RESPONSES TO COMPLIMENTS WITHIN MINANGKABAU FAMILIES IN PAUH, INDONESIA
Tanggapan dari pujian dalam keluarga di Minangkabau di Pauh, Indonesia

Angela Flores, Rina Marnita A.S., Lindawati
Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Andalas
Hp:081378346204, pos-el: smileangy@gmail.com.
(Diterima: 5 September 2019, disetujui: 3 Februari 2020)

Abstract
This study investigates the compliment responses used within Minangkabau nuclear families with low education levels in Pauh District, Padang city, West Sumatera, Indonesia from a pragmatic perspective. Responses to compliments on appearance and achievement addressed from one family member to another were classified according to Herbert’s taxonomy. This model was modified to include two new categories of response. A simple “thank you” style response was rarely used. Relative status within family was found to influence the preferred types of compliment response. This is a synchronic and descriptive study that used a qualitative approach. The data was gathered in the field using interviews and observation. Analysis showed that the majority of the participant responses were in the agreement category and were often comment acceptances such as of course! I’m handsome since I was born! etc. It appeared that the participants’ preferences were influenced by relative status and the Minangkabau predisposition for joking.
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1. Introduction

Compliments, in general, are part of every culture, and the way how people respond to them depends on the specific culture including its social norms and values as the context and to whom they respond to. Interest in the compliment responses in the Minangkabau was triggered in the author due to an awareness of differences between her own Spanish speaking Latin American culture and what she observed amongst the Minangkabau recognizing that communication patterns depend on the norms or values from each specific society and culture (Katesi, 1986), context, and the level of relationships among the speakers (Ikahesti, 2014). Asian cultures, such as the Minangkabau, use more high context communication (Hall, 1976) which according to Park & Kim (2008) means that the style of communication is indirect, inferring meaning, interpersonal sensitivity, using feelings to guide behaviour and using silence. In contrast, Western culture tends to be low context which is characterised by dramatics and domination and is animated, relaxed, attentive, open, friendly, contentious and impressing-leaving (p.47).

On discovering no previously published studies about compliment responses within the Minangkabau culture, the author was motivated to study this topic in the family context. The way that the Minangkabau respond to compliments in different situations could be expected to depend on the context and to whom they are addressing their response to. Holmes (cited in Hans, 1992) defines a compliment as “a speech act which 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 the hearer” (p.18). The speech act of complimenting is classified as an expressive illocutionary act. Expressive illocutionary acts according to Searle (1969) “are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels” (in Yule, 1996, p. 53). Yuan (2001) points out that compliment and compliment responses are worthy of study because they reveal the rules of language use in a specific speech community. The reason that compliment responses are so revealing are that, as Pomerantz (1978) states, there are two opposing social forces at work when the receiver of a compliment responds. Generally they do not want to disagree with the compliment giver nor do they want to self praise as both are detrimental to the solidarity of the relationship. The way they solve this dilemma depends on their cultural values (cited from Chen, S. H. E. (2003). Hence, analysis of compliments and compliment responses enables us to enhance our understanding of people’s culture, social values, social organisation, and the function and meaning of language use in a community” (Yuan, 2001 p. 273).

To analyse the compliment responses the pragmatic approach is used. Pragmatics studies is interested in how the users use the language in a culturally determined social context (Mey, 2001; Matiki & Kgolo, 2017; Kecskes & Horn, 2007). The choice of expression depend on the rules for conversations that depend on the social context in a way that is characteristic of the particular speech community (Wardhaugh, 1991). In addition, the theories included in this study are: the speech act theory from Searle (1969), as well as the SPEAKING theory from Hymes (1974) to describe the context and the different factors that are relevant to understand the context of the compliment responses.

The purpose of this study was to find out how the Minangkabau respond to compliments given by another member of the family according to the relationship between the participants. Husband and wife, father and children, wife and husband, mother and children, children and father, children and mother, and inter-sibling interactions were investigated. Compliments involving admiration or approval of another’s appearance, work or abilities
(Ishihara, 2010) were the focus. Different members of a family responded to received compliments or praise because of personal appearance (especially clothes) and results of skills or efforts (Herbert, 1986). The research questions for this study were the following:

1. What are the types of compliment responses that the Minangkabau people use among the family members?
2. What types of compliments responses are the most frequently used by Minangkabau family members according to the different relationships between the participants?
3. What are the possible factors that influence the types of compliment responses among the family members?

This research is a synchronic descriptive study that uses a qualitative approach to collect, analyse and interpret the data. The data was collected using in-depth interviews for the primary and secondary data. The secondary data was used for triangulation in order to cross-check the accuracy of the data and maintain validity, reliability and legitimisation of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). This research aimed to obtain the most natural possible compliment responses that the Minangkabau family members use between themselves.

For this study, the participants providing the primary data were 20 Minangkabau nuclear families originally from Pauh district in Padang city. These families consisted of a father, a mother and at least 2 children. If there were more than 2 children only 2 of them participated in the interview process. The mothers in the selected families had no education beyond Junior High School. This group were chosen because they are less likely to be influenced by other cultures and because they are more likely to use Minangkabau in the home rather than Indonesian. (Holmes, 1992, Llamas, 2006). Judgement sampling (Holmes & Hazen, 1992) was used to select the families because the participants were found through the “extended social networks of the researcher and the researcher’s contacts within the community, employing the ‘friend of a friend’ and snowball technique” (p. 31). Due to this, some of the participants were found through a friend in common and others by participants who recruited other informants from amongst those with whom they already had a preexisting relationship. This network of existing relationships helped the subjects’ willingness to participate and was very beneficial for the data collection.

For the secondary data, an elder with acknowledged expertise in Minangkabau culture was interviewed, Musra Dahrizal Katik Rajo Mangkuto from Batipuh, Tanah Datar, West Sumatra. This interview was carried out by the researcher with support from an Indonesian language interpreter on June 21st, 2019, in Padang city.

The interviews for the primary data were conducted at the homes of the participants (Holmes, 1992), and administered orally in the informants’ first language (Minangkabau language) in which the author was not yet fluent, so an interpreter was recruited to carry out the interviews in the field while the author observed. The interview of these nuclear families had two parts; one for the parents and another for the children. In order to obtain the most natural responses, the participants interacted among themselves when members were asked to compliment another member of the family directly. The interview lasted around 50 minutes. The situations the compliments were based on were chosen to be somewhat familiar to the participants as according to Holmes (1992) it is important “to find significant or familiar events in different areas that participants can answer more naturally because they have already experienced them” (p. 34).

To collect the data cell phone and video-recordings were used (Sudaryanto, 2015). Personal notes were taken in order to remember specific information, any observations and details of the data collected. The data was transcribed in Minangkabau language and then
translated into English to enable identification of compliment response types. Errors including spelling errors were not corrected for either the original transcript or the translation.

In order to categorise the compliment responses the commonly used Herbert’s taxonomy of compliment responses was used (in Matiki & Kgolo, 2017; Sucuoglu & Bahçelerli, 2015; Sari, 2009, and Al Falasi, 2007, etc.).

### Table 1
**Herbert’s taxonomy of compliment responses (1986, p.79)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Acceptances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciation Token</td>
<td>Thanks: thank you (smile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comment Acceptance</td>
<td>Thanks, it’s my favourite too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Praise Upgrade</td>
<td>Really brings out the blue in my eyes, doesn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Comment History</td>
<td>I bought it for the trip to Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Reassignment</td>
<td>My brother gave it to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Return</td>
<td>So’s yours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Non-agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Scale Down</td>
<td>It’s really quite old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Question</td>
<td>Do you really think so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Non-acceptances</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagreement</td>
<td>I hate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Qualification</td>
<td>It’s all right, but Len’s is nicer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. No acknowledgment</strong></td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Other Interpretations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Request</td>
<td>You wanna borrow this one too?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This taxonomy was based on the different responses that emerge in American English after a compliment is given for which a simple *thank you* would suffice. Herbert noted that alternatives to expressions of thanks appeared due to the function of compliment which was to negotiate solidarity with the addressee (Herbert, 1986). In this present study the compliment responses were categorised for each family relationship in order to be described and explained. When a response did not fit any existing category of Herbert’s taxonomy, a new subcategory was added.

### 2. Findings and Discussion

The data collected from Minangkabau nuclear families through interviews consisted of two specific situations given in a context where compliments might be expressed in order to obtain the compliment responses among the family members.

**Participant:** the husband/father

**Situation**

*Apak ado acara pai baralek atau tagak gala, biasonyo tantu apak pakaibaju yang rancak. Katiko tu ibuk dan anak-anak muji apak, apo tanggapan apak ka katiko tu? Apo yang biasonyo apak kecekan atau pak lakukan ka ibuk (istri) jo anak-anak untuak pujian yang apak tarimo?*
‘You will go to a wedding party or a special ceremony, so you dress up for the occasion. When your wife and children see you, they compliment you. What do you normally say or do to your wife, and children after the compliment?’

**Participant:** the wife/mother  
**Situation**

Hariko adolah pernikahan karabaik wak, oleh karano tu ibuk mamakai dress untuak acara tu, dengan penampilan yang indak biaso ibuk pakai dan badandan. Nampak rancak bana katiko suami jo anak-anak ibuk mancaliak urang tu mamuji, “Buk rancak bana Ibuk hariko.” Apo yang biasonyo ibuk kecekan atau ibuk lakukan ka apak (suami) jo anak-anak untuak pujian yang apak tarimo?

‘Today is one your relatives’ wedding day, because of that you get dressed for the occasion, which is not the common way you dress or make up, looking very pretty. When your husband and your children see you they say, mom you look so beautiful for the wedding. What do you normally say or do to that particular member (husband, wife, etc) after the compliment?’

**Participants:** the children  
**Situation**

Adiak (kamu) mandapek prestasi atau mandapekan sesuatu karano adiak hebat, contohnyo untuak mandapekan hadiah, tandiang atau kontes, atau mandapekan nilai paliang tinggi di sakolah, dan lain-lain. Urang tuo jo dunsanak adiak baiak laki-laki atau padusi mamuji dek karano tu. Apo yang biasonyo adiak kecekan atau lakukan ka urang tuo jo abang/kakak atau adiak untuak pujian yang adiak tarimo?

‘You obtain a great achievement or performance, for example win a prize, competition or contest, or you get top marks at school, etc. Your parents and sibling compliment you because of that. What do you normally say or do to that particular person (parents, and sibling) after the compliment?’

In responding to the compliments given by other family members, the responses found among the Minangkabau nuclear families were: appreciation token, comment acceptance, reassignment, return, question, and disagreement. The other types of responses found in Hebert’s taxonomy (praise upgrade, comment history, scale down, qualification, no acknowledgement, and request) were not found in the Minangkabau nuclear families interviewed. However, there were two new categories that appeared but they were not found in Herbert’s taxonomy.

**Response type**

**Appreciation Token**  
smile, laugh, kiss, and thank you.

**Comment Acceptance**

yes, of course. 
Indeed from the beginning I’m handsome/beautiful/smart. 
I will look for another wife (joking).

**Reassignment**

your Mum bought the clothes for me. 
I’m my Mum’s daughter (that’s why I’m smart)

**Return**

Because you’re my mother/father/child. 
Because you’re handsome/beautiful/smart too.
Really?, is it true?

If it’s like that, then I don’t need to go to school.

I’m going to a wedding party. I’m going out.

thanks be to God!

In order to have a general view of the compliment responses from the 20 families (which in this case, only 18 were representative), Table 2 shows the total responses obtained from the different families among the following relationships: husband to wife (H-W), father to children (F-C), wife to husband (W-H), mother to children (M-C), children to father (C-F), children to mother (C-M), older to younger child (C1-C2) and from younger to older child (C2-C1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>H-W</th>
<th>F-C</th>
<th>W-H</th>
<th>M-C</th>
<th>C-F</th>
<th>C-M</th>
<th>C1-C2</th>
<th>C2-C1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciation Token</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comment Acceptance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Praise Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Comment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reassignment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Return</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Non-agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scale Down</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Question</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Non-acceptances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disagreement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Qualification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. No acknowledgment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Interpretations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Request</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Other explanation *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Praising God *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: - = not used
* = new type of responses
The compliment responses are presented by relationships through pie charts.

**Figure 1 Husband to wife**

In this relationship, the husbands’ preference to respond to the wife through comment acceptance including jokes, then following by the appreciation token which included smile, laugh and thank you.

**Figure 2 Father to children**

Fathers’s first choice to respond for the compliment the children was comment acceptance, followed by appreciation token (including thank you) and another explanation.

**Figure 3 Wife to husband**

According to the participants in this case, the wives interviewed, responded to their husbands choosing three types of responses, comment acceptance in first place, and then with appreciation token and return, which is different comparing the relationship of them with children.

**Figure 4 Mother to children**
Compared to the previous relationship the way how the mothers responded to the children was choosing comment acceptance as their first preference, followed by the other explanations which is different as well. In this occasion the mothers preferred to say something, instead of smiling or laughing, however, the thank you response was found only in one occasion.

**Figure 5 Children to father**

Through this pie chart it is notorious to observe that the compliment responses given from the children to the father were different from the children to the mother, in which many participants mentioned that they feel closer to the mother rather than the father, having a more respect relationship with him than a closer relationship with the mother. In this opportunity, there was only one particular participant that disagreed with the compliment.

**Figure 7 From child 1 to child 2**

In the relationship children and father, children’s choices to respond to the compliment given by they fathers were three: comment acceptance, appreciation token and return. The children used more thank you compared to other relationships.

**Figure 6 Children to mother**

In the relationship from child 1 to child 2, the older child chose comment acceptance type of response and also appreciation token as the second option, including one thank you. However, it is interesting to observed that the other responses were not part of their choice in this relationship in the family which was clearly seen when they respond to the father and mother.

**Figure 8 From child 2 to child 1**
On the other hand, children 2 (who are younger than child 1) chose different type of responses, which still the comment acceptance was their preference, but also appreciation token, return and reassignment.

**Figure 9 Overall compliment responses**

The participants in general, irregardless of relationship, preferred to respond to a compliment given by another member of the family with comment acceptance which is included under the agreement category in Herbert’s taxonomy, meaning that the participants directly accepted the compliment, by agreeing and giving a comment in response to it. The most common comment acceptance response was words of confirmation such as yes, and of course (number of responses). The reasons given by the participants for these kind of responses, which was also corroborated by Katik, was because of the family context and the relationship of the participants which is high-intimate, even though the Minangkabau culture is hierarchical.

Comment acceptance also included jokes, for example, since I was born I’m smart/handsome/prety, etc. Joking appears to be used to reduce the degree of self praise but is also characteristic of Minangkabau speech where a clever reply is appreciated.

Apart from comment acceptance, the responses used by the Minangkabau nuclear family members were, in order of frequency: appreciation token (43 responses), reassignment (9 responses), return (24 responses), questions (7 responses), only one disagreement, other explanation (11 responses), and praising God (5 responses each), and only one direct disagreement response. The majority of the participants agreed with the compliment given in one way or other.

In some particular families and relationships, the participants stated that they hadn’t received a particular type of compliment from that particular member of the family, because it was not part of the family dynamic. Some parents had not received praise from children and some children had not been praised by siblings. The reason for this was likely the age of the participants. Some children around 9 years old hadn’t given compliments to one of the parents or to an older sibling. However, they had received compliments from other members. This only occurred in four interactions in different families. There were, however, six occasions when wives stated that they had never received that sort of praise from their husbands. This appears to be because men do not show affection to their wives in in the presence of their children although a couple of wives stated that their husbands had stopped praising their wives appearance after they married.

The expression thank you was found, but only rarely, except between wife and husband. However, even then it is not their preferred response. Both participants and Katik agreed that it is not common for Minangkabau to say a direct thank you to nuclear family members except for something that was particularly significant or unusually generous. One significant exception to this was a family where the father responded to the wife and the older child with a ‘thank you’. In this family the older child used a ‘thank you’ to all family members. In this case, the wife suggested the reason for the use of ‘thank you’ was that the father was surrounded by highly educated people in his working situation and had learned to use this response there and then his son had copied him.

On the other hand, if an outside person compliments them, the most used response
would be *thank you* or a scale down expressions to humble themselves before the other person as that is part of politeness in Minangkabau culture (Oktavianus & Revita, 2013). This is contrast to most Westerners, particularly Americans (Apte, 1974; Cheng, 2005).

Minangkabau language in general is not direct, people are more likely to use satire or metaphors (Oktavianus & Revita, 2013). Appreciation tokens like a smile, laugh or kiss were more common compliment responses amongst the participants which reflects that they don’t necessarily use words all the time to express how they feel or agree with the compliment in this case. Appreciation token was found in every relationship, however, it is found in a high percentage between children and parents. This could be a sign of respect to their parents, because of that hierarchical relationship which is different between the children. In the case of mother to children, only thank you was found but not smile, or laugh, which reveals that in these families, the mothers chose a verbal response rather than a non-verbal one.

Amongst these Minangkabau families, there were two types of responses used that were not included in Herbert’s 1986 taxonomy. These were praising God, other explanation. On six different occasions the Arabic expression *Alhamdulillah!* translated into English as *thanks be to God!* was the response given to the compliment. It was used by both adults and children in five different families (25%). The use of this response is a reflection of the strong Islamic identity that is part of the Minangkabau culture. Many parts of Indonesia have a strong Muslim majority and so expressions including the mention of God are common (Oktavianus, 2006).

The other new type of compliment response was “other explanation” used exclusively by parents responding to their children compliments. In each case, they didn’t say anything related to the compliment itself but answered the question that in some cases followed the compliment. For example, some children said: Wow Dad/Mum you look very handsome/beautiful (where are you going?) and received the reply: I’m going to a wedding party. This response was only used in a small percentage of cases (14% and 17% for fathers and mothers respectively).

The preferences for certain type of responses were not only an individual choice or as part of the participants’ character (eg. Someone just smiling to every member, etc), but were often reflected by other family members. The way that children responded to a compliment was often similar to the response used by the parents. For example, in one particular family:

**Setting:** Home  
**Participants:** father, mother, and children  
**Ends:** to find out the compliment responses  
**Key:** informal

1. The father’s responses to the compliments given by his wife and children.

**Wife:** *Ndeh, tambah gagah se uda mah se uda mah.*  
‘Wow, hubby, you are more handsome today’.

**Husband:** *Emang dari lahianyo lah gagah juo.*  
‘Indeed, I’m handsome since I was born (joking)’.

**Child 1:** *Ndeh, gagah bana Apa kini.*  
‘Wow, you look very handsome Dad’.

**Father:** *Oh nan rancak ko lah dari dulu ko.*  
‘Oh I’m handsome since a long time ago!’ (joking).
2. The mother’s responses to the compliments given by her husband and children.

Husband: Ndēh manih bana bini ambo ko ha.
‘Wow, you are very beautiful/sweet my wife’.

Wife: Tu iyo manihnyo. Kok ndak manih ma amuah Apa.
‘Yes, I’m sweet, if I’m not, you won’t like me (joking)’.

Child 1: Rancak na ama hari ko.
‘Mum, you look beautiful today’.

Mother: Iyolah siap babadak tadi. Tu iyo rancaknyo.
‘Of course, because I’m wearing make up. That’s why I’m beautiful’.

Child 2: Tumben rancak bana ama hari ko ha.
‘Mum are very beautiful today!’

Mother: Emang dari dulu ama ko mode tu.
‘Indeed, since I was born I’m like that (joking)’.

3. The child 1’s response of the compliment given by the parents and younger sister.

Father: Ndēh yo hebat anak Apa.
‘Wow, you are amazing my son!’

Child 1: Tu iyo dek Apa. Apa kuek tu Rendi kuek lo.
‘Yes because of you, Dad. You, Dad are strong so I’m strong too’.

Mother: Rendi, ondeh, dapek juara panjek pinang waang mah.
‘Wow Rendi you are the champion of climbing the pine tree (traditional competition)’.

Child 1: Tu iyo anak Ama mah.
‘Yes, I’m your son’.

Child 2: Yo pandai bana abang. Manang lomba a bang tadi.
‘Wow big brother you are smart, you could won the competition’.

‘Yes of course, because I’m old enough now, I can do it’.

4. The child 2’s response of the compliment given by the parents and big brother.

Father: Ndēh, hebatnyo anak den lai.
‘Wow, your amazing, my daughter’.

Child 2: Tu iyo apa maajaan salamuko mah.
‘Yes, dad, you have been teaching me’.

Mother: Weh, yo santiang anak Ama.
‘Wow, you’re smart, my daughter’.

Angela Flores, Rina Marnita A.S.: Responses to Compliments within Minangkabau Families in Pauh, Indonesia
In the case of this family, the family members made their own choices according to their personality, style, and in some cases based on the relationship. The father chose to give a joking response to his wife and child 1, but to his youngest child, while the response was also light-hearted, it also returned the compliment. The mother chose to give a joking comment to her husband and to child 2, but for her child 1 she focused her response on her makeup (reassignment). The child 1’s responses to his parents were returned compliments but when responding to his sister he gave a comment explaining that he is old enough to be the champion. Similarly, child 2, returned the compliment to her parents but she also complimented her big brother as well. Participants’ choices were influenced by the interaction style in the family, which in this case is using a joking style in returning the compliment. However, there is a respect for hierarchy, especially that based on age. All the responses to older family members compliment returns including that of the youngest child who returned the compliment to her big brother. Looking at the data overall, compliment returns are about 2 ½ times more likely from younger to older than to older to younger.

The other response that was more common from younger to older were appreciation tokens which were almost twice as likely than from older to younger, including amongst siblings of different ages. While this could be partly because a younger child is likely to be less verbal it may, along with the observation above, reflect the Minang cultural ideal of kato nan ampek where speech to older interlocutors has characteristics distinct from speech amongst equals or to younger interlocutors.

In fact, responses from older to younger participants also showed some distinctive features. Not only was ‘other explanation’ only used by adults addressing children but ‘reassignment’ of the compliment to another person or object was used eight times from parents to children and only once in a response to an older sibling.

3. Conclusion

Minangkabau family members used a range of compliment responses including two that do not appear in Herbert’s taxonomy. Thanking God (Alhamdullilah) reflects the religious nature of Minangkabau culture and was used by adults and children alike. response was A simple thank you response was rarely used by these Minangkabau in a family context. On the occasions where it was used there had been more significant contact with wider and more highly educated social circles. Comment acceptance was the most frequently used response irregardless of relationship among the participants. Joking was often used to avoid the impression of self praise. There were differences in the response patterns according to the relative age of the interlocutors that could reflect cultural values of responding to interlocutors in a way that reflects age differences.

Suggestions for Future Research

As there is no previous study related to the compliment responses among the Minangkabau family members from Pauh, it is expected that these findings could be use for further studies. Future research may investigate the same topic but with different data for example, to compare this study with families where the mothers have high level of education to see if the same happens among their families or with other cultures too.
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