

---

## STRATEGIES OF RESPONDING TO PRAISE USED BY HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: SOCIOPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

**Herlisa, Lukman, Gusnawaty**

Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

E-mail: herlisa.lisa@gmail.com, lukmanhufs@gmail.com,  
gusnawatyanwar@gmail.com

---

### ARTICLE INFO

### ABSTRACT

Received:

**December, 26<sup>th</sup>  
2021**

Revised:

**January, 17<sup>th</sup>  
2022**

Approved:

**January, 18<sup>th</sup>  
2022**

*This study aims to analyze the strategies for responding to praise used by Hasanuddin University students. This research is a qualitative research using descriptive method and the approach used in this research is a socio pragmatic approach. The data from this study were obtained from questionnaires distributed by researchers. After the data was obtained, the researcher analyzed the answers from the respondents using 12 praise response strategies according to Holmes, after which they were linked to the theory of praise indicators from Golato. The results in this study, namely the respondents in this study tend to accept the praise given and the most widely used praise response strategy is Strategy 1, namely Appreciation Token, Strategy 2 is Comment Acceptance and Strategy 3 is Praise Upgrade. Between the three ethnic backgrounds (Makassar, Bugis and Toraja) and the two sex groups (Male and Female), there was no significant difference in the choice of strategies to receive praise (Use of strategies 1, 2 and 3). Among the three categories of familiarity level, respondents tend to receive praise and use Strategy 1 (Appreciation Token) the most when meeting foreigners compared to using strategy 2 or strategy 3 where both of these strategies are used quite a lot (besides strategy 1) to provide an acceptance response*

---

Herlisa, Lukman, Gusnawaty (2022). Strategies of Responding to Praise Used by Hasanuddin University Students: Sociopragmatic Analysis. Journal Eduvest. 2(1): 22-33

How to cite:

**E-ISSN:**

2775-3727

**Published by:**

<https://greenpublisher.id/>

---

*a compliment delivered by a friend or friend.*

---

**KEYWORDS**

Sociopragmatic, Praise, Strategies of Responding

---



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

---

## INTRODUCTION

Culture is the identity of a society. (Spencer-Oatey, 2008) stated that culture is a collection of basic assumptions and values, life orientations, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioral conventions that are shared by a group of people and influence (But do not determine) the behavior of each member and his or her interpretation of it. the 'meaning' of the behavior of others. Cultural elements are universally divided into seven elements, namely knowledge systems, language, equipment and technology systems, arts, livelihood systems, religious systems, and social systems. Language is a medium of communication. Language is the most valuable and most useful tool that humans have. Language is used by humans to ask for and give information (Holmes & Hazen, 2013). According to (Trudgill, 2001), the function of language is not only simply to communicate information, but also to build and maintain relationships with other people.

In an effort to maintain this relationship, each individual has special characteristics in expressing a language. The way a person expresses a language is different from others even though they use the same language. Language differs from place to place, from one social group to another and from one situation to another. The way someone expresses a language can show the habits in a society or even the culture of the community. It can be said that language has a very close relationship with the culture of society. This causes each speech community in society to have different characteristics from other speech communities, including how to interact between individuals in that community. One of the differences is their language behavior because each culture has a different language behavior according to the prevailing norms/rules. To understand social rules and norms related to language behavior, a sociolinguistic study is needed. A speaker will bring up various forms of speech to convey his aspirations, feelings, and ideas with the people around him in various forms of linguistic expression. The forms of linguistic expressions that appear when someone speaks with their partner include asking for, giving, refusing, and praising, and other utterances.

In everyday conversation, someone will use certain utterances either directly or indirectly to convey their meaning. These utterances can be utterances of request, utterances to apologize, or utterances to avoid or refuse. These utterances are usually framed with certain impressions to show polite behavior, such as thanks, greetings, flattery or praise, and utterances that express concern or concern for others. Holmes (1988) states that expressions of praise are included in speech or expressions that cause attention, desire, need, and attention from the listener. Expressions of praise are used for various reasons such as to express admiration, or respect for the work or activities that have been carried out by others, to maintain solidarity, instead of greetings / respects, apologies, and congratulations (Wolfson, 1981). Furthermore, linguists state about the various purposes of people expressing praise, including to dilute communication, open communication with unknown people, make people who are praised happy, and others.

Although people like to be praised, but how to respond to compliments appropriately is often a problem for the recipient of the compliment. This is caused by the

recipient of the compliment who tends to try not to show his pleasure as a form of humility. In addition, people usually respond to compliments in various ways. Such as saying "thank you", "really?", "ah no, I'm not that good", "actually I didn't prepare well", "I will try to do better", and so on. In addition, there are several classifications of responses to praise. (Pomerantz, 1978) classifies various responses to praise into four categories; (1) accept (acceptances) for example by saying the word "thank you", (2) agree (agreements) for example by saying the word "I am also satisfied with my appearance earlier", (3) reject (rejections) for example by saying "oh no. ...I don't feel comfortable wearing these clothes", and (4) disagree, for example by saying, "Really? I am not sure".

Praising is giving birth to admiration and appreciation for something (which is considered good, beautiful, brave, etc.). Praising is a means of expressing sincere appreciation to the speech partner. Origin of the word praise is praise which means acknowledgment of admiration and sincere appreciation for the goodness (superiority) of something. The utterance of praise and its response is one form of the principle of politeness in language. According to (Brown, Levinson, & Levinson, 1987), praise is one of the positive politeness strategies used to show the speaker's desire to be considered a group with the speech partner, and have the same values or norms as the speech partner, so that praise is said to be able to bring the relationship between the speaker and the speaker closer. speech partner. However, praise can also threaten the face of the interlocutor by giving pressure to respond to the compliment, sometimes praise can be used as a satire (Holmes, 1988). Therefore, for smooth communication, it is necessary to have pragmatic or contextual knowledge about praise so that misunderstandings and miscommunications will not occur which will eventually make the speaker's relationship with the speech partner relaxed.

Misunderstandings that occur are usually caused by differences in perceptions by the speech partner which causes the response given is not in accordance with what is expected (Supposedly) by the speaker. The response of these speech acts of praise can be very diverse and as explained in the previous section, it will be greatly affected if it is applied to people with different cultures. This is in line with (Golato, 2005) statement that responding to praise properly is an aspect of communicative competence that varies and varies from one culture to another. The response, in various aspects (depending on the social context), will lead to language politeness because the response cannot be predicted to be in the form of approval, rejection, or neutral form (disagree or reject). If the response appears in a bad form (rejection), it will certainly have a negative effect on the giver of the compliment. Therefore, in responding to one's speech acts, the role of culture is also decisive.

One of the most visible differences in responding to compliments is the habit of Indonesians when receiving compliments, many of them respond to compliments in a denial style, which is different from the culture and linguistic model, for example, westerners or Chinese. They have several responses to show politeness and respect for others. Praise expresses the rules of language used in a speech community and is an important element of the toolkit for maintaining relationships between individuals. Studying the praise response can improve our understanding of people's culture, social values, social organization, and the function and meaning of language used in a community. Furthermore, it can be said that research on praise response is an important and interesting topic because it differs from culture to culture.

The differences are not always related to western and eastern culture as is widely discussed. Indonesia is famous for various tribes that live side by side where each of these

tribes has a different culture. The ethnic background makes the variety of language behavior of the Indonesian people. One of the language behaviors that are assumed to invite these differences, as mentioned in the previous section, is how to respond to compliments. Responding to praise for some people on certain cultures in Indonesia creates contradictions. Responding to praise by saying thank you or agreeing to the content of the compliment can be considered arrogant while refusing a compliment is considered a violation and sometimes someone will be confused in choosing the right response to express when receiving a compliment.

Empirical studies conducted so far (Hill et al., 2018); (Aisyah, 2015); (Yoga, Malau, & Marbun, 2021); (Lestyanawati, Hartono, & Sofwan, 2014); (Rosiah, 2017); (Yuliasri & Allen, 2019) show that the same speech act will be realized very differently by speakers who have cultural backgrounds. different. The results of the study show that there are differences in the way in giving praise and responding to praise. The influence of culture on the use of language in speech acts of praise is very visible when people respond to praise. The difference is seen in the language pattern, the attributes that are the source of praise, the order of frequency, the function and the response given. The most striking difference lies in the strategies used in responding to compliments. In Western cultures, for example, the most common response is to accept praise, while in Asian cultures, Asians tend to avoid praising themselves.

The people of Sulawesi, which is a sub-culture of Asian society, also experience the dilemma as mentioned above. In the culture of the people of Sulawesi, harmony or harmony and respect for others are basic principles that always to hold in everyday interactions (Adawiyah, 2020). The principle of harmony is achieved by avoiding vulgar conflicts in the arena of community members. The principle of respect is embodied in the system of sipaka tau, sipakalebbi, silapaknga and politeness in language. Thus, the response of the people of Sulawesi to a compliment will not be far from this principle.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This research was a qualitative research using descriptive method and the approach used in this research is a socio pragmatic approach. According to (Lexy, 2010)"Qualitative research is research that is intended to understand the phenomenon of what is experienced by the object of research in a descriptive way in the form of words and language, in a special natural context and by utilizing various scientific methods". The method used in this research is descriptive analysis method or descriptive research. Through the descriptive analysis method, the researcher tries to explain clearly the discourse data obtained based on the results of the research that has been carried out. According to Prastowo (2011) "Descriptive analytical research is research that seeks to describe a symptom, event, event that has occurred at the present time (when the research was carried out)". With the descriptive analysis method, the researcher tries to record all the symptoms or events that occurred during the implementation of the creative method in the field and then explain it as it is to answer all questions. The results of discourse data were represented in words that could clarify and describe the actual situation in the field or at the time of research.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

In the following section, the researchers discussed the results of the research which were divided based on ethnic background, gender and level of familiarity to see what response is the most widely used in terms of the three variables.

The table below contains the total answers for each classification of general praise responses which are categorized based on differences in ethnic background. There are 3 ethnic groups, namely Bugis with 31 respondents, Makassar with 25 respondents and Toraja with 19 respondents.

Table 1. Classification of Praise Responses Based on Ethnic Differences

Compliment Response Classification	Bugis Tribe		Makassar Tribe		Toraja Tribe	
	Total Answer	Average	Total Answer	Average	Total Answer	Average
1 = Receipt of Praise	99	8	66	6	88	6
2 = Agreed Commenting	99	8	80	6	36	2
3 = Praise Increase	26	2	12	1	5	1
4 = History Explanation	3	1	2	1	1	1
5 = Diversion of Praise	4	1	6	1	2	1
6 = Compliment Revenge	4	1	2	1	3	1
7 = Giving Humble Comments	40	2	41	3	18	2
8 = Asking Questions	5	1	4	1	8	1
9 = Rejection of Praise	13	1	3	1	6	1
10 = Comparative Commenting	3	1	6	1	2	1
11 = Response Cancellation	23	2	21	2	16	1
12 = Request Submission	4	1	6	1	4	1

No answer	30	2	0	0	0	0
	Total Respondents	31	Total Respondents	25	Total Respondents	19
	Bugis Tribe		Makassar Tribe		Toraja Tribe	

Based on the data above, it was discovered that the most widely used response strategy by respondents with a Bugis ethnic background to respond to compliments given was strategy 1, namely Acceptance of Praise (Short verbal or non-verbal responses indicating the acceptance of praise from those who praised) and strategy 2 i.e. Agreed Commenting (Accepting compliments and providing appropriate comments on the topics discussed). However, there are some of them who reject the praise using strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments (rejecting praise by giving comments that show that the topic of praise is normal) and there are also respondents who do not respond to the praise given (strategy 11, namely Eliminating Response / no response in any form, both verbal and nonverbal).

The same thing applies to respondents with a Makassar ethnic background that Strategy 1 (Receiving Praise) and Strategy 2 (Giving Agreed Comments) are the most widely used strategies to respond to compliments given. Quite in line with this, respondents from Toraja ethnic backgrounds also chose strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) as a form of response to the praise given. However, unlike the other two tribes who also used strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments) with a not too significant difference from strategy 1, respondents from the Toraja tribe did not experience the same thing. There is a significant difference between the use of strategy 1 and 2, which means that respondents from the Toraja tribe tend to use strategy 1 more than strategy 2.

Drawing conclusions from the explanation above, it can be said that in terms of differences in ethnic background, respondents from each ethnic group tend to accept the praise given and respond to it (at most) using strategy 1, namely Receiving praise and then strategy 2, namely Giving Agreed Comments. However, there are some of them who reject the praise using strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments and there are also respondents who do not respond to the praise given (classified as strategy 11, namely Elimination of Responses).

The table below contains the total answers for each classification of praise responses (general) which are categorized based on gender differences. There are 49 female respondents and 26 male respondents.

Table.2 Classification of Praise Responses by Gender

Classification of Praise Respons	Female		Male	
	Total	Average	Total	Average
1 = Receipt of Praise	160	14	93	7
2 = Agreed Commenting	157	14	58	5
3 = Praise Increase	27	3	16	1
4 = History Explanation	4	1	2	1
5 = Diversion of Praise	6	1	6	1
6 = Compliment Revenge	7	1	2	1
7 = Giving Humble Comments	62	6	37	3

8 = Asking Questions	11	1	6	1
9 = Rejection of Praise	6	1	16	1
10= Comparative Commenting	3	1	8	1
11 = Response Cancellation	37	3	23	2
12 = Request Submission	11	1	3	1
No answer	17	2	13	1
	Total Female Respondents	49	Total Male Respondents	26

Based on the data above, it was found that the most widely used response strategy by female respondents to respond to compliments given was strategy 1, namely Accepting Praise (a short verbal or non-verbal response indicating the acceptance of praise from those who praised) and Strategy 2, namely Giving Agreed Comments (Accept the praise given and provide appropriate comments on the topics discussed). There are also a small number of them who use strategy 3, namely Increasing Praise with a significant comparison compared to strategies 1 and 2. There are also several respondents who reject the praise by using strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments (Rejecting praise by giving comments that show that the topic of praise is a common thing) and there are also some respondents who do not respond to the praise given (Strategy 11, namely the Elimination of Response/no response in any form, both verbal and nonverbal).

The same thing applies to male respondents that Strategy 1 (Receiving Praise) and Strategy 2 (Giving Agreed Comments) are the most widely used strategies to respond to compliments delivered with significant differences that are not too far away. Even in receiving praise, there are some male respondents who use strategy 3 (Increasing Praise) with a significant difference compared to Strategies 1 and 2. There are also some respondents who use strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments to reject the praise given and strategies 11 (Negation of Response) as a form of lack of response to the praise given.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that based on gender differences, female respondents and male respondents alike tend to accept the praise given and respond to it (at most) using strategy 1, namely receiving praise, then strategy 2, namely Giving Agreed Comments and strategy 3 is Increase in Praise. There are also some of them who reject the praise using strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments and there are also respondents who do not respond to the praise given (Classified as strategy 11, namely Eliminating Responses).

The table below contains the total answers for each classification of praise responses in general which are categorized based on differences in the level of familiarity, namely the respondent's answers to situations where the speaker (Complimentary) is a friend or stranger.

Table 3 Classification of Praise Responses Based on the Level of Familiarity

Classification of Praise Respons	Best Friends		Friends		Foreigners	
	Total	Average	Total	Average	Total	Average
1 = Receipt of Praise	82	21	56	14	138	37
2 = Agreed Commenting	75	19	62	16	52	14

## Herlisa, Lukman, Gusnawaty

3 = Praise Increase	18	5	14	5	7	2
4 = History Explanation	1	1	2	1	3	1
5 = Diversion of Praise	3	1	14	5	0	0
6 = Compliment Revenge	4	1	5	1	0	0
7 = Giving Humble Comments	25	6	51	13	23	6
8 = Asking Questions	8	2	1	1	7	2
9 = Rejection of Praise	14	5	8	2	7	2
10 = Comparative Commenting	5	1	4	1	1	1
11 = Response Cancellation	22	6	21	6	18	5
12 = Request Submission	3	1	11	1	0	0
No answer	20	6	34	9	18	5
	Total Respondent	75	Total Respondent	75	Total Respondent	75

Based on the data above, it was found that the most widely used response strategy by respondents in responding to compliments given by friends was strategy 1, namely Accepting Praise (Short verbal or non-verbal responses that indicate receiving praise from those who praised) and strategy 2, namely Giving Comments. Agreed (accepting compliments and providing appropriate comments on the topic being discussed). There is also a small percentage of them who use strategy 3, namely Increasing Praise with a significant comparison compared to strategies 1 and 2.

There are also some respondents who reject the praise by using strategy 7, namely Giving Condensing Comments (Rejecting praise by giving comments that show that the topic of praise is a normal thing), strategy 8, namely Giving Questions (asking the truth of praise to those who praise). who uses strategy 9, namely Rejection of Praise (Rejecting praise by giving comments indicating that the praise is inappropriate. In addition, there were several respondents who did not respond to the praise given (Strategy 11, namely the Elimination of Responses/no response in any form, both verbal and nonverbal).

The same thing applies to compliments delivered by Friends and Strangers that Strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and Strategy 2 (Giving Agreed Comments) are the most widely used Strategies to respond to compliments delivered with significant differences that are not too far away. Even in receiving praise, there are several respondents who use strategy 3 (Increasing Praise) with a significant difference compared to Strategies 1 and 2.

There are also some respondents who use strategy 7 (Giving Low Comments) and strategy 9 (Rejecting Praise) to reject the praise given and strategy 11 (Rejecting Response) as a form of not responding to the praise given. However, there is one difference in terms of rejection of compliments between Friends and Strangers in that strategy 8 (Questioning) is used more by respondents to respond to compliments given by Strangers than those delivered by Friends.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that in responding to compliments given by friends, friends or strangers, respondents tend to accept the praise given and respond by (at most) using strategy 1, namely receiving praise, then strategy 2, namely Giving Agreed Comments and strategy 3. i.e. Increased Praise. There are also some of them who reject the praise using strategy 7, namely Giving Low Comments, strategy 8 namely Giving Questions and strategy 9 namely Rejecting Praise and there are some respondents who do not respond to the praise given (classified as strategy 11, namely Rejecting Response) .

From table 1.1, it can be seen that of the 31 Bugis respondents, on average 16 people chose to receive praise with 8 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 8 people using strategy 2 (Giving Agreed Comments). There is also an average of 2 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 2 people who do not respond (classified as strategy 11). Of the 25 Makassarese respondents, on average 12 people chose to receive praise with 6 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 6 people using strategy 2 (Giving Agreed Comments). There is also an average of 3 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 2 people who do not respond (Classified as strategy 11). Of the 19 Toraja respondents, an average of 8 people chose to receive praise with 6 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 2 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments). There is also an average of 2 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Giving Low Comments) and an average of 1 person who uses strategy 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Based on this, it can be concluded that respondents in this study tend to receive praise by using strategies 1 and 2. This is in line with the results of research from (Fakhiroh & Rohmah, 2018), (Lestiyawati et al., 2014) and (RAHDAYANTI, 2017) which suggests that statements agree with or without explanation is still the respondent's favorite strategy in responding to the praise given. Ethnic differences are not a factor in response polarity because all three are still in the same culture and community circle, namely the Sulawesi community with the characteristics of the sipaka tau culture, sipaka lebbi, sipaka inga and politeness in language (Adawiyah, 2020).

From table 2, it can be seen that from 49 respondents for women, an average of 28 people chose to receive praise with 14 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 14 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments). There is also an average of 6 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 3 people who do not respond (classified as strategy 11). Of the 26 male respondents, on average 12 people chose to receive praise with 7 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 5 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments). There is also an average of 3 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 2 people who do not respond (Classified as strategy 11).

Hasyari (2018) suggests that Bugis women are more likely to accept to show solidarity with their interlocutor and refuse praise to avoid exalting themselves. Meanwhile, Bugis men tend to joke rather than accept compliments. Bugis men also tend to refuse compliments. If you look at this reference, there are differences in assumptions where the results of this study do not show that and quite the opposite, at least for male

respondents. Both female and male respondents in this study tended to accept the praise given using strategy 1 and 2 while a small proportion of them refused using strategy 7.

Although this has not been confirmed for real, because according to (Guo, Zhou, & Chow, 2012) there are several variables that affect a person's praise response to the praise given. The researcher assumes that the difference between the results of this study and Hasyari's (2018) research is due to the age factor that male and female respondents in the study are in the adult age category, while in this study the age category of the respondents is classified as teenagers (Students). This is as stated by (RAHDAYANTI, 2017) in her research which says that the acceptance of praise is also influenced by the age factor. However, further research is highly recommended to confirm the above assumptions.

The following section will discuss the analysis of data from table 3 which is about choosing a praise response strategy based on the level of familiarity. The situation is that in a condition where there is an utterance of praise delivered by a friend, friend or stranger. Based on some of the references that have been stated previously, social variations can affect the response to praise, so it is assumed that the level of intimacy between the speaker and listener (who is in a praise speech situation) affects the choice of response strategy.

From table 3, it was found that from 75 respondents who were in a situation of communicating with friends, an average of 40 people chose to receive praise with 21 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 19 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments). There is also an average of 6 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 3 people who do not respond (classified as strategy 11). Of the 75 respondents who were in a situation of communicating with friends, an average of 40 people chose to receive praise with 14 people using strategy 1 (Receiving Praise), 16 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments) and each 5 people using strategy 3 (Increasing Praise) and strategy 5 (Diversion of Praise). There is also an average of 13 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 6 people who do not respond (classified as strategy 11). Of the 75 respondents who were in a situation of communicating with strangers, an average of 51 people chose to receive praise with 37 people using strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) and 14 people using strategy 2 (Agreeing Comments). There is also an average of 6 people who refuse praise using strategy 7 (Positive Commenting) and an average of 5 people who do not respond (Classified as strategy 11).

From these data, it can be seen that respondents will tend to use strategy 1 (Accepting Praise) when dealing with Strangers and will tend to avoid strategy 3 (Increasing Praise). On the other hand, if the respondent is dealing with friends and friends, strategy 3 actually experiences a significant increase in usage, which is 2.5x more than its use to strangers. One other thing that needs to be explained is the use of strategy 7 which is more than 2x used against friends than against friends or strangers. All of these are forms of response strategies used by respondents when viewed from who said the compliment (friends, friends or other people) who pointed there is an effort to maintain relationships, solidarity and harmony between individuals.

Apart from being based on the level of familiarity, this research questionnaire was also compiled based on 4 topics of praise as proposed by (Miyazaki & Shimizu, 2016), (Golato, 2005) and (Nugroho & Suparno, 2019) namely Appearance, Behavior, Ownership and Achievement. As stated at the beginning of the discussion that of the 75 respondents in this study, when receiving praise they will use strategy (Accepting Praise) and Strategy 2 (Giving Agreeable Comments), while to reject praise they will use strategy 7 (Giving Humble Comments) and there are also who do not respond to compliments (classified as Strategy 11). The same applies to the classification results based on the

topic of praise in this section.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that respondents in this study tend to accept the praise given and the most widely used praise response strategy is Strategy 1, namely Appreciation Token, Strategy 2 is Comment Acceptance and Strategy 3 is Praise Upgrade. However, there are also a small number of respondents who reject the praise given using strategy 7, namely Scale Down, while some others choose not to respond to the praise given (strategy 11, namely No Response). Between the three ethnic backgrounds (Makassar, Bugis and Toraja) and the two sex groups (Male and Female), there was no significant difference in the choice of strategies to receive praise (Use of strategies 1, 2 and 3). Rejection of praise was also carried out using strategy 7, namely Scale Down and there were also respondents who did not give any response to the praise given (Using strategy 11). The female community with Bugis and Makassar ethnic backgrounds and the male Bugis community were the respondents who mostly used strategy 3 (besides strategies 1 and 2) to receive compliments given by friends or friends. Among the three categories of familiarity level, respondents tend to receive praise and use Strategy 1 (Appreciation Token) the most when meeting with strangers compared to using strategy 2 or strategy 3 where both of these strategies are used quite a lot (besides strategy 1) to give response to receiving praise from friends or friends.

## REFERENCES

- Adawiyah, Robiatul. (2020). *Dampak Gadget Bagi Penghafal Al-Qur'an (Studi living Qur'an pada Mahasiswi Institut Ilmu Al-Qur'an Jakarta)*.
- Aisyah, Siti. (2015). *Perkembangan peserta didik dan bimbingan belajar*. Deepublish.
- Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen C., & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Fakhiroh, Zakiyatul, & Rohmah, Zuliati. (2018). Linguistic Landscape in Sidoarjo City. *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 9(2), 96–116.
- Golato, Andrea. (2005). *Compliments and compliment responses: Grammatical structure and sequential organization* (Vol. 15). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Guo, Hong-jie, Zhou, Qin-qin, & Chow, Daryl. (2012). A variationist study of compliment responses in Chinese. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(3), 347–373.
- Hill, Keith D., Suttanon, Plaiwan, Lin, Sang I., Tsang, William W. N., Ashari, Asmidawati, Abd Hamid, Tengku Aizan, Farrier, Kaela, & Burton, Elissa. (2018). What works in falls prevention in Asia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Geriatrics*, 18(1), 1–21.
- Holmes, Janet, & Hazen, Kirk. (2013). *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lestiyanawati, Rochyani, Hartono, Rudi, & Sofwan, Ahmad. (2014). Translation techniques used by students in translating English news items. *English Education Journal*, 4(2), 90–98.
- Lexy, J. (2010). Moleong. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*.
- Miyazaki, Takashi, & Shimizu, Nobuyuki. (2016). Cross-lingual image caption generation. *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 1780–1790.

**Herlisa, Lukman, Gusnawaty**

- Nugroho, Harizki Agung, & Suparno, Suparno. (2019). Implementing Beyond Centers and Circle Time for Linguistics Intelligence of Children with Hearing Impairment at an Early Age. *International Conference on Special and Inclusive Education (ICSIE 2018)*, 285–288. Atlantis Press.
- Pomerantz, Anita. (1978). Attributions of responsibility: Blamings. *Sociology*, 12(1), 115–121.
- RAHDAYANTI, L. (2017). *EXPRESSIONS OF COMPLIMENTS IN BUGINESE*. HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY.
- Rosiah, Rosi. (2017). Respon terhadap pujian pembelajar bahasa Jepang. *Journal of Japanese Language Education and Linguistics*, 1(1), 108–130.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. (2008). *Culturally speaking second edition: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Trudgill, Peter. (2001). The sociolinguistics of modern RP. *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*.—Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.—P, 176–178.
- Wolfson, Nessa. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 117–124.
- Yoga, Husni Rahman, Malau, Nadya Aulia, & Marbun, Derliana. (2021). CODE-MIXING PHENOMENA ON HORROR GAME RESIDENT EVIL 4 BY REGGY PRABOWO YOUTUBE CHANNEL. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 3(2).
- Yuliasri, Issy, & Allen, Pamela. (2019). Humour loss in the Indonesian translation of Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 119–127.