"I'm Sexy And I Know It": Husbands and Wives' Differences In Compliment-Response Strategies

Juland Dayo Salayo

Abstract: **This paper attempts to determine the strategies employed by the husbands and wives and their differences to each other's compliments on appearance, attire, emotion, personality traits/ability and achievements. Compliment Response strategies (CRs) were drawn from the participants, who also acted as interlocutors, using the diary. Maintaining the natural speech occurrences between the couples, they were instructed not to disclose the nature and purposes of the study to their marital partners. In order to explore the CRs made by the participants, interview with the interlocutors was conducted revealing the differences of strategies between the husbands and wives. The results showed that husbands tend to be more appreciative and active participants in compliment responses than the wives. These can be manifested by a higher frequency of acceptance particularly praise upgrade, appreciation token and comment acceptance; however, both husbands and wives have greater emphasis on appearance, attire and personality traits. The study revealed further implications to the Filipino relationship cultural pattern.**

Keywords: **Compliment, Compliment Response Strategies, relational pattern**

I. INTRODUCTION

Compliments play a role in how we view ourselves as well as provide us with perceptions of intentions of others in conversation. There are notable differences in compliment topics and also the intentions behind them. Some examples of compliment topics include: physical appearance, materialistic items, and personality traits. Existing studies have suggested that between genders, women often use compliments to build or strengthen affiliations and to help increase one's self-esteem (Jones & Buckingham, 2005). In the same context, Grant and Fabrigar (2010) said that compliments are used frequently in conversations in an attempt to have or maintain a social relationship with another person, but sometimes people will use a strategy called 'compliment manipulation' to gain compliance with a person.

To highlight behavioral compliments between genders, Holmes (1995) concluded that women receive and accept more compliments indicates that they more concerned with addressing the speaker's positive face and have a more cooperative attitude in conversations. Doohan and Manusov (2004) pointed out that women typically base compliments on appearance, while men deliver materialistic based compliments.

In romantic relationship, it is not imperative that outsiders recognize compliments; instead compliments need to be recognized by the romantic partner, and indeed they may be idiosyncratic to the relationship which is typically consist of a personal language that may not be recognized or identified by people outside their relationship and compliments tend to follow that pattern.

According to Wogan and Parisi (2006)**,** women compliment men more on their skills than appearance and men mainly compliment women on their physical appearance. Calogero, et al (2009) conducted an exploration on the effects of compliments to women self-worth and self-image. The study highlights that the more negative criticism or the positive compliments given about their appearance will increase awareness to a woman's body and also their negative self-image. In support, Sun (2014) said that in an overall view, women are more actively involved in complementing behavior, both giving and receiving more compliments than men, especially on the topic of appearance. In explaining the different strategies used in compliment response by both genders, Coates (1993) believed that it is also essential to note that women's language style has been claimed to be more cooperative, whereas men's is shown to be more competitive and control-oriented.

In another point of view, the study conducted by Karlberg, et al. (2014) revealed that in giving and receiving compliments, majority of the responses indicated the main perception of the intention of a compliment based on materialistic possessions, personality, and physical to be nice or genuine. However, to get responses, it should be done in real life situation (Cheng, 2011). Added to the gender, social and cultural contexts in relation to compliments, the theory of politeness by Pomerantz (1978) is useful in evaluating compliments strategies; thus the following conditions are used: (a) agree with the speaker and (b) avoid self-praise, but on the other hand, they also want to avoid self-praise in order to show modesty.

Among those who studies the social and cultural contexts were Kyung-Hee Suh (2009) who found out that Indonesian and Korean respondents have similar ways of expressing responses to compliments as compared with those used by American counterparts as the latter are willing to accept the credit offered by compliment, but the previous are more likely to deflect or reject the credit, presumably with the intention of trying to appear modest. Holmes (1988), in the same manner, stated that compliments are common in various cultural and social contexts and are generally as a way to build or increase solidarity between the speaker and the addressee. It is a speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed,

PhD English Language Education Student, Philippine Normal University – Manila

for some 'good' (possession, characteristics, skill, etc.) which is valued by the speaker and the hearer (Holmes, 1986). In addition, compliments serve as praise and encouragement. These are likely to reflect the relationship between the complimenter and the complimentee, because praise is often directed towards the subordinate or less powerful participant. In general, it is found to be multifunctional speech acts and the following summary from Holmes (1995) lists their functions as identified by different analysts: (a) to express solidarity, (b) to express positive evaluation, admiration, appreciation or praise, (c) to express envy or desire for hearer's possessions and (d) to use as verbal harassment.

In the study made Katsuka (2012), he found out that subcategories compliment in regards to personality traits and achievements were relatively more accepted in the English group than the Japanese group. His findings supported a unique discovery in the motivation of 'be sarcastic' when receiving personality compliments. Participants were likely to question other's intention as 'sarcastic', because they might be reluctant to accept the compliment which was interpreted with a less genuine intention or possibly with negative connotation.

With these concepts, it is of great interest to consider and examine the compliment-response strategies in a husband-wide relationship as it is relatively brings out specific cultural values among the Filipino couples. While there are already numbers of published studies about compliments; this study focused on the wide social functions across cultures leading to generalized cultural patterns. Hence, with the limitations of the existing studies on compliments (appearance, attire, emotions, and personality / ability), this study included the compliment-response on achievements of both husband and wife.

Specifically, this paper attempted to answer the question: (1) What compliment response (CRs) strategies do husband and wife employ and their distinct differences as triggered by the interlocutors using the following compliment topics: appearance, attire, emotion, personality traits/ability and achievements?

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Taxonomy of compliment used by Herbert (1990, as cited by Doohan at Manusov, 2004) in his study titled "Sex-based Differences in Compliment Behavior" was used to classify compliment responses provided by the participants. There are 13 strategies enumerated in the said taxonomy as stated in Table 1.

TABLE 1. COMPLIMENT RESPONSE STRATEGIES (CRS)

Macro Level	Micro Level		Description
I. Agreement			
A. Acceptance	1.	Appreciation Token	A verbal or non-verbal acceptance of the compliment (e.g. Thank you)
	2.	Comment Acceptance	Addressee accepts the compliment and offers comment on the complimented topic (e.g. Thanks, it's my favorite too.)
	3.	Praise Upgrade	Addressee accepts the compliment and asserts that force is sufficient. (e.g. It really brings out my eyes, doesn't it?)
	4.	Scale Down	Addressee disagrees with the compliment, saying praise is overstated. (e.g. Oh, it is really quite old.)
B. Non-Acceptance	1.	Comment History	Addressee offers a comment on the object complimented (e.g. I bought it for my trip.)
	2.	Reassignment	Addressee agrees with the compliment, but transfers the compliment to a third person or object itself. (e.g. Thanks, my mother made it for me.)
	3.	Return	Compliment is returned to the giver. (e.g. So is yours.)
II. Non-Agreement	1.	Scale Down	Addressee disagrees with the compliment saying praise is overstated (e.g. Oh, it is really quite old.)
	2.	Disagreement	Addressee asserts that the topic of compliment is not worthy of praise (e.g. I hate it.)
	3.	Qualification	Addressee qualifies the assertion. (e.g. It's alright bit Mary's is nicer.)
	4.	No acknowledgment	Compliment is ignored. (e.g. It's alright but I like pink more.)
	5.	Questions	Addressee qualifies the assertion.
III. Other Interpretation	1.	Request Interpretation	Addressee interprets the compliment as a request. (e.g. You want to borrow it?)

These compliment response categories were employed by Yousefvand (2010) in his study using Herbert's (1990) model. These categories were generally divided into: Acceptance, Non-Acceptance and Other Interpretation. Chen (2011) developed another category, which is called Combination, which entails both acceptance and non-acceptance. These were the bases for the data analysis of this study.

III. METHODOLGY
3.1. Participants
The participants were mainly husbands and wives regardless of some factors attributed in their marital relationship like number of marital years, religion, profession, and social status.

While Duck, et al. (1991) as cited in Doohan & Masunov (2004) stated that females are more aware of the presence and absence of compliments in their romantic relationship, this study value the participation of the husbands equally with the wives who both served as interlocutors. Both of them were unaware that their partners carefully observed and recorded those strategies used in CRs. There were ten couples who participated in this paper.

Both husbands and wives, in separate place and time, were oriented how to do the procedures of recording the CRs without disclosing to their partners the nature of the study because this paper aimed to gather data coming from real communicative situations between husband and wife.

3.2. Instruments

A. Diary

Interlocutors (husbands and wives) were asked to keep a compliment diary provided by the researcher. The diary is designed to gather compliment response from their partners. This consists of topic compliment and compliment response. The interlocutors have to record their daily compliment topics with corresponding responses. Topics included are appearance, attire, personality/ability and achievements. The diary consists of examples per topic patterned from Knapp, Hooper, and bell (1984, as cited in Doohan & Manusov, 2004) as appearance, "You are beautiful today", attire, "Nice shirt", emotion, "I'm lucky to have you", and personality traits/ability, "You are so smart."

The interlocutors freely used any topic depending on communication contexts. As Doohan and Manusov (2004) said that diary can get compliment in action in participants relationship with their partners.

B. Interview Guide

The face-to-face interview with the participants was conducted after the 10-day recording of husbands-wives' CRs. This interview, which was highlighted by the status of the couple's relationship, the observed attitude of each other's partner to the given compliments and the status of communication situations which pertain to the time and scenes of utterances which may be contributory to the compliment responses, was conducted to further view, explore and justify the reasons of the CRs given by the interlocutors' partners.

3.3. Data Gathering Procedure

A personal approach asking permission to conduct study including the nature, purposes and methods of gathering data was made by the researcher. Upon the approval of the chosen participants, they were provided a compliment diary to be accomplished in 10 days; followed by the instructions on how to accomplish the diary and its secrecy to their partners to meet the natural flow of communication between the couples. The data were analyzed using Herbert's (1990) framework on data coding.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Compliment Response Strategies of Participants

This part presents the CRs of the husbands and wives according to compliment topics such as appearance, attire, emotion, personality traits / ability and achievements.

3.1.1. The Husbands.

On Appearance. As revealed in Table 2, majority of the interlocutors gave compliments on their husbands' appearance. A number of the CRs came from the agreement specifically on the use of praise upgrade (18%) then followed by both the appreciation token (10%) and comment acceptance (10%). Praise upgrade was demonstrated by verbal category like *"Kaya nga gwapo mga anak mo, mana sa akin," "Siempre, pogi ako eh. Matagal na kaya yun," "Siempre naman, artistahin eh" "Ganyan talaga ang pogi,"*

among others. During the interview, the interlocutors revealed that their husbands would boastfully respond to their compliments by upgrading them or by adding some positive descriptions about their physical appearance like *"Alam ko yun, swerto mo nga lagi ka may kasama artista."* Appreciation token and comment acceptance were also among the common CRs used by the interlocutors' husbands by simply saying "Thank you," and *"siempre"* (Of course). These simply show that their husbands are comfortable and proud with the compliments their wives have uttered. However, Pomerantz' (1978, as cited by Nhung, 2014) concepts of avoiding self-praise on the part of the husbands in order to remain humble in the relationship contradicted the result of the study regarding appearance.

On the other hand, there are some husbands who have another responses or reactions toward the compliments by asking questions (7%), scaling down (7%) or showing no acknowledgment at all (7%). When the interlocutors were asked about these responses, they said that their husbands thought they just need something or they have committed mistakes *("Hindi nga? May kelangan ka?" "Ano na naming ginawa mo?" "Maniwala ako sa 'yo," "Sinabi mo na dati pangit ako," Gwapo pag bagong ligo, paano pag di naligo?).* By the manner of responding, the husbands diverted the topics to another concerns. According to Yousefvand (2010), questions as strategies are common between the husband and wife relationship to establish solidarity.

Accordingly, the worst respond received was *"Magkano kelangan mo?"* that although this answer hurt the interlocutors, this also made them realize that most of the time, giving compliments become a way of receiving favor or financial aid to their partner. For some, these statements or responses which appeared to be negative on the part of the interlocutors were just common nature of conversation; in fact, this may also appear to be a showcase of the sweetness that strongly bonds their relationship. The idea of "cariño brutal" (signs of affection given in a harsh, brutal or savage manner) is normally integrated in the Filipino culture as a form of delight and affection (Salvador, 2003).

With the usual use of agreement and non-agreement, it directly violates Pomerantz' (1978) principle of agreeing with others.

On Attire. Like the appearance, praise upgrade garnered the highest percent (14%). Among those CRs received by the interlocutors were *"Kahit naman akong suot ko, bagay," "Siempre ako ang nagsusuot," "Gwapo lagi ako kahit anong kulay ng t-shirt ko."* This shows consistency with the husband's behavior on confidence, and comfort as revealed in the appearance. It is also noticeable that the compliments on attire were interpreted to be a request (8%). For examples, most of their husbands would say, *"Luma na nga 'yan. Bili ka na ng bago," "Maliit na nga ito," "Baka gusto mo bilhan mo ako ng iba; kahit ano kulay."* In the same manner, like appearance, appreciation and comment acceptance were also among the top strategies used by the husbands in the given compliments.

On Emotion. The topic on emotions got the lowest instances of compliments. Even if the interlocutors openly discussed that they really feel the love, care and concern of their partners, the acts were hardly be translated into words.

In fact among the strategies, the highest is the lack of acknowledgment or appreciation (6%) to the compliments; however, some non-verbal responses were shown like smiles, hugs and kisses. The exchanges of "I love you" as an expression becomes normal to them in especially in private moments. Upgrading (3%) and returning (3%) the compliments were also among the top strategies under emotion. Some of the husbands would say, *"Sabi ko naman sa 'yo eh di ka magsisisi sa akin," "Inborn akong sweet at thoughtful," "Ikaw din naman kaya, hindi ko lang madalas sabihin," "Eh, sweet ka rin naman kase," "Love din naman kita ah, mamaya ako maniningil."*

On Personality Traits and Ability. In terms of personality traits and abilities of the husbands, the praise upgrade (16%) remains the most responded strategies. By saying, *"Kilala mo ako, expert ako dito," "Sanay na sanay na ako sa ganitong gawain," "Ngayon mo lang nalaman magaling ako magluto, tagal na kaya,"* they only proved that men were typically proud and confident of themselves and whatever they were doing. However, even if the highest percent was attributed to the acceptance, the non-acceptance in terms of scaling down (10%) ranked second among the CRs strategies. These can be manifested by saying, *"Hindi pa tapos yan eh," "Medyo pangit nga pagkakagawa ko dito," "Hindi nga pantay yung pagkakabit ko ng tubo." "Maliit na bagay"*, which was also used several times, appeared to be scaling down but by implicature, the speaker tended to imply something bigger on his part in terms of ability.

Generally, the responses made by the husbands tend to show their prideful side of being masculine that every time they were complimented of doing something good, they tended to boost themselves. But according to the interlocutors, these kinds of responses showing pride especially on their partners' ability are common only in between their conversation or with their children. This behavior is not commonly shown with other people who are not in close contact with their husbands. In the same manner, these expressions were also uttered not mainly to boast but express strong emotions, maintain solidarity and to express sweetness.

On Achievements. The combination (8%) of many strategies ranked first in the topic on achievements (appreciation token + comment + history). After saying "thank you" as a response to the compliments, most of them still provided comments and how they attained those achievements (like winning in the contest, promotions, job reassignment, salary increase, etc.). For examples, "Thank you, *pinaghirapan ko talaga ito"; "alam mo naman kung paano ako magtrabaho"; "gusto ko talaga ang bago kong trabaho at deserving ako kahit talagang pinaghirapan ko yan." "Pinaghirapan ko lahat ito; parang nung nangliligaw lang ako sa 'yo."* Praise upgrade (6%) was also the top strategies in achievements which could be seen in the following responses: *"Ako lang naman maayos sa office," "Sa galing at talino, wala sila sa akin."*

Again, the superiority complex of the men, together with the strong sense of fatherhood being the provider in the family, and the focus, understanding and industry of men in workplace, were revealed in this topic.

TABLE II: FREQUENCY OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE STRATEGIES OF HUSBANDS

Macro Level	Micro Level	Appearance (%)	Attire (%)	Emotion (%)	Personality Traits / Ability (%)	Achievements (%)	TOTAL (%)
I. Agreement A. Acceptance	1. Appreciation Token	10	5	2	8	4	**29**
	2. Comment Acceptance	10	5	2	8	2	**27**
	3. Praise Upgrade	18	14	3	16	6	**57**
	1. Comment History	4	0	0	4	2	**10**
B. Non-Acceptance	2. Reassignment	2	2	2	4	0	**10**
	3. Return	4	0	3	0	0	**7**
II. Non-Agreement	1. Scale Down	7	4	0	10	0	**21**
	2. Disagreement	5	4	0	2	0	**11**
	3. Qualification	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
	4. No acknowledgment	7	2	6	2	2	**19**
	5. Questions	7	0	2	2	0	**11**

III. Other Interpretation	1. Request Interpretation	0	8	0	2	0	**10**
Combination	1. Question + Appreciation	0	0	0	0	2	**2**
	2. Appreciation Token + Comment History	2	0	2	0	8	**12**
	3. Question + Reassignment	0	0	0	2	0	**2**
	4. Disagreement + Comment	2	0	0	2	0	**4**
	5. Assurance + Promise	0	0	0	2	0	**2**

3.1.2. The Wives.

On Appearance. Among the wives, disagreement (8%) was the highest CRs strategy used. Among those common responses were *"Tumataba na nga ako," "Hindi naman totoo yan," "Nambobola ka na naman," "Hinding-hindi, sikip na nga uniform ko," "Yan ang di totoo."* These imply that most of the time, the positive compliments toward the wives' physical appearance were not in agreement with the responses; in fact, wives usually believed that appreciations and compliments on their appearance were just common techniques their husbands did to please them. In addition, these responses also showed that the interlocutors' partners were bit conscious about their physical appearance. Lack of acknowledgement which is the 7% of the compliment frequency was also among the dominant strategy of the women. Instead of uttering some words or phrases to respond to the praises or compliments, they tended to show it by means only of smile or make face-strategy.

Although the result still showed the verbal dominance against the non-verbal, it still contradicted the study of Holmes (1995) who concluded that women receive and accept more compliments indicates that they more concerned with addressing the speaker's positive face and have a more cooperative attitude in conversations.

On Attire. The topic on attire had different result from the physical appearance because the highest CRs strategy was in the form of question (10%) and return (9%). It was followed by the disagreement which corresponds to 5% of the total frequency on the stated topic. Most of the interlocutors' wives responded like the following: *"Talaga?" "Ano yun?" "Hindi nga?" "Totoo ba yan?" "Wala bang bago?" "Ano ba nakain mo?" "Nang-aasar k aba?"* while others said *"Bagay sa akin kase ikaw ang bumili nito," "Di ba ikaw ang pumili nito?" "Magaling ka kase pumili," "Ikaw ang aking hari,"* (from the compliment, "You are my queen.") Still, in this topic, disagreement was among the top choice of the wives in return to the interlocutors' compliments. For example, *"Luma na nga ito," "Parang hindi naman," "Lumang style."*

When the interlocutors were asked about the kinds of responses and the dominant strategies employed by their wives, most of their agreed that their partners are not easily pleased by those comments. This showed that women have a better judgment on attire or fashion as they require more suitable comments according to what they wore. Likewise, the compliments appeared to be a form of jokes because it was not very usual for the interlocutors to comment such utterances. On the part of those who regularly complimented their partner, it appeared to them as if they needed something in return connotatively and denotatively.

On Emotion. Emotion is believed to be a woman thing; however, in this study, the strategy of no acknowledgment (10%) highlighted the result, which was followed by question (7%). The lack of acknowledgment among the wives was shown by mere gesture and facial expressions like smile. Questioning compliments and their intention was revealed through the following: *"May kailangan ka?" "Ano talaga gusto mo," "Bakit may nabago ba sa akin?" "Ako sweet?"*

During the one-on-one interview with the interlocutors, most of their partners were not very expressive in showing their emotion; thus, non-verbal means of demonstrating emotion became even normal in their relationship. In the case of asking questions as their responses to the compliments, the act of confirming served as the purpose rather than questioning the truth-value of the statements or expressions. In fact, most of the interlocutors believed that the more their wives did not react nor disagreed to their compliments, the more that they felt the intense feeling of their partner toward them. In a sense, these strategies are important in establishing solidarity and intimacy.

On Personality Traits and Ability. Again, the absence of reaction or acknowledgement (8%) toward the compliments given by the interlocutors received the highest frequency among the CRs strategies. Most of them just stared at their husbands upon hearing those praises regarding their personalities and abilities; although, during the interview, the interlocutors had emphasized that their wives' looks seemed meaningful with the unusual but provocative smile. Scaling down (6%) and disagreement (6%) went along together which signaled that their wives did not believe in what they heard. Among those responses were: *"Hindi ko pa nga tapos ito," "Hindi ko na nga tinapos at pagod na ako," "Talaga magaling ako, huwag mo na ako lokohin."*

When further asked about these responses, wives were really hard to be pleased in terms of compliments. In fact, two (2) of the interlocutors shared that every time their wives did something extraordinary, they would rather appreciate material gifts than simply appreciated verbally.

On Achievements. In this topic, reassignment (9%) was the top rank among the strategies, followed by request interpretation (7%) and a combination of disagreement and comment (7%). Among those common responses were: *"Hindi naman ako, si God gumawa nyan,"* *"Thanks to God,"* *"Ikaw naman kase ang tumapos nyan,"* *"Tinutungan ako nung assistant,"* *"Kung hindi lang sa tulong ni bff."* While others expressed disagreement to the received compliments like *"Hindi naman, nachambahan lang, mas ok yung ginawa nung officemate ko kaso di sya type,"* *"Hindi rin,*

pinagkatiwalan lang siguro. Actually mas maraming magagaling dun," *"Wala lang mapili si boss, kase ako pinakamatanda sa department."* For the request interpretation, the following responses were uttered: *"Ikaw ba?"* (from the compliment, "Congrats mommy, gagraduate ka na sa M.A. mo.), *"Kaya mo rin yan,"* (from "Kagaling mo ah, nagturo ka ng math kay bunso?"), *"Ganun talaga pag nagtatry,"* (from "Wow, kagaling mo naman, natapos moa gad yung report mo?).

The interviewees explained that unlike them who loved being appreciated because of certain achievements, their wives remained lowly with those accomplishments and had the tendency to value other people who have helped them in one way or another to achieve the such successes.

TABLE III: FREQUENCY OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE STRATEGIES OF WIVES

Macro Level	Micro Level	Appearance (%)	Attire (%)	Emotion (%)	Personality Traits / Ability (%)	Achievements (%)	TOTAL (%)
I. Agreement A. Acceptance	1. Appreciation Token	3	4	2	1	1	**12**
	2. Comment Acceptance	5	3	5	0	3	**16**
	3. Praise Upgrade	5	4	0	4	0	**13**
B. Non-Acceptance	1. Comment History	0	0	5	0	3	**8**
	2. Reassignment	4	0	5	0	9	**18**
	3. Return	3	9	0	0	0	**12**
II. Non-Agreement	1. Scale Down	0	0	0	6	3	**9**
	2. Disagreement	8	6	1	6	4	**35**
	3. Qualification	0	0	4	0	0	**4**
	4. No acknowledgment	7	3	10	8	0	**28**
	5. Questions	0	10	7	0	0	**17**
III. Other Interpretation	1. Request Interpretation	3	0	0	0	7	**10**
	1. Question + Appreciation	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Combination	2. Appreciation Token + Comment History	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
	3. Question + Reassignment	5	4	0	0	0	**9**
	4. Disagreement + Comment	5	0	0	0	7	**12**
	5. Assurance + Promise	0	0	0	0	0	**0**

3.2. Differences noted between the husbands and wives in terms of appearance, attire, emotion and personality traits / ability and achievements.

Upon the retrieval of the diary, each interlocutor was interviewed to explore and justify the compliment responses of their partners according to the topics presented.

3.2.1. Appearance: This topic widens the gaps or differences of the husbands and wives as both different ways of receiving or appreciating physical appearance. For the husbands, praise upgrade ranked the highest, which is equivalent to 18%, followed by appreciation token and comment acceptance which are both equivalent to 10%. In contrast, the wives to more uncooperative in conversation as they displayed disagreement (8%) and lack of acknowledgment (7%). Generally, appearance received the

highest frequency of compliment response for both husband and wife.

The result revealed that men generally are more confident and boastful when receiving positive comments especially from the wives. Their tendency to upgrade those comments happened to show their superiority and masculinity as they attached themselves to famous social figures like television and movie personalities and celebrities. This only means that they love recognitions as they help them boost their physical confidence. On the other hand, women generally appeared to be oppositions in conversation as they displayed disagreement or no reaction at all to those compliments their partners uttered. The usually expressed doubts if their husbands were sincere to express those compliments. The lowly side of the women is also shown through the strategies used.

Looking at how the husbands reacted positively on the wives' compliments on appearance being revealed as the most applied strategy, this established Doohan and Manusov's (2004) statement that women typically compliments on appearance, while men deliver materialistic-based compliments. Jones and Buckingham (2005) also supported that physical appearance was among those compliment topics which was oftenly used by women in building or strengthening affiliations. In contrast, it was contradicted by Wogan and Parisi (2006) who stated that women compliment men more on their skills than appearance.

In addition, it is to be understood that more negative criticisms and even the positive compliments given about their appearance will increase awareness to a woman's body and also their negative self-image.

3.2.2. Attire. The confidence of husbands in CRs again dominated as praise upgrade (14%) topped the listed strategies. This was **followed** by request interpretation (8%). In contrast, their wives appeared to be hesitant in accepting those **compliments** which could be manifested through questions (10%) and return (9%) strategies.

Again, the confidence and positive acceptance of husbands to the compliments of their partners was shown which is exactly the opposite of the wives' acceptance toward the topic as the latter opt to accept them. Although, the male interlocutors justified that these reactions are just a matter of confirming the expressions. Thus, women's attitude toward this strategy was supported by Pomerants (1978) that in order to observe politeness in conversation, we must avoid self-praise to achieve modesty. This statement, however, is not true among the male participants.

3.2.3. Emotion. In terms of emotion, both husbands and wives appeared to be passive in accepting or appreciation compliments having no acknowledgement as the highest percent among the strategies, 6% and 10%, respectively. However, husbands still valued the praise upgrading (3%) and returning (3%). The wives, on the other hand, showed non-agreement to the compliments by asking questions (7%).

The result showed that both husbands and wives were not showy in terms of emotion in a verbal way; however, the explanations of the interlocutors proved that the non-verbal communication especially in expressing their emotions appeared to be more powerful than verbal means. This was proven by the strong relationship of the couples that emotion

may not necessary be expressed orally. Emotion, however, appeared to be the least strategy used by men.

3.2.4. Personality traits / Ability. Agreement and non-agreement were both employed in showing personality traits / abilities as praise upgrade (16%) remained one of the topnotch strategies of the husbands in CRs, but the next strategy appeared in contrast, scaling down (10%). For the wives, no acknowledgment strategy ranked closely with scaling down and disagreement with 8%, 6% and 6%, respectively.

The personality traits both valued the agreement and non-agreement strategies. Again, the high frequency of praise upgrade among the husbands proved that they value compliments. In fact, it is already common among them to be praised and they enjoyed a lot of receiving positive compliments as one way of establishing masculinity and superiority. Like other strategies, women tended to be more doubtful every time they received praises from their husbands. It was supported by Jones and Buckingham (2005) as they included personality traits along with physical appearance and materialistic items in compliments, but not true among the women. Personality traits and abilities are least concern of the wives.

3.2.5. Achievements. Among the CRs strategies used by the participants, it was the combination of appreciation token and comment history (8%) and praise upgrade (6%) that husbands employed the most. For their counterpart, the reassignment (7%) and request interpretation (7%) were the usual strategies in CRs.

In terms of achievements, both interlocutors have the tendency to combine various strategies which gave them way to express more of their ideas: to reason, to add details or to justify the compliments or utterances. While men are more concern to achievements being the head of the family, the frequency of CRs strategies appeared to be fewer than the women. This study revealed that the husbands' less interest to giving compliments to their wives affect the result.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper proves that compliments differentiate husbands and wives in terms of strategies as compliments bring out various feelings but not of them can elicit positive face (Doohan & Manusov, 2004). Husbands tend to be more appreciative in the given compliments; thus, making them more confident especially when receiving positive praises. In fact, the result rejected the idea that women receive and accept more compliments and they are more cooperative in conversation (Holmes, 1995). With that, wives appeared to be very passive participants in the conversation generally having various disagreement and non-acceptance strategies. Although, husbands expressed that the non-verbal reactions of their wives are effective means of delivering the message.

The study also gives importance to the kinds of language, through compliment responses strategies, employed by the couples as a means of establishing harmony, solidarity and cooperation. The value of non-verbal communications is also proven to be effective in transferring the intended meanings of the speaker. In order to establish positive relationship, this does not always rely on the employment of the oral language.

However, future researches are encouraged to be conducted by classifying the differences of husbands and wives response compliments according to the years of their marital relationship as this study partly reveal that there were significant differences of the responses according to the marital years and status.

REFERENCES

[1] Calogero, R. M. Herboso, S. & Thompson, J. (2009). Complimentary weightism: The potential costs of appearance-related commentary for women's self-objectification. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33(1), 120-132.

[2] Chen, R. (2011). Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness between American English and Chinese speakers. Journal of Pragmatics 20(1), 49-75.

[3] Coates, J. (1993). Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language (2nd ed.). New York: Longman Publishing.

[4] Doohan, E. M. & Manusov, V. (2004). The communication of compliments in romantic relationships: An investigation of relational satisfaction and sex differences and similarities in compliment behavior. *Journal of Communication, 68 (2), 170-194.*

[5] Grant, A. L., Fabrigar, L. R. & Kim, H. (2010). Exploring the efficacy if compliments as a tactic for securing compliance. Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 32(3), 226-233.

[6] Herbert, R. K. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior, Language in Society 19:201-24.

[7] Holmes, J. (1986). Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English. Anthropological Linguistics 28, 4:485-508.

[8] Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: A sexual-preferential politeness strategy. Journal of Pragmatics 12:445-65.

[9] Holmes, J. (1995). Women, men and politeness. London: Longman Publishing.

[10] Jones, A. M. & Buckingham, J. T. (2005). Self-esteem as a moderator of the effect of social comparison on women's body image. Journal of Social & Cinical Psychology, 24 (8), 1165-1166.

[11] Karlberg, T., et al. (2014). Giving and receiving compliments – What are your intentions? St. Paul: Concordia University.

[12] Katsuka, H. (2012). The role of compliment topics in compliment response (Order No. 1529750). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full text: Social Sciences (1221533119).

[13] Lopez, L. J. (2003). Cariño Brutal. (Retrieved from www.philstar.com/sunday-life/204831/carino-brutal, December 5, 2016.)

[14] Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints. J. Schenkein (ed.), Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction, New York: Academic.

[15] Suh, K. (2009). A contrastive study of compliment responses among Indonesia and Koreans.

[16] Sun, N. (2014). Gender-based differences in complimenting behaviour: A critical review. Canberra: The Australian National University.

[17] Wogan, P. & Parisi, C. (2006). Compliment topics and gender. Women & Language, 29(2), 21-28.

JULAND DAYO SALAYO is currently pursuing his PhD in English Language Education in the Philippine Normal University – Manila. He is affiliated to Department of Education – Division of Cavite – Trece Martires City National High School as an English and Creative Writing Teacher. Prior to his service in the Philippine public school system, he has served as a language teacher and Subject Area Coordinator of the English Department in the Sisters of Mary School in the Philippines and in Guatemala, Central America.

His research interests include Conversational Analysis, Sociolinguistics, Second Language Writing, and Critical Pedagogy.