisms reviewed in the Introduction. I further argue that face is an inextricable component of evaluations of (im)politeness.

Compared to previous analyses within the maxim approach, the present investigation reveals that

- 1 the Tact, Generosity, Sympathy, and Approbation Maxims may be involved to a greater degree in shaping CRs than has hitherto been considered in the literature;
- 2 it is difficult to dissociate the maxims from each other, since they are inferentially inter-related;
- 3 given point (2), the close connection that the model makes between specific speech acts and specific maxims is untenable; and
- 4 self-presentational sensitivities of interlocutors are important dimensions of the sociopragmatics of CRs.

Regarding points (1) and (2), the observed fluidity in interpretation proceeds from the definition of politeness as attendance to the wants of the hearer. Given the transactional metaphor on which the model constructs politeness, any transfer of material or immaterial value between interlocutors necessarily relates to the second sub-maxim of the Tact Maxim (i.e., 'maximize benefit to hearer'). In the case of complimenting, this is natural since the Cer offers value to the Cee and the Cee offers something proportionate in return. In this manner, one could argue that the strategies in the acceptance category adhere to the Sympathy Maxim too, since they explicitly state or imply something good about the Cer and thus appeal to his/her feelings of self-worth. Intensified agreements (especially when the C topic is directly related to the assessment of self) and praise upgrades, however, would be theoretically excluded from this account as they are closely related to the concerns of socially appropriate self-assertion.

If CRs which imply something good for/about the Cer are ultimately related to the Tact Maxim, this amounts to saying that the Agreement Maxim may not actually be the prime motivating factor in the accepting category. In other words, the Tact Maxim and concern for appropriate self-presentation have greater explanatory power. If we follow the cost-benefit metaphor to its logical conclusion, deflections and rejections that do not arise from cognitive dissonance, attribution of negative affect, etc. could also be explained through the Tact/Generosity Maxims since they minimize benefit to self through non-acceptance of the transfer of value. This could in turn imply low estimation of self's attributes or concern for the other's standing *vis à vis* the C. In situations/cultures where display of modesty is expected, such implicatures appear to be fairly conventionalised. Yet, given that speakers of different languages do not arrive at the same implicatures, I hold it unnecessary for the theory to include maxims that are based on the semantics of utterances, on the one hand, and maxims that label conversational implicatures, on the other.

As has been previously mentioned, it is possible that appreciation tokens also function as appropriate displays of modesty besides implying agreement with the propositional content, since they acknowledge the Cer's positive evaluation of self through an expression of gratitude. This re-analysis explains the diversity of interpretations of conceit, lack of self-confidence or modesty in hearer evaluations of disagreements reported in Spencer-Oatey et al. (2000). It also accounts for disagreements that lead to interactional tension since some form of appreciation of the goodwill extended by the Cer appears to be the expected reaction unless there are other constraining factors.

In brief, since the model conceptualizes politeness as transfer of value, Tact/Generosity is the single constraint that accounts for CRs, the other maxims being conversational implicatures derivable from the particular context in which a CR occurs.

However, the model does not accommodate self-presentation, especially in cultures and situations where assertion/acknowledgement of self's attributes is either expected or is the personal style of the individual. Neither does it appear to allow for such an extension. Thus, contrary to the argument in Chen (1993) that the maxim model neatly explains differences in CRs in cultures with respect to the prevalence of acceptance or deflection/rejection, I maintain that the model is deficient in describing self-presentational concerns and that the face construct needs to be incorporated into the model.

If I were to describe the Turkish data with a more emic perspective to delineate the role of face in communication, I would argue that the value symbolically transferred in the compliment event and in illocutionary acts related to Positive Politeness is emotion in the sense of positive affect towards alter. This element incorporates a consideration of self's and alter's feelings and thoughts of personal worth, warmth, cordiality, sincerity and unpretentiousness in interaction. The closest term that would reflect this dimension of emotion is empathy, which is closely connected to the social value of tolerance and hospitality toward ingroups and outgroups in Turkish culture (Tezcan 1974). In this sense, the display of modesty or self-assertiveness – two allegedly conflicting motivations in interaction – reflects a social self that communicates interrelatedness in terms of shared feelings, thoughts and goals, while at the same time retaining autonomy and agency (cf. Kağıtçıbaşı 1996). Under this light, the maxims triggering the CRs are not Agreement and Modesty, but Tact and Sympathy (or more accurately, an Empathy Maxim, which would reflect the consideration of feelings and the viewpoint of the addressee in communication). Tact is operative in the return of goodwill and consideration of the Cer's standing *vis à vis* the C, and Sympathy/Empathy in interpersonal communication, where the value given to warmth and sincerity allows the speaker to remain in the limelight through, for example, contextually appropriate display of self-assertiveness.

This excursion on the emics of politeness in Turkish reveals that, while the maxim model describes communicative behaviour based on linguistic expression, if modesty is implied meaning and is appealed to in order to explain the emergence of deflections and rejections, then the model should also be expected to account for acceptance strategies in a manner that reflects their social meaning as, say, display of self-confidence.

To return to the criticisms of the model that were listed in the Introduction, let me re-capitulate the major points. These were the bias of the model towards the hearer perspective and the polite end of communication; the description of speech acts as being inherently (im)polite; the disregard of the socio-psychological context; and the difficulty of assessing which maxims utterances abide by and how hearers arrive at the implicatures they do.

The discussion above reveals that the Cee is clearly ignored with respect to his/her concerns for displaying self-confidence, assertiveness and individuality. This may be because the model focuses on fairly conventional ways of performing politeness. The model certainly connects the PP to concerns of the speaker since s/he is assumed to appeal to it in order to achieve social goals (e.g., in the calculation of costs-benefits), yet the self all but disappears in the definition of the maxims except perhaps in the case of the Modesty Maxim, where a praise upgrade could be harmful for the Cee since it may be perceived as boasting (GL: 136). On the second point, while the model, with its provision of pragmatic scales, proposes a framework within which

(im)politeness can be performed differentially, the lack of consideration of the context of situation leaves it rather weak in explaining why and how impoliteness may emerge in situations where self's image is in some way jeopardised. Furthermore, as the model would lead one to infer, it remains unclear whether abiding by the CP in situations where politeness is normative is sufficient to explain how implicatures of impoliteness emerge. The model does not take impoliteness within its purview; however, if speakers compute impoliteness *vis-à-vis* expectations of politeness, politeness theory should also take impoliteness on board.

The foregoing discussion also reveals that (im)politeness emerges with respect to a variety of factors concerning the communicative event and not just the specific propositional content of the C or broad sociolinguistic variables such as gender and vertical/horizontal social distance. Amongst other things, positive or negative affect towards the addressee is a strong factor in wording the CR. While I do not disregard the influence of the other dimensions, the CR is particularly sensitive to affect since the hearer responds to assessment of self by other, which increases the likelihood of the triggering of inferences regarding, for instance, the sharing of common viewpoints. It appears then that acts, when performed in natural talk, cannot be qualified as (im)polite without a consideration of the socio-dynamics of the setting.

Nonetheless, I believe that the criticism that acts are not inherently (im)polite is contradicted by the present data since speakers clearly have cultural schemas with respect to their inherent politeness feature. I therefore agree with GL in arguing that acts have an absolute value with respect to their illocutionary function. From a methodological point of view, however, examining (im)politeness in interaction needs to be enriched with the qualitative analytic tools in the tradition of conversation analysis and Communities of Practice, which would look into the evaluations that people make of behaviour in interaction.

To turn to the next criticism, the discussion on the interrelationship between the maxims has shown that it is indeed difficult to identify the maxim to which the CR adheres. As has been noted in Section 3.1.2, Leech (2003) maintains that the maxims “are not separate, independent constraints [...]: They are instances of the operation of the [Grand Strategy of Politeness] as “super-maxim.” But the positing of other maxims is not necessary when politeness is conceptualised as transfer of value.

A more crucial point regarding linguistic politeness, however, is that it is speakers who attribute (im)politeness. This implies that rather than describing (im)politeness in natural language use by examining the semantic content of utterances in terms of adherence to the PP and/or the CP, what needs to be investigated is the relevance that participants perceive in utterances and the inferences that they derive in context.

3.2. The face-management approach to politeness and CRs

Since the analysis builds on existing revisions or extensions of politeness in B&L, this section first summarises the major tenets of the theory and presents an overview of criticisms that have a bearing on the analysis of CRs. Section 3.2.2 clarifies the points of divergences in previous studies on CRs with a view of unravelling the problematic aspects of the face construct. It proposes an analytic scheme for CRs that draws on the notion the balance principle and the distinction between face as claims to social worth,

on the one hand, and the needs people have for appropriate amounts of association/dissociation and equity in interaction, on the other. The analytic framework is further developed in Section 3.2.3 by incorporating a set of self-politeness strategies that aim to account for the self-presentational concerns of speakers. The framework is then applied to the corpus at hand and implications for the B&L model are discussed.

3.2.1. *The B&L model and complimenting*

The B&L framework has been described extensively in the literature, so this summary will be very brief and concentrate on (1) the nature of the politeness strategies posited in the model; (2) the assumption that nearly all speech acts are face-threatening; (3) the aspects of face that the politeness strategies attend to; and (4) the balance principle. Criticisms on the first two aspects will be taken up in this section but those on the face-construct and the balance principle will be incorporated into the summary of previous studies on CRs in Section 3.2.2.

Similar to GL, B&L develop a single speech act-oriented scheme of analysis. Although B&L do not define politeness, a remark on the objective of the theory shows that they view the construct as a tool for explaining social relationships in general and not just politeness understood as display of concern for others in interaction (B&L: 55).

B&L claim that linguistic politeness emerges as deviations from the CP, which are motivated to protect face in interaction when the speaker performs a speech act that “run[s] contrary to the face wants of self or other” (B&L: 65). Therefore, they maintain that politeness is involved in performing a face-threatening act (FTA hereafter).

B&L (p. 61) define face as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” and state that it comprises two aspects: A positive face (PF, hereafter) and a negative face (NF, hereafter). PF and NF are described as “the desire ... to be approved of” regarding personality, values, etc. and “the desire to be unimpeded in one’s actions”, respectively (B&L: 13). Politeness is thus construed as face-saving strategies that may attend to the PF and/or the NF of the speaker or the hearer (B&L: 247). In accordance with the kind of face attended to, two types of politeness super-strategies are posited. Briefly, in uttering a FTA, positive politeness strategies “claim or presuppose common ground by noticing, attending to H[earer], showing and intensifying interest, approval, seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, joking; convey that S[peaker] and H are cooperators by claiming reflexivity or reciprocity; or fulfil H’s wants by giving gifts to H in the form of goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” (summarised from B&L: 102).

Negative politeness is avoidance-based and “maintain[s] claims of territoriality and self-determination” (B&L: 70). In summary form, negative politeness strategies “are conventionally indirect; do not make assumptions about H’s wants; do not coerce H by minimizing imposition and giving deference; communicate S’s want to not impinge on H by dissociating self from infringement; or redress NF wants of H by, for example, acknowledgement of incurring a debt (B&L: 131). B&L (pp. 211-227) further note that a FTA may be performed off record by flouting Gricean maxims. In this manner, B&L connect off record strategies to the NF of the hearer. The last super-strategy is ‘Don’t do the FTA.’ B&L note that it avoids offence to the addressee but do not discuss whether this is avoidance of offence to PF or NF.

This summary clearly shows that the type of interaction B&L are concerned with is linguistic behaviour that increases social harmony. Furthermore, although the model proposes parameters for studying the effect of acts on the speaker, the politeness strategies are discussed mainly from the hearer's perspective.

As redress of a FTA, Cs in B&L fall under the positive politeness strategies of "claim[ing] 'common ground'" by "convey[ing] 'X is admirable, interesting'" and "fulfil[ling] H's want" by "giv[ing] gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation" (B&L: 102). However, B&L group them under intrinsic FTAs that threaten the NF of the addressee (B&L: 66).

Regarding the CR, B&L (p. 39) maintain that agreements with prior Cs are triggered by the need to attend to the Cer's PF and that self-denigrations imply a raising of the Cer. However, a further description of CRs reveals that B&L also consider self-denigrations in CRs as threats to the Cee's PF since they are damaging to his/her own face (p. 68) in terms of "wants of control and self-respect" (p. 286). Presumably because a return can imply a lowering of self, it is also deemed as threatening the Cee's PF. The difficulty in attending both to Cer's and to self's PF is compounded by their observation that if the speaker fails "to achieve [wants of control and self-respect] he makes it unlikely that H[earer] will approve of him, as well as threatening H[earer]'s face (potentially) with embarrassment *for* S[peaker]" (p. 286). I will return to the implications of these statements in the analysis of the data in Section 3.2.3.

B&L's comments on the compliment event is one illustration of why scholars have criticised the model for qualifying nearly all interaction as face-threatening and for positing strategies that are ambivalent in nature with respect to the face they attend to (e.g., Schmidt, quoted in Kasper 1990). This has led to varying interpretations of the model in empirical research and studies on CRs are no exception. While I agree with these criticisms to the extent that speech acts may not necessarily damage face but actually boost it, this does not necessarily imply that face is immune to redressive action in discourse involving face-enhancing acts. In this sense, part of what C-CR sequences do in interaction is to change the face values of the interlocutors.

The model proposes that facework will be performed in any situation where there is interactional imbalance concerning face needs (B&L: 236). B&L's exposition on the usefulness of politeness in explaining conversational structure refers to interactional imbalance under the concept of the "balance principle":

If a breach of face respect occurs, this constitutes a kind of debt that must be made up by positive reparation if the original level of face respect is to be maintained. Reparation should be of an appropriate kind and paid in a degree proportionate to the breach. (B&L: 236)

B&L illustrate the concept in exchanges forming chains of "imbalance, overcorrection, counter-correction until balance is again restored" (B&L 1987: 236). The operation of adjustments in situations of interactional imbalance is thus envisaged – albeit not theoretically developed – for both the speaker and the hearer. A further observation due here is that B&L point to the relevance of the balance principle in actions that monitor social distance and power relations.

Considering the significance of the balance principle in the model, it may be that the term 'face-threatening' is a misnomer. I suggest that the notion of FTA in B&L can be better described as a face-sensitive act. Utterances that lead to perceived damage to face would function as FTAs, while those that attend to interlocutor needs would function as "face-boosting acts" (Bayraktaroğlu 1991: 15; FBA hereafter). Arguably,

the categories can be better conceptualised as the two ends of a scale, incorporating points where utterances do not lead to any change in the equilibrium.

Thus, despite the fallacy of identifying practically all acts as inherently face-threatening and the ambivalence of the connection between specific politeness strategies and aspects of face, a significant strength of the model is the notion of the balance principle. It can be used as a framework for describing recurrent structures in conversation, where speakers make “fine and delicate adjustments of the balance of mutual face respect” (B&L: 238). With these considerations in mind, Cs and CRs can be described as face-sensitive acts since they change the face value attributed to the interlocutors.

3.2.2. *Face and the balance principle*

In this section, I first explain the sources of the discrepancies between accounts of CRs according to the B&L model. Based on this overview, I take up the suggestions in the current literature that the face claims of speakers need to be distinguished from their association/dissociation needs and their need for freedom from imposition. These distinctions and the notion of the balance principle form the basis for the analytic framework that will be further developed in Section 3.2.3 with a set of self-politeness strategies.

The discrepancies between analyses of CRs concern three issues: The description of the complimenting event as FTA or FBA; the definition and the kind of face attended to; and the identification of the politeness strategy underlying the response.

Holmes (1986, 1995) describes a C as a positive politeness act unless it is considered face-threatening to the social relationship or to the ethos of the speakers. Her description of the speech act suggests that positive politeness, and by implication PF, is interpreted as need for recognition of one's social worth and the maintenance of association. Chen (1993) and Baba (1996) also state that Cs mainly display positive politeness and that CRs are supportive of the Cee's PF. Their analyses imply that PF is the need for recognition of one's positive social image and that CRs are mainly supportive of the Cer's PF. Baba further notes that upgrades in Japanese intensify the hearer's interest and “add details and stories about the topic.” (e.g., ‘Oh he's MUCH cuter now he's got down to wearing OLD man glasses and ah changes hair’). Baba's comments suggest that it is not the PF of the Cer that is being attended to but the demands of the interaction that could be obliging interlocutors to keep the conversation going. In other words, what the Cee is attending to is PF in the sense of association needs.

Chen's analysis of Cs as face-threatening for the Cee, suggests that he goes by the definition of NF as freedom from imposition. To illustrate, even though returns and offers display positive politeness, returns protect the Cee's NF by getting him/her “out of debt by returning the verbal gift” and offers actually threaten NF by forcing the Cee to give the complimented object (1996: 58). Baba, on the other hand, makes no connection between NF and the positive/negative politeness strategies.

The two studies reveal further differences in the links they establish between specific response strategies and the politeness strategies. Chen argues that deflections and rejections cannot be explained within the B&L framework in a straightforward

manner (1993: 59-61). He further argues that the framework leads to contradictory analyses in the case of rejections since these are both face-threatening and face-giving to the Cer's PF. Baba, on the other hand, describes deflections as applications of the off-record strategies. As for rejections, questions and self-mockery, Baba classifies them as negative politeness.

In contrast to the above studies, Henderson follows the standard model in qualifying the whole compliment event as face threatening to either the PF or the NF of the Cer and the Cee. Her understanding of PF and NF is that PF is associated with ingroup membership, and NF with want for freedom from imposition and appropriate social distance. What is interesting in Henderson's analysis is that formulaic responses such as returns in the form of 'I like yours, too' occur among non-intimate interlocutors. Therefore, they are described under threats to the NF of the Cee, even though she sides with Chen (1993) and Baba (1996) in indicating that they raise the Cer's face. Thus, contrary to Chen and Baba, Henderson connects them to negative politeness as they increase social distance in African American English (1996: 205).

Besides the previously noted problem in identifying acts as inherently FTA or FBA, the overview raises a number of significant issues regarding how the face construct is employed in the analyses:

- 1 Is PF to be interpreted as either the need for recognition of social worth or association, or both? Similarly, is NF the need for freedom from imposition or disassociation, or both?
- 2 Are CRs geared towards PF/NF needs of the Cee or the Cer, or of both interlocutors?

To address these questions, we need to look further into critiques of the model concerning the definition of face.

A number of scholars hold that disentangling aspects of face into distinct but interrelated components can provide a better understanding of face-management and that the construct needs to be re-defined following Goffman's (1982[1967]) definition (e.g., Spencer-Oatey 2002). From what transpires in the data on complimenting, I concur with this need since it will

- (a) allow for a distinction to be drawn between issues of face, social distance/affect and imposition; and
- (b) explain why previous analyses of CRs refer to different aspects of face for the same response strategy.

One significant contribution towards unravelling face is the division scholars have drawn between face as an entity that corresponds to the individual's self-esteem, on the one hand, and the recognition of the individual's needs for a sense of association/dissociation and consideration on an autonomy-imposition scale, on the other. As the proposals partially overlap and not all offer revisions on the same aspects of face in B&L, the comparison summarised in Table 5 focuses only on the revisions in O'Driscoll (1996) and Spencer-Oatey (2000, 2002).

Table 5. Face and proposed revisions

B&L	O'Driscoll (1996)	Spencer-Oatey (2002)
PF (as the desire to be approved of)	Culture-specific face	Quality face
	-	(Social) identity face
PF (implied; as need for association)	PF (as association)	Association/ Dissociation rights
NF (as freedom from imposition)	NF (as dissociation and autonomy)	Equity rights (fairness in dealings; autonomy vs. imposition)

The first point of contact in the revisions is that one aspect of face is the positive attributes that the individual claims in public. O'Driscoll (1996: 4, 13-14) calls this "culture-specific face". Both O'Driscoll and Spencer-Oatey maintain that PF should be re-conceptualised as the need for acknowledgement of personal and social worth and should be divorced from its implied need for association. In this respect, the definition of PF in B&L accords well with both culture-specific and quality face. However, the model also implies that face is a need for association/dissociation. Positive politeness strategies are associated with creating/displaying greater intimacy since they carry an element of sharing of wants. NF and its related strategies are associated with freedom from imposition, hence possibly greater distance in interaction.

To avoid confounding the need for social recognition with needs regarding social contact, O'Driscoll proposes that PF and NF should be interpreted as the universal dual needs of "symbolic recognition", the former for "proximity and belonging", the latter for "distance and individuation" (1996: 3-4).

Spencer-Oatey (2002) proposes another division of labour between PF and NF. She argues that the term face should be employed only in the sense of quality and identity face while the need for association/dissociation and freedom from imposition are better conceptualised as "sociality rights." The first need is studied under "association rights" – the need for the appropriate amounts of interactional and affective association or dissociation. Thus, association rights cover both PF and NF in O'Driscoll (1996). The second construct, "equity rights," extends the B&L notion of NF along an autonomy-imposition scale to include the interrelated notion of cost-benefit concerns, which is the "belief that cost and benefits should be kept roughly in balance through the principle of reciprocity" (Spencer-Oatey 2000: 14). Spencer-Oatey calls this framework a "rapport management model" and maintains that it can cover a range of social behaviour – from harmonious to conflictive relations.

These two proposals, I believe, are major revisions of the B&L framework since they respond to the questions raised in (1)-(2) above and the criticism that the politeness strategies are ambivalent regarding the aspects of face redressed or threatened. However, as Spencer-Oatey points out, it is necessary to consider "the extent to which face and sociality rights are distinct concepts: Do they exist as two ends of a continuum, do they give rise to different types of affective reaction, or are they inextricably intertwined?" (2002: 544).

For purposes of analysis, I opt for the terms association/dissociation and equity rights instead of PF and NF to avoid confusion with their standard use in other studies on CRs. I will also not make a distinction between quality face and social identity face in this study and adopt O'Driscoll's (1996) concept of culture-specific face and simply refer to it as face. Thus, acts that respond to or threaten association needs will be described as association-enhancing/maintaining and association-threatening acts,

respectively (AEA and ATA, hereafter). Similarly, acts concerning equity rights will be described as equity enhancing/maintaining and equity-threatening (EMA and ETA, hereafter).

I now turn to a consideration of the second issue, that is, whether CRs respond to the PF or NF needs of the Cer or the Cee, or both. Once it is theoretically accepted that face needs are distinct from association rights, it becomes possible to explain why previous studies on the CR have discussed the speech act both in relation to enhancement of or threat to PF and imposition on NF. To illustrate, by focusing on the social function of the act in monitoring social distance, Henderson's (1996) study concerns the relation between the CR and association rights. Chen (1993) and Baba (1996), on the other hand, have discussed its relation with face values.

What we need to consider is that speech acts are multi-directional and multi-functional such that they can receive multiple interpretations or fulfil a number of concurrent goals. For example, under the appropriate circumstances, a C may enhance the addressee's face but it also allows the Cer to be evaluated positively since it displays him/her as a person who fulfils social expectations. From the perspective of association rights, a C may be found insincere, thereby threatening the social relationship. Such multi-directionality is an inalienable feature of communication that emerges in the flow of discourse. Thus the dynamic relation between the C and the CR may be captured if the notion of the balance principle (i.e., interactional imbalance) in the B&L model is defined as points in interaction where interlocutors perceive changes in face values and sociality rights.

At this point, the extension of the construct of interactional imbalance in Bayraktaroğlu (1991) is particularly relevant for the compliment event as she focuses on face needs. She argues that interlocutors attend to differences in relative change of face values rather than just face-threats in interaction. She re-defines interactional imbalance as "the state of disturbance caused in the previously established face values of self and other, by means of face-threatening or face-boosting acts" (1991: 31). The four-way grid proposed in B&L for FTAs is extended to include the following: FBA/self; FTA/self; FBA/other; and FTA/other. Accordingly, Bayraktaroğlu identifies patterns of polite and impolite exchanges affecting the face of the interlocutor based on the illocutionary force of utterances. For example, a positive evaluation of the hearer functions as a face-boost other, while a denigration of one's attributes functions as a face-threat self.

In Table 6, I present those that are relevant to the C-CR sequence owing to either the propositional content of the act or the conversational implicatures connecting the acts. I have added patterns (f) and (h) to accommodate exchanges where the first speaker enhances face of other and the second threatens other either by an FT/other or an FB/self. That is, impolite exchanges are also assumed to emerge by an opposite action to other's face or a similar action to self-face.

The politeness values indicated in the table are based on the semantics of the utterances and the inferences that link the patterns to each other. According to the balance principle, an increase in the face value of the Cee, generated by the utterance of the C, implies a lowering of the Cer's face value. This can be counter-balanced by a similar action towards the Cer's face or by a lowering of the Cee's face value by the Cee. The context-free assumption is that where speakers boost the face of addressees or where they threaten their own face, they are behaving politely since they would not be presenting themselves as better than the other. If they boost their own face or threaten

that of the addressees, they would be behaving aggressively, which could be interpreted as being impolite. All this is said with the caveat that it is the social role relationship and the particular paralinguistic features with which the utterances are performed that affect whether they will be perceived as (im)polite.

Table 6. Moves in restoring face values

<i>Polite exchanges</i>							
Pattern F1	S1	(a)	FB/other	↑	(b)	FT/self	↓
	S2		FT/self	↓		FB/other	↑
Pattern F2	S1	(c)	FB/other	↑	(d)	FT/self	↓
	S2		FB/other	↑		FT/self	↓
<i>(Im)polite exchanges</i>							
Pattern F3	S1	(e)	FT/other	↓	(f)	FB/other	↑
	S2		FB/self	↑		FT/other	↓
Pattern F4	S1	(g)	FT/other	↓	(h)	FB/other	↑
	S2		FT/other	↓		FB/self	↑

(Adapted from Bayraktaroğlu (1991: 18); S: speaker; ↑: face-boosting; ↓: face-threatening)

My reason for including patterns (F1b), (F2d), (F3e), (F3f), and (F4g) in the case of complimenting is that they are relevant to the interlocutors' concerns over face values. In essence, they are meant to reflect the Cee's perception of the C. Patterns (F1b) and (F2d), for example, reflect (F1a) from the perspective of the Cee since a C may be perceived as FT/self for the Cer by the Cee. In these cases balance is restored with an FB/other or FT/self. Pattern (F1a) is also diagonally related to (F2d), especially in a C that explicitly depicts the Cer in a comparatively less favourable light (e.g., Cs of the form "I wish I were as ... as you"). Whether (F3f) and (F4h) can be considered cases of balance restoration would naturally depend upon role relationships.

As will be illustrated in the following section, viewing exchanges from the vantage point of face value changes allows the analysis to investigate "the cohesion between activities" (Bayraktaroğlu 1991: 26) and accounts for CRs that employ more than one strategy and exchanges that extend over several turns. Together with the self-politeness strategies which will be described in the next section, the interaction patterns will also accommodate both speaker and hearer concerns.

Since face is now theoretically distinguished from association and equity rights, a set of patterns can be posited to explain balance restoration concerning sociality rights. Acts may enhance/maintain or threaten association rights and equity rights. Since the acts related to these are either reciprocal or not, the relevant patterns for polite and impolite exchanges can be represented diagrammatically as in Tables 7 and 8:

Table 7. Moves restoring association rights

<i>Polite exchange</i>							
Pattern A1	S1	(a)	AE/other	↑			
	S2		AE/other	↑			
<i>(Im)polite exchanges</i>							
Pattern A2	S1	(b)	AE/other	↑	(c)	AT/other	↓
	S2		AT/other	↓		AT/other	↓

Key: AE: association enhancement; AT: association threat

Table 8. Moves restoring equity rights

<i>Polite exchanges</i>							
Pattern E1	S1	(a)	EM/other	↑			
	S2		EM/other	↑			
<i>(Im)polite exchanges</i>							
Pattern E2	S1	(b)	EM/other	↑	(c)	ET/other	↓
	S2		ET/other	↓		ET/other	↓

Key: EM: equity maintenance; ET: equity threat

The extension of balance restoration patterns to sociality rights allows for a multi-dimensional account of CRs since it handles utterances that are oriented to face and sociality rights separately. As will be illustrated below and in Section 3.2.3, it also explains why previous analyses of the same response strategy have focused on one or more dimensions of the act. Utterances oriented to face can create implicatures concerning association since ingroupness/outgroupness can be displayed by positive or negative evaluations in interaction (Ensari and Miller 1998).

From the perspective of acts related to sociality rights, implicatures regarding face values can be derived in interaction. To illustrate, greetings are a form of phatic communication that primarily concern association rights. If S2 meets S1's greeting with expressions that follow socially expected norms, the exchange would constitute a polite exchange (pattern A1a), while no exchange of greetings in contexts where they are expected (i.e., pattern A2c) could lead to interpretations of dissociation. If, on the other hand, an association-enhancement also includes asking about health/well-being in contexts where it is not expected, it may be interpreted as complimenting face in the Turkish context (Ruhi and Doğan 2001). Depending on the particulars of the situation, recurrent lack of greetings between acquaintances would constitute marked behaviour and could lead to implications of mutual negative evaluation regarding face values. Exchange of greetings between acquaintances is a minimal form of social contact implying that the speakers find each other worthy of interaction. Its non-occurrence, therefore, in situations where it was formerly performed is likely to have repercussions on face values.¹⁰

The interpretation of acts on the relational level as im(polite) is constrained by the then current interpretations and expectations of the interlocutors. Observance of silence, for example, between people in the same environment need not necessarily lead to negative evaluation since the interlocutors may be respecting each other's need for privacy. Another crucial point for the analysis is that the binary choice between uttering a FBA vs. a FTA and the linguistic style in which they are performed need to be conceptualised as scalar notions since (1) the degree of FB or FT by the speaker or the addressee may be attenuated with the use of strategies that move in the opposite direction (e.g., an FB/self may be performed along with an FT/self as in the case of weakened agreements); and (2) the amount of face payment may not necessarily correspond to the addressee's expectations.

In the manner delineated above, the attention to changes in face values would resolve the contradiction that Chen finds in analysing disagreements according to the B&L model. A disagreement with a C would now be a FT/self uttered in response to a

¹⁰ Cf. Hess (2000) on distancing behaviour between interlocutors who dislike each other, and Haugh and Hinze (2003: 1605) for a similar discussion on the role of greetings in showing approval of others.

FB/other (that is, pattern F1a). Since the Cee is denigrating self, through implication, it could raise the Cer's face value and thereby restore balance in face values.

The revision can also resolve the discrepancies between analyses concerning the function of returns in Chen (1993) and Henderson (1996). Where the Cee responds to FB/other with FB/other (i.e., pattern F2c), the Cer's face value will be increased. But since the formulaic returns in Henderson also monitor social distance, they can now be described as threatening the association needs of the Cer since they indicate outgroup membership in African-American English. They would also thus fall under patterns (A2b) and (A2c) for the Cer and the Cee, respectively, in moves restoring association rights. In other words, while the Cer performs an association-enhancement (AE/other), the Cee counteracts with the formulaic return (AT/other) since the C may be perceived as an association-threatening act.

If the above reconsideration of previous studies on CRs is in the right direction, what it suggests about the relation between face concerns and association rights in complimenting is that the two are inextricably related to each other. This is to be expected given that the CR responds to an act oriented primarily towards face and that a positive assessment of the Cee is likely to enhance relational ties. Section 3.2.3 will elaborate on the connection especially with respect to exchanges that were found to be problematic for the maxim model, and propose a framework for handling such responses through the understudied notion of self-politeness. By examining the effect of self-politeness in interaction, the analysis proposes to handle cases of both polite and impolite exchanges in complimenting.

3.2.3. *Self-politeness, politeness strategies, and CRs*

In this section, I develop a framework for analysing the self-presentational concerns of speakers. I propose specific self-politeness strategies that relate to face and sociality rights, based on Goffman's (1982[1967]) conceptualization of demeanour. Together with the balance restoration patterns described in the previous section, the application of the self-politeness strategies are illustrated with samples drawn from the corpus.

As previously summarized in Section 3.2.1, B&L's claims about the face-threatening nature of the CR for the Cee's PF are some of the few instances where they reflect upon the impact of interaction on the speaker's face needs. They claim that denigrating the object of a C or returning a C may damage the Cee's face. They further remark that "[t]hese acts are damaging to S[peaker]'s face because of his basic positive-face wants of control and self-respect" (p. 286). It is thus possible to assume that recipients of Cs are sensitive to self-face needs in formulating their responses. If so, the model can be extended to include strategies that attend to self-face.

Based on the issues raised in Section 3.1.3 concerning the self-presentational needs of individuals for self-affirmation/assertion, display of wittiness and originality in performing CRs, there is a need to accommodate them within politeness theory. This is all the more necessary since it was observed in the analysis that upgrades and jokes do not necessarily lead to impolite exchanges. It was also noted that disagreements in the corpus do not all proceed from modesty but from incompatibility between judgements on the praiseworthiness of the object of C, the social inappropriateness of the C, and negative affect. Such disagreements can best be considered self-face-saving strategies and moves that monitor social distance. Admittedly, there are situational and cross-

cultural differences concerning what would be deemed appropriate kinds of self-presentation. Notwithstanding such variation, in what follows I attempt to integrate such strategies with the balance restoration patterns after a brief overview of the way self-politeness has been approached in current literature.

Self-politeness has recently has been taken up by Chen (2001) and Haugh and Hinze (2003) with significant difference in scope. Chen defines self-politeness “as cases in communication where the need to protect and enhance one's own face influences what one says and the way she says it” (2001: 88, emphases added). Haugh and Hinze, on the other hand, define self-politeness (in their terminology, *demeanour politeness*) as “what A shows A thinks of A” and claim that in English and Japanese it involves “showing that one does not think good of oneself, especially in cases where one has received a positive evaluation from someone else” (2003: 1606). I will briefly dwell on these proposals.

Although Haugh and Hinze cite Goffman (1982[1967]) in their description of *demeanour politeness*, we observe that it is similar to the Modesty Maxim in GL and the B&L version of deference. The description is also considerably narrower than Goffman's understanding. Goffman defines *demeanour* in the context of American culture as attributes of the individual: Discretion, sincerity, self-control over emotions, showing deference to others, and self-respect (1982[1967]: 77-82).

Parallel to Haugh and Hinze's description of self-politeness, Chen (2001) too considers self-face enhancement to be mainly a self-face threatening act. Furthermore, his description of self-politeness strategies would predict that if a CR reacts to undesirable appraisal of self, it would be performed with greater indirectness or even withheld (2001: 97-98). The data discussed in Section 3.1.2 indicate that mitigation in self-face protection is usually not the case.

I find the emphasis on modesty in self-presentation both in Chen (2001) and in Haugh and Hinze (2003) to be deficient in accounting for the present data since they downplay the need to display competence and originality in interaction. As I will further clarify in the sections below, individuals can express competence, self-confidence and individuality in a variety of settings regardless of whether or not their face is threatened. Thus, rather than follow the FTA approach to self-politeness, I take up Goffman's description of *demeanour* as a starting point and maintain that individuals boost or protect their public image (and others pertaining to themselves) by attending to the face needs and sociality rights of not only others but also themselves. Furthermore, I maintain that this attention may take the form of an attack to alter's needs.

I propose three super-strategies to account for self-face enhancement and self-face protection: ‘Display confidence,’ ‘display individuality,’ and ‘display impoliteness’. Some of the self-politeness (SP hereafter) sub-strategies are specific to CRs (e.g., SP1 and SP2) and the list is not meant to be exhaustive. As with the balance restoration patterns, the politeness values indicated in the list rely on the context-free assumption that denigrating the face of interlocutors and disregarding their association and equity rights constitute impolite behaviour:

- I Display confidence by
 - SP1 asserting agreement with the C*
 - SP2 upgrading the assessment in the C
 - SP3 disagreeing with the C
- II Display individuality with

	SP4	non-formulaic CRs (e.g., re-wording formulaic CRs creatively, original metaphors)
	SP5	ironic
	a.	FT/other
	b.	AT/other
	c.	ET/other
III	Display	impoliteness with/by
	SP6	FT/other
	SP7	AT/other
	SP8	ET/other
	SP9	withholding a response ¹¹

The first two super-strategies (but not the specific sub-strategies) are the same as those posited in Rogers and Lee-Wong (2003) to account for politeness in organisational settings in (non-)western cultures, where individuals have to maintain solidarity and individuality, on the one hand, and deference and confidence, on the other, in competitive and collaborative environments. I claim that the same tensions are applicable to interaction in non-institutional settings too, and require a formulation within politeness theory. Although all the strategies require contextual investigation as to whether politeness or impoliteness is inferred by the interlocutors, the first two super-strategies are distinctively more neutral compared to those under impoliteness since they do not involve explicit threat to face in their propositional content.

To briefly clarify the strategies, I will show below that those in the first group are operative in some unqualified agreements, praise upgrades and disagreements. The strategy of asserting agreement may sound like agreement in the B&L model. However, B&L word the strategy as “seeking agreement” (B&L: 102), while I maintain that it is its assertive illocutionary force that is present in CRs of the agreement type. In this sense, it is equivalent to the bald-on strategy in B&L. Stating disagreement, if done with no face-anointing verbal or non-verbal strategy, can also achieve interpretations of impoliteness depending on the specific context. Super-strategy II mainly applies to jokes but also operates in the more creative CRs. Super-strategy III will be shown to apply in situations where Cees perceive the Cs as threats to either self-face or sociality rights.

The proposed strategies aim to counter-balance the bias in both the maxim and the face-management approach towards showing deference and solidarity (the latter often taken to imply that solidarity emerges primarily from agreement rather than expression of true feelings and assessments). The lack of attention to confidence, individuality, and sincerity as interactional strategies misrepresents the nature of not only some CRs in naturally occurring environments but also other forms of discourse in real life. Interlocutors can compete for enhanced face value, enter power play, contest socially circumscribed roles and conventional ways of doing ‘linguistic interaction,’ and display sincerity through disagreements to generate either camaraderie/solidarity or discord/conflict, depending on the socio-psychological details of the interaction.

It may be argued that what is at stake here is the self-face concerns of individuals and that these should lie beyond the scope of politeness theory, given that there may be a whole range of intercultural and individual variation on what counts as

¹¹ The strategies of impoliteness are similar to those in Culpeper (1996: 356-8) and are inspired from B&L’s list of FTAs to PF and NF (B&L: 66-67). Different from Culpeper, however, I distinguish between face and sociality rights.

appropriate demeanour and ways of challenging, complying with, or re-interpreting social norms through interactional strategies. However, the data in the present study and those in other studies (e.g., Rogers and Lee-Wong 2003) suggest that self-presentational issues are at the heart of the performance of (im)politeness, and that politeness theory needs to take into account speaker sensibilities. Thus, in contrast to critiques levelled at the B&L model within the context of non-western cultures (e.g., Mao 1994), I maintain that it is the individual who is lost in both the maxim and the face-management models of politeness. The focus on other-directed politeness in these theories and the assumption that self-politeness is achieved primarily by showing modesty portray only part of linguistic behaviour in western and non-western settings alike.

In the following sections, I will examine samples of CRs where speakers display less standardised forms of self-presentation and discuss how the responses can be accounted for through the balance restoration patterns and the self-politeness strategies. Section 3.2.1 will dwell on the implications of the analysis for the face-management model.

3.2.3.1. *Accepting*

Let us first consider balancing of face values. If we were to follow the FTA approach or the definition of self-politeness as essentially consisting of modesty, intensified agreements would be responding to a FB/other with FB/other by implying shared common ground with the Cer (i.e., pattern F2c). However, the intensified agreement can also be interpreted as a FT/other under pattern (F4f). That is, they perform a FB/self and this could be interpreted as impolite since the Cee does not hedge the complimentary force to lower self-face compared to the Cer's implied devaluation of his/her own face. In the same manner, upgrades would also lead to interpretations of impoliteness since the Cee does not hedge his/her acceptance of the C (i.e., a FB/other followed by a FB/self; cf. pattern (F4h)).

The data reveal that unqualified agreements and praise upgrades are easier to accomplish when the C is directed to possessions or when the response involves mutual role relationships and common tastes. The exchange in (32) is an illustration where the Cee is a friend of the Cer's son. (The comment in line 2 that the Cee can also be considered the Cer's son is complimentary in Turkish.):

- (32)
Cee	<i>Biz M'yla aynı sınıftaydık ODTÜ'de</i>
'M and I were classmates at university'
Cer	<i>Aa siz de benim oğlum sayılırsınız</i>
'Oh, then you are my son too'
→ Cee	<i>Tabii öyle</i>
Of.course so
'Of course that is so'

However, there are quite a few examples which involve accomplishments in common areas of interest or responsibilities. In such situations, one would expect the Cee to display modesty so as to avoid suggesting that the Cer is held in lower esteem. I will describe such exchanges with an example from unqualified agreements and take the same to apply to praise upgrades. The difference between the two strategies is that while

unqualified agreements display confidence by asserting agreement (i.e., SP1), upgrades display confidence by intensifying the positive assessment (i.e., SP2).

Sample (33) is from an exchange between well-acquainted students, where the topic is the Cee's essay. It illustrates a case of pattern (F4h), that is, FB/other-FB/self:

(33)	1	Cer	<i>Bu yazıyı kim yazdı?</i>
'Who wrote this essay?'	
	2	Cee	<i>Ben yazdım</i>
I write-PAST-SING
'I wrote [it]'	
	3	Cer	<i>Yazın da maşallah inci gibiymiş</i>
'Your handwriting too <i>maşallah</i> is like pearl'	('like pearl': an idiom used to describe neat handwriting or teeth)
	→ 4	Cee	<i>Öyledir</i>
So-COP
'That is so'	

The presence of the assertive copula in the Cee's response (line 4) allows hearers to discern the strong agreement, which distinguishes it from weaker agreements. It implies that the agreement is not motivated by FB/other but by FB/self. In the absence of non-verbal cues, it is possible to argue that the C may have been uttered in envy or that the Cer was making light of the accomplishment by making an ironical use of the invocation, *maşallah* 'what wonders God hath willed'. If this is the case, then the Cee may have perceived the C as FT/other and responded with the unqualified agreement (i.e., FT/other-FB/self; cf., pattern F3e).

According to Bayraktaroğlu's (1991) analysis, the exchange in (33) would constitute an impolite exchange since the increase in the Cee's face value is not decreased by the Cee. However, there are some cases which suggest that there are individual differences in self-presentational styles and that self-aggrandisement may be a behavioural form sanctioned among friends and intimates (cf. Section 2.3.1 on acceptance strategies). In other words, display of confidence by asserting agreement may be an acceptable form of self-presentation.

Such sequences often, though not necessarily, involve "a theatrical quality ... meant as entertainment ... or humour", similar to the interactional quality described of Black American English (Kochman and Reisman, reported in Wierzbicka 1991: 84-85), with the difference that in Turkish it is mostly restricted to ingroup communication. Performed with the appropriate tone, assertions of agreement may override interpretations of claim for superiority. Cers may chide the Cee in a similar playful manner or respond to the CR with laughter, while they may even sanction such assertions in intimate relations (e.g., husband-wife or parent-child exchanges). Thus a FB/other-FB/self has to be seen in its situation of occurrence to be evaluated as impolite.

This analysis reveals that self-enhancement needs to be considered from the perspective of both the Cer and the Cee. If a C is perceived as face-threatening as in (F3e), that is, 'FT/other-FB/self', the intensified agreement or the upgrade would be protecting self-face by marking self-confidence. But they could be a FT/other from the perspective of the Cer if performed in unwarranted contexts. To illustrate this point with two cases, a C directed from parent to child may be responded to with a FB/self and this

could to be perceived as self-confidence. The FB/self by the Cee in response to FB/other, i.e., pattern (F4h), then, would not generate implicatures of impoliteness. In the case of harmonious relations, impoliteness may emerge when the praise upgrade is not followed up with a second turn that downgrades the C or responds with an act that is in some way beneficial to the Cer. Sample (34) is an illustration where the Cee displays concern and offers more food to the Cer (line 4; positive politeness strategies), thereby counterbalancing the second turn C generated by the Cee's upgrade in line 2. It restores balance according to pattern (F2c), that is, 'FB/other-FB/other':

- (34) 1 Cer *M amca. Eline sağlık yemek çok harika olmuş*
 'Uncle M, Health to your hands. The food is really wonderful '
- 2 Cee *Lafa bak şimdi. Tabi ki güzel olacak. Kim yaptı?*
 Utterance-DAT look now. Of.course EMPH.PART nice be-FUT. Who do-
 PAST
 'Just look at what you're saying now. Of course it should be nice. Who made
 it?'
- 3 Cer *Ay pardon. Her zamanki gibi çok güzel olmuş diyeyim bari*
 'Oh, sorry. Let me say it's very delicious as usual
- 4 Cee (smiling) *Afiyet olsun da çok az yiyorsunuz. Olmuyor yani*
 May it do you good too very little eat-PROG-PLU. Become-NEG-PROG well
 'May it do you good but you're eating very little. Now that's not OK'

To turn to weakened agreements, it was observed in Section 2.3.1 that such responses in Turkish may make use of linguistic markers that have weaker semantic content ('yeah') or transfer the agreement to a third party (e.g., 'Everybody says so'). The first response claims common ground, which is a positive politeness strategy in B&L. The second, by impersonalising the agreement, dissociates self from the proposition and, thereby, avoids implications of comparative superiority. In this manner, the weakened agreements strike a balance between a second turn full-fledged FT/self and a FB/self in response to a FB/other by the Cer (cf., patterns (F1a), (F2c), and (F4h)). That is, they maintain both self-face and other-face.

The returns and reciprocations are positive politeness strategies since they 'convey that X is admirable' by enhancing the face of the Cer (i.e., 'FB/other-FB/other'; cf. pattern F2c). We may also describe offers as enhancing the face of the Cer since the Cee displays awareness of his/her needs. Furthermore, by offering material good in return for the verbal gift, they restore and maintain equity rights symbolically through pattern (E1a), that is, 'EM/other-EM/other'.

Appreciation tokens can also be explained along the scale of equity rights: While the Cee maintains a positive image of self, they mark the speaker's indebtedness and restore balance according to pattern (E1a). Since the Cee also pays back the good will of the Cer, association rights and face values are kept in balance too (i.e., patterns (A1a) and (F2c), 'AE/other-AE-other' and 'FB/other-FB/other', respectively). On the assumption that Cs are acts of good will on behalf of the Cer in contexts where they do not violate behavioural expectations, it is possible say that weakened agreements also maintain sociality rights along the pattern (A1a).

It was argued in Section 3.1.2 that jokes are instantiations of the Banter Principle in GL but that they can also be considered cases where the speaker displays wittiness and self-confidence. From the perspective of the face-model, most of the jokes instantiate pattern (F3f) at face value, that is 'FB/other-FT/other', since they are face-threatening in various ways. They do not say something in return for the good will of

the Cer; they question the motivation of the Cer; they poke fun at the Cer's formulation of the C; or the like. The exchange in (35) illustrates how a Cee may display wittiness by ironically threatening association rights:

- (36) Cer *Ben n'apardım sensiz*
 'What would I do without you'
 Cee *N'apıyordıysan onu yapardın*
 What do-PROG-PAST-COND-SING that-ACC do-AOR-PAST-SING
 'You would do whatever you used to do'

If received well, jokes add humour to the interaction and may thereby foster intimacy. In this manner, jokes enhance association. If they misfire, they would operate along patterns (A2b) and (F3f), that is, 'AE/other-AT/other' and 'FB/other-FT/other', respectively, since they lead to tension and the Cer could feel a self-face threat. Thus, while jokes display individuality through non-formulaic CRs that are ironic face or sociality right threats (i.e., SP5), much depends on how they will be evaluated. It is also likely that the Cee's choice to move away from a conventional CR involves an element of power play, which makes the joke especially risky when it involves a FT/other.

As has been mentioned in Section 2.3.1, laughter occurs in response to novel or surprising Cs. Most of the samples indicate that the Cs are evaluated positively, but since the response does not directly address the change in face values, it can be assumed that they enhance association by increasing warmth and friendliness in interaction (i.e., pattern (A1a)). This does not preclude the fact that laughter is actually vague in terms of indicating how the C has been received and that it may be a form of self-face protection if the C was perceived as a face-threat.

3.2.3.2. Deflection/evasion, rejections and request interpretations

In terms of attending to the change in face values, the strategies in the deflection/evasion category function in two ways. The comment histories and evasions do not respond to the enhancement of face but skilfully change the nature of the speech event into 'small talk' on an aspect of the topic of the C. In this manner, the topic is impersonalised but at the same time the Cee is able to display interest in the topic selection of the Cer. These strategies are thus instantiations of pattern (A1a), that is, 'AE/other-AE/other', because they co-construct the conversation and attend to the Cer's interest in the topic. In this sense, they are positive politeness strategies since they address the comment in the C as assertive acts and not as expressives.

Credit shifts to the Cer are interesting ways of resolving the interactional imbalance since they combine patterns (F1a) and (F2c); that is, they decrease the value attributed to self-face and boost the face of the Cer. Since the reason for the C is placed on the Cer's good will, such CRs are also implicationally related to pattern (A1a) in that they enhance mutually supportive relations between the interlocutors (a positive politeness strategy in B&L). When the credit is shifted to a 3rd person or an aspect of the C topic, balance is restored by the Cee's devaluation of his/her contribution concerning the positive attribute (i.e., it instantiates pattern (F1a)). As has been previously noted, B&L describe raising of other and lowering of self as a negative politeness strategy. However, since freedom from imposition is conceptualised as a sociality right in the present study, it is reasonable to assume that credit shifts mainly address face values.

In Section 2.3.2, it had been noted that questions consist of either information-seeking questions or negative-polarity questions. The information-seeking questions (e.g., 'What do you mean?') respond to the C first as an assertive act in that they protect self-face before committing the Cee to a complimentary interpretation of the Cer's remark. Although none of the samples in this category lead to impoliteness, the Cer's face is challenged when the Cee perceives the C as face-threatening or vague in illocutionary force. In other words, while the C is FB/other for the Cer, it is perceived as a possible FT/other by the Cee (patterns (F3f) and (F4g), 'FB/other-FT/other' and 'FT/other-FT/other', respectively). In the corpus, the perceived illocutionary vagueness or misunderstanding is resolved by a second turn C, and the exchanges usually end with a balance restored by the Cee's denigrating self-face or by boosting the face of the Cer (i.e., patterns (F1a) or (F2c)). In terms of the strategies in B&L, we observe that such questions are not face redressive and function as a bald-on-record strategy following the CP.

The negative-polarity questions (e.g., 'Really'), on the other hand, portray the Cee as not being overly presumptuous in accepting the validity of the C. Since it is the Cee who implies deprecation of self-face, the response restores balance with a FT/self (i.e., pattern (F1a)). It was reported in Section 3.2.2 that Chen (1993) regards the implied rejection in deflections and disagreements as running counter to protecting the Cer's face. This assessment is based on the assumption that expressing disagreement is always a FT/other (cf. B&L: 102). However, what is changing here is the value of the Cee's face; therefore, interlocutors are unlikely to interpret negative-polarity questions as such. As has been noted in Section 3.1.3, that negative-polarity questions receive interpretations of modesty is a strong indication that interlocutors judge such responses from the perspective of the Cee (see sample (33)). On the other hand, the Cer may also judge the Cee as lacking in self-confidence, being self-conceited in situations where the C is deserved (cf. Spencer-Oatey et al. 2000), or as fishing for Cs. While it is possible that interlocutors assign such meanings, this remains a question for further contextual investigation.

To turn to the category of rejections, the downgrades and disagreements that do not result from dissonance regarding the evaluation of the social relationship, the content of the C, or the then current psychological state of the Cee also instantiate pattern (F1a), since the Cee decreases self-face value (i.e., 'FB/other-FT/self'). This explains why downgrades and disagreements prolong the adjustment made by alternate speakers just as is often the case with negative-polarity questions. Different from negative-polarity questions, however, disagreements are often performed with weakeners such as appreciation tokens and mitigators, which suggests that they have the potential to damage the Cer's face since their linguistic form is open to interpretation either as an assertive or an expressive speech act. A more plausible explanation, however, is that disagreements are not FT/other but threats to association and equity rights in the sense that they may imply a lack of appreciation of the Cer's attempt to be sociable (see the discussion in Section 3.1.3). In this manner, weakened disagreements enable Cees to maintain balance in sociality rights while allowing them to present their own perspective on the C topic.

In the case of disagreement due to difference in opinion regarding the assessment (i.e., SP3, 'display confidence by disagreeing with the C'), the Cee perceives the C as threatening self-face, in which case s/he may perform a FB/self or a FT/other to protect self-face (i.e., the second turn in patterns (F3e) and (F3f)). The

degree of face-threat to the Cer may vary. In sample (35) we observe a case where the Cee does not mitigate her rejection of the C that her freckles become her:

- (35) Cer *Bence bu çiller sana hoş bir hava veriyor. Daha çekici yapıyorlar seni*
 'I think these freckles give you a charming air. They make you more attractive'
 → Cee: *Saçmalama yaa! Ben öyle hava istemiyorum. Ayrıca çil de istemiyorum*
 Nonsense.do-NEG PART! I like.that air want-NEG-PROG-SING. Besides freckle also
 want-NEG-PROG-SING
 'Oh don't speak nonsense! I don't want an air like that. What's more I don't want
 freckles either!
 Cer *Tamam canım! Sakin ol. Sadece fikrimi söylemiştim*
 'OK canım! Be calm. I just told you what I think'
 Cee (no reaction)

In the exchange the Cee asserts her own self-evaluation through strategies SP3 and SP6 (i.e., FT/other). This response would probably be evaluated as impolite as is evident in the Cer's attempt to compensate for the displeasure caused by her remark. The sample indicates that a disagreement may function as a FT/other and lead to confrontational discourse in the case of direct attacks on the Cer's face. In other instances, they may be treated as a matter of difference of opinion that does not affect the Cer's face. Sample (36) is one exchange between a mother and daughter, where strong disagreement would probably not be perceived as having repercussions on the Cer's face:

- (36) Cer *F! Bayağı zayıflamışsın sen*
 'F! You really have put off a lot of weight'
 → Cee *Aman anne! Yapma Allah aşkına! Ben ve zayıflamak? Asla*
 Go.on mother! Do-NEG God love-POSS-DAT! Me and slimming? Never
 'Go on mother! Don't say that for God's sake! Me and slimming? Never'
 Cer *Yok, yok. Gerçekten bana öyle geldi*
 'No, no. I really think so'
 Cee *İşte sorun da o. Sadece sana "öyle" geliyor*
 This problem too that. Only you-DAT like.that come-PROG
 'Well that's the problem. It only looks like that to you'

Where the Cee attacks the Cer's face, the CR may also affect the interactional balance with respect to association and equity rights. In situations where the C is unwarranted due to the nature of the social relationship (i.e., 'AT/other-AT/other'), the Cee perceives the C as a FT/other and performs a FT/other to protect his/her association rights through SP6 (i.e., display impoliteness with a FT/other). The CR in sample (30), where the Cee attacks the face of the service provider in a photocopying shop is one illustration of the use of this strategy ('Ugh! How artificial you are!'). In situations where the Cer assumes reciprocity in social relations and the Cee performs a FT/other, the response is likely to create disaffiliation through SP7 (i.e., display impoliteness with AT/other). The discussion on sample (31), where the Cer was accused of being insincere is especially relevant here as we observed that the Cer later displayed disaffiliation behaviour towards the Cee (see footnote 9).

In the literature on CRs, silence is first classified as a 'do not-do-FTA' on the assumption that responding to a C is a FTA for the Cee. It is then accounted through the modesty constraint (cf., Baba 1996). However, what needs to be considered is that the CR is a second turn in the adjacency pair so that no acknowledgement of a first turn may actually be a FT/other. As noted in Section 2.3.3, silence is often interpreted as either disagreement or as something that the Cee can account for (cf., for example, the

question, 'What's the matter my dear?', in sample (28)). Thus rather than infer impoliteness, the Cer may check on the Cee's psychological state by asking about the Cee's well-being. In other words, a possible perception of threat to association rights is restored by an AE/other (i.e., AE/other-AT/other-AE/other). If the Cer interprets the silence as a disagreement, the C may be re-worded to restore the balance by seeking agreement. In cases where there is greater social distance, the silence functions as a way of marking disaffiliation along pattern (A2b), that is, 'AE/other-AT/other'. The exchange in (37) illustrates such an interaction between a hairdresser and a customer:

- (37) Cer *Ne kadar güzel saçlarınız var! Hem dolgun, hem de parlak*
 'What beautiful hair you have! It's both voluminous and shiny'
 Cee (silence)
 Cer *Şampuan reklamlarına çıkmayı hiç düşündünüz mü?*
 Have you ever thought of appearing in shampoo commercials?
 Cee *Hayır*
 'No'

From the perspective of the Cee, withholding a response protects her association rights and functions as an association threat to the Cer.

Not all samples of silence lead to second turns. Where there are non-verbal cues such as blushing or averted gaze in friendly relations, the response is likely to be interpreted as a form of evasion and display of modesty, in which case we may assume that the Cee decreases his/her face value (i.e., 'FB/other-FT/self').

According to the B&L framework, the last category of CRs, request interpretations, would be examined as a FTA to the Cer's PF since they do not respond to the illocutionary force of the C as an expressive act but interpret it as a directive. However, this describes the exchange only from the perspective of the Cer and does not address the face concerns and equity rights of the Cee. In exchanges where the Cee shows reluctance or refuses the implied request, we observe that the C is interpreted as a threat to equity rights. Cees may question the motivation for the C or refuse to comply with the implied request (e.g., in sample (24) the Cee responds to the C on her elegance with 'Yeah, well, what's up?'). The Cee thus challenges the Cer's sincerity and performs a FT/other. At the same time, it restores the interactional imbalance concerning the equity rights of the Cee by placing the Cer in the position of a potential requestee (i.e., SP8, display impoliteness with ET/other). In other words we observe an interaction pattern where a perceived threat to equity rights is responded to with an implied FT/other and an explicit ET/other (i.e., pattern E2c).

In the foregoing analysis, we have observed that interlocutors make use of a variety of self-politeness strategies to protect and enhance self-face. They also employ self-politeness strategies to protect their association and equity rights, depending on their assessment of their own interactional goals and those of their addressees. A further finding of the analysis is that strategies to maintain face closely interact with sociality rights. The implications of the analysis will be developed in the next section.

3.2.4. Implications of the analysis for the face-management model

The analysis in Section 3.2.3 has carried over the conceptualisation of other-directed politeness to self-directed politeness. Admittedly, politeness in this sense is different

from that underlying the proposal in B&L and its layman conceptualisation, which views politeness as showing consideration to alter. However, the corpus reveals that speakers are as much concerned about their own face and self-presentation as the face of others and that the attention to self-face may take the form of face attack. In this sense, the technical conceptualisation of politeness as ‘concern for other’ needs to be expanded to include ‘concern for self’. The exchanges have also revealed that speakers make fine adjustments to monitor sociality rights and interactional goals. It has therefore been necessary to expand the notion of politeness to include both self-politeness and impoliteness in a more explicit manner than is available in the B&L framework.

To accommodate such aspects of interaction, the analysis has distinguished between the face and the sociality rights concerns of people (Spencer-Oatey 2000). The analysis has also appealed to Goffman’s notion of demeanour to account for self-presentational styles. It has been observed that speakers may employ self-face boosting strategies and that these may not necessarily lead to interpretations of impoliteness or conflictual discourse in naturally occurring discourse. This implies that the description of politeness mainly as deferential behaviour towards others only partially reflects communicative behaviour. Thus, in line with Watts’ notion of ‘social practice’ (2003), I suggest that normativity should be extracted from politeness theory. The sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic principles and styles that speakers adhere to can then be described by looking into the behavioural expectations and conventions that they co-construct and contest in discourse.

The analysis has also revealed that while self-face concerns impact upon interaction, the choices that speakers make regarding self-presentation and the manner with which they handle alter’s face needs depend on the context of situation, their interactional goals, and their perception of the addressee/s. It has been possible to elucidate the impact of such concerns with recourse to the balance restoration patterns. In this regard, the data suggest that besides self- and other-face, speakers are sensitive to the relational aspect of face too. As proposed in Face-Negotiation Theory, it may be necessary to incorporate a notion of mutual face in interaction. Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) define mutual face as the image of the interlocutors or the relationship. That mutual face is a significant concern in interaction is epitomized in the formulaic CR, *o sizin güzelliğiniz* (lit. ‘that is your beauty’; ‘Beauty is in the eye of the beholder’), with which the Cee consolidates reciprocal good will and maintains the face of the other.

Regarding the relation between face and sociality rights, the corpus shows that they are closely inter-related in both harmonious and conflictual communicative events. Given the nature of complimenting, this is to be expected since the C proposes a re-definition of the Cee’s public image. It is only natural that it may have repercussions on sociality rights. However, I would not suggest moving back to conflating face and sociality rights. People appear to reflect sensitivities that foreground concerns over one or the other in communicative events, even though evaluations regarding both concerns may be present in all communicative settings. The request interpretation strategy, for example, is one case showing that equity rights are separate issues from face concerns. Naturally, analyses of other speech events are needed to further address the issue.

I will now turn to the criticisms of the B&L model that I did not take up in the previous sections, namely the bias in the model towards the polite end of the continuum in interaction and the lack of attention to the socio-psychological context. As has been shown to be the case in the maxim model, B&L do not take impoliteness within their

purview, but the model can be extended. Concerning the role of context in interaction, the analysis allows us to discern that judgements of (im)politeness depend on a variety of factors, ranging from behavioural expectations to judgements that speakers make regarding their interlocutors. However, as has been mentioned in Section 3.1.4, this does not weaken the argument that speech acts inherently embody a positive or a negative impact on face and sociality rights. Just as a C affects association rights, a request may enhance the individual's face when it implies that others evaluate his/her competencies positively. However, that does not detract from the imposition that the act places on the individual's equity rights.

4. Summary and conclusion

The foregoing analysis of CRs has been informative in a number of ways. It has shown that the individual's face is invested with great affective value and that interlocutors will adopt self-presentational styles that are consistent with the self-image they wish to project in interaction. To effect such presentations, speakers may opt for displaying self-confidence, individuality or impoliteness. The analysis has thus shown that the bias towards other-oriented politeness in both the maxim and the face-management approaches may be remedied by positing self-politeness strategies, which operate not only in cases of threats to self-image but also in situations where speakers wish to project competence and individuality. This extension of the notion of politeness does not deny that speakers more often than not pay attention to the face needs of their interlocutors, but by focusing on the speaker it has been possible to account for CRs that diverge from the maxims and strategies described in GL and B&L.

The investigation has also revealed that speakers are sensitive to possible changes in degree of association and imposition. To account for these aspects of interaction, the analysis has separated face concerns from sociality rights (Spencer-Oatey 2000). Drawing this distinction has been especially fruitful in accounting for cases of face attack and threats to the social relationship in situations where the C is deemed inappropriate or insincere. Furthermore, by attending to the changes both in face values and sociality rights, it has been possible to explain how speakers attempt to effect (im)balance in interaction.

The study has revealed that any choice in communicative interaction ultimately bears its own risks. Speakers may choose to maintain harmony or generate conflictual discourse. Sometimes they may even unwittingly create disharmony in interaction. In maxim-theoretic terms, whether speakers opt to transfer value to hearer and thereby gain face as interlocutors who are sensitive to the face and sociality rights of others or portray themselves as competent, self-confident, witty persons who can drop deferential styles in communication depends on the nature of the social relationship and the personality features of the interlocutors. Speakers may also find that other-directed politeness clashes with their own evaluation of the ongoing interaction, in which case they may challenge the hearer's face and sociality rights.

It is highly likely that speakers will calculate cost and benefits regarding the communicative choices they make in particular situations and will attend to their short and long-term goals in interaction. It appears then that the cost-benefit scale in GL functions as a superordinate factor affecting the manner with which speakers will attend to both their own face and sociality rights and those of their interlocutors. In this

respect, we may conclude that the maxim and the face-management models complement each other when the notion of politeness is extended to include self-politeness. If politeness is operationalised as transfer of value, we observe that value may be directed towards self-face, other-face, or withheld from one or the other. In the same manner, value may be directed towards or withheld from relational ties and equity rights. Whether a particular kind of transfer produces (im)politeness depends on the evaluation of the interlocutors, but the corpus suggests that transfer of value to self-face need not necessarily generate impoliteness.

To accommodate the above-mentioned dimensions in interaction, I propose that (im)politeness phenomena can be investigated within the broader concept of relational work, defined as the verbal and non-verbal action that interlocutors take to effect supportive or non-supportive moves towards the face, sociality rights, and interactional goals of self and/or other/s. It incorporates a continuum of behaviour – from considerate to rude, aggressive behaviour. It involves a range of behavioural forms: Warmth, sincerity, respect, etc., depending on the expectations that people have in particular cultures and communicative settings. In this respect, (im)politeness would emerge as evaluative judgements that people make on the social appropriateness of relational behaviour.

To account for the relational work that people engage in, I propose that the relational style effected by people will be influenced by their face needs, their interactional goals, the linguistic and non-linguistic conventions relevant to the communicative event (e.g., the expectation that the audience should turn off mobile phones at a concert), the behavioural expectations that they have of others (e.g., that friends will support each other in times of trouble), and the values and ideologies that they uphold (e.g., generosity, modesty, etc.; cf. Schwartz et al. (2001) on personal values). Within such a scheme, the maxims in GL and the notion of face-maintenance (or enhancement and threat) in the BL framework can be re-interpreted and elaborated as socio-pragmatic interactional principles that people uphold in communication (e.g., showing sympathy, warmth, etc.; cf. Spencer-Oatey and Jiang (2003) for a discussion of such principles). I assume that people will show individual variation both in the principles that guide their (non-)linguistic behaviour and in their style of relational work but that there are conventions shared in communities of practice. For example, some individuals may have a tendency to deflect credit attributions in Cs, irrespective of the social setting, while others may prefer to accept the credit to a greater extent. I present the scheme diagrammatically in Figure 1.

The framework is inspired from the bases of (im)politeness judgements discussed in Spencer-Oatey (2005) and the analysis of the present corpus. I assume that the sociopragmatic interactional principles form the bases of relational work and that values/ideologies will also impact upon people's style of relational work. Furthermore, by subsuming principles related to equity rights within the domain of relational work, I suggest that consideration or disregard of the transactional goals of interlocutors is also open to judgements of (im)politeness (Ruhi and Işık 2005).

Figure 1. Dimensions of relational work

As has been mentioned above, I assume that the cost-benefit scale in GL functions as a superordinate factor on the nature of the relational work that people will engage in. The bi-directional arrows in the diagram are meant to represent the interactive nature of the dimensions in relational work such that, for example, a negatively evaluated interactional move may change the behavioural expectations that people will have of each other in future interaction and the interactional goals that they might entertain. To avoid complicating the diagram, I have not drawn links between the various dimensions but I maintain that they are all linked to each other in the same manner.

In conclusion, this study points towards the need for further investigation into the conditions underlying self- and other-directed politeness in a variety of discourse genres. A crucial line of research would be to investigate the interplay of these factors and the employment of self-politeness strategies to better understand the factors that trigger self- and other-directed politeness. Another aspect that has not been touched upon in the study is the impression that speakers create with their choice of self-presentational style and the impact that it has on the quality of the social relationship and evaluations of (im)politeness. Thus research that taps the impressions that particular self-presentational styles generate in context-specific environments would further contribute to an understanding of the ingredients of (im)politeness.

Appendix 1

AEA	Association-enhancing act
ATA	Association-threatening act
C	Compliment
Cee	Complimentee
Cer	Complimenter
CR	Compliment response
EMA	Equity-maintaining act
ETA	Equity-threatening act
FBA	Face-boosting act
FTA	Face-threatening act
NF	Negative Face
PF	Positive Face
PP	Politeness Principle
SP	Self-politeness

Appendix 2

ABL	Ablative
ACC	Accusative
AGR	Person agreement
AOR	Aorist
CAUS	Causative
COP	Assertive copula
DAT	Dative
EMPH	Emphatic
GEN	Genitive
LOC	Locative
MANN	Converb of manner
NEG	Negation
OPT	Optative
PART	Particle
PAST	Past
PERF	Perfective
PLU	Plural/Plural agreement
POSS	Possessive
PROG	Progressive
PRT	Participle
Q	Question particle
REL	Relative marker
SING	Singular agreement

References

- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Baba, Junko (1996) A study of interlanguage pragmatics: Compliment responses by learners of Japanese and English as a second language. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, UMI No.: 9719290.
- Bach, Kent, and Robert M. Harnish (1979) *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: MIT Press.
- Barnlund, Dean C., and Shoko Araki (1985) Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 16.1: 9-26.
- Bayraktaroğlu, Arın (1991) Politeness and interactional imbalance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92: 5-34.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, Rong (1993) Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 49-75.
- Chen, Rong (2001) Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 87-106.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (1996) Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 349-67.

- Eelen, Gino (2001) *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome's Press.
- Ensari, Nurcan, and Norman Miller (1998) Effect of affective reactions by an out-group on preferences for crossed categorization discussion partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75: 1503-1527.
- Festinger, Leon (1962[1957]) *Theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Fraser, Bruce (1990) Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 219-236.
- Goffman, Erving (1982[1967]) *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Golato, Andrea (2002) German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 547-571.
- Grice, Paul (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics, vol. 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.
- Haugh, Michael, and Carl Hinze (2003) A metalinguistic approach to deconstructing the concepts of 'face' and 'politeness' in Chinese, English and Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1581-1611.
- Henderson, Anita (1996) Compliments, compliment responses, and politeness in an African-American community. In J. Arnold, R. Blake, B. Davidson, S. Schwenter, and J. Solomon (eds.), *Sociolinguistic variation: Data, theory and analysis, selected papers from NWAV 23 at Stanford*. Stanford, CA: Center for Language and Information, pp. 195-208.
- Herbert, Robert K. (1990) Sex-based differences in compliment behaviour. *Language in Society* 19: 201-224.
- Herbert, Robert K. (1997) The sociology of compliment work in Polish and English. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. London: Macmillan, pp. 487-500.
- Hess, Jon A. (2000) Maintaining nonvoluntary relationships with disliked partners. *Human Communication Research* 26.3: 458-488.
- Hofstede, Geert (1998) Masculinity/femininity as a dimension of culture. In G. Hofstede (ed.), *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 3-28.
- Holmes, Janet (1986) Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. *Anthropological Linguistics* 28.4: 485-508.
- Holmes, Janet (1995) *Women, men and politeness*. London, New York: Longman.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (1996) The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist* 1.3: 180-186.
- Kasper, Gabriele (1990) Linguistic politeness – current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 193-218.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey (2003) Towards an anatomy of politeness in communication. *International Journal of Pragmatics* XIV: 101-124.

- Liu, Dilin (1995) Sociocultural transfer and its effects on second language speakers' communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 19.2: 253-265.
- Manes, Joan, and Nessa Wolfson (1981) The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routines: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned Speech*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, pp. 115-132.
- Mao, LuMing Robert (1994) Beyond politeness theory: 'Face' revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 451-486.
- Meier, A.J. (1995) Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24: 381-392.
- O'Driscoll, Jim (1996) About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 1-32.
- Pérez Hernández, Lorena (1999) Grounding politeness. *Journal of English Studies* 1: 209-236.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1978) Compliment responses. In Jim Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 79-112.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred and dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.
- Rogers, Priscilla S, and Song Mei Lee-Wong (2003) Re-conceptualizing politeness to accommodate dynamic tensions in subordinate-to-superior reporting. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 17.4: 379-412.
- Ruhi, Şükriye (2002) Complimenting women in Turkish: Gendering and otherness. In A. Duszak (ed.), *Us and others: Social identities across languages, discourses and cultures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 401-427.
- Ruhi, Şükriye, and Gürkan Doğan (2001) Relevance theory and compliments as phatic communication: The case of Turkish. In A. Bayraktaroğlu and M. Sifianou (eds.), *Linguistic politeness across boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins, pp. 341-390.
- Ruhi, Şükriye, and Hale Işık (2005) Face and facework in Turkish: Revelations from politeness lexemes and idioms in Turkish. Paper presented at the 9th International Conference on Pragmatics, 10-15 July, 2005, Riva del Garda.
- Schwartz, Shalom, Gila Melech, Arielle Lehmann, Steven Burgess, Mari Harris, and Vicki Owens (2001) Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 32.5: 519-542.
- Searle, John (1969) *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John (1976) A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language and Society* 5: 1-23.
- Sifianou, Maria (2001) "Oh, how appropriate" compliments and politeness. In A. Bayraktaroğlu and M. Sifianou (eds.), *Linguistic politeness across Boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins, pp. 391-430.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2000) Rapport management: A framework for analysis. In H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum, pp. 11-46.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2002) Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 529-545.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen (2005) (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 95-119.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen, Patrick Ng, and Li Dong (2000) Responding to compliments: British and Chinese evaluative judgements. In H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum, pp. 53-65.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen, and Wenying Jiang (2003) Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: Moving from politeness maxims to sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1633-1650.

Tezcan, Mahmut (1974) *Türklerle ilgili stereotipler (kalıp yargılar) ve Türk değerleri üzerine bir deneme* [The stereotypes about Turks and a study on Turkish values]. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.

Thomas, Jenny (1995) *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Ting-Toomey, Stella, and A. Kurogi (1998) Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22.2: 187-225.

Yu, Ming-chung (2003) On the universality of face: Evidence from Chinese compliment response behavior. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1679-1710.

Watts, Richard (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1991) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wolfson, Nessa (1983) An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N. Wolfson, E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Newbury House Publishers, Rowley/London/Tokyo: Newbury House Publishers, pp. 82-95.