

ISSN: 1412-3320

Celt

A Journal of
**Culture, English Language
Teaching & Literature**

Accredited by DIKTI 040/P/2014
Celt, Vol. 14, No.1, pp. 1-128, Semarang, July 2014

Celt

A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching and Literature

A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching and Literature (Celt) is published biannually in the months of July and December (ISSN: 1412-3320) presenting articles on culture, English language teaching and learning, linguistics, and literature. Contents include analysis, studies, application of theories, research reports, material development, and book reviews. **Celt** was firstly published in December 2001. Based on the decree from *Hasil Akreditasi Jurnal Ilmiah, SK Direktur Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi*, No. 040/P/2014 dated on 18 February 2014, **Celt** is nationally accredited until 2019.

Editor-in-Chief

Ekawati Marhaenny Dukat

Business Manager

Cecilia Titiek Murniati

Editors

Antonius Suratno

Emilia Ninik Aydawati

Gerardus Majella Adhyanggono

Heny Hartono

Website Designer & Administrator

Ridwan Sanjaya

Cover Designer

Oscar Santoso

Correspondence:

Address: The Editors, **Celt**, Faculty of Language & Arts, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Henricus Constance building, 4th floor, Jl. Pawiyatan Luhur IV/1, Bendan Dhuwur, Semarang 50234, Indonesia; email: celtjournal@gmail.com; celt.unika@yahoo.com; celt@unika.ac.id; website: <http://www.journalcelt.com>; <http://journalcelt.blogspot.com>; Telephone: +62-24-8316142, 8441555 (hunting) ext. 1705, Fax no.: +62-24-8445265

Celt is published by the Faculty of Language & Arts, Soegijapranata Catholic University. Rector: Prof. Dr. Ir. Yohanes Budi Widianarko, M.Sc., Vice Rector for Academic Affairs: Dr. Ridwan Sandjaja, S.E., S.Kom, MS.IEC., Vice Rector for Financial and Administration Affairs: Ineke Hantoro, S.T.P., M.Sc., Vice Rector for Students' Affairs: Lita Widyo Hastuti, S.Psi, Msi, Vice Rector for Cooperation and Development Affairs: Dr. Marcella Elwina Simandjuntak, S.H., CN, M.Hum., Dean: Angelika Riyandari, S.S., M.A., Ph.D., Vice Dean for Academic Affairs: Dra. Cecilia Titiek Murniati, M.A., Ph.D, Vice Dean of Financial and Administration Affairs: Drs. Antonius Suratno, M.A., Ph.D., Vice Dean for Student Affairs: B. Retang Wohangara, S.S., M.Hum.

Contributions:

Contributions are welcome from anyone who is concerned with culture, English language teaching and learning, linguistics and literature. Contributors should consult the current Celt Manuscript Submission Guidelines before submitting articles, which contains important information about the focus and format of articles (see back cover). Cost per journal is Rp 40.000 and is payable through **Bank BII** kas Unika Soegijapranata, with a bank swift code: **IBBKIDJA**, bank acc. no.: **1-575-16246-4**, bank acc. name: **Angelika Riyandari dan Antonius Suratno**.

Printed by Santosa Print Offset, Yogyakarta

Published and copyrighted by Soegijapranata Catholic University Press, Semarang © 2014.

Heavenly Tears – Earthly Loss: Different Ways of Coping with Life Loss in <i>Tears in Heaven, Circus, and Since I Lost You</i> Akun	1
Constructing a Course on Indonesian Shadow Puppet for International Students Yoseph Bambang Margono Slamet	16
Using Popular Culture's Media of Indonesian-English Picturebooks as a Way of Reaching More Vegetable Consuming Children Ekawati Marhaenny Dukut, Maya Putri Utami, Adi Nugroho, Novita Ika Putri, and Probo Y. Nugrahedi	36
Cultural Untranslatability: a Study on <i>The Rainbow Troops</i> Nur Utami S.K.	48
Analyzing Complaints by Indonesian EFL Speakers Anna Marietta da Silva	63
Teacher Questioning in Classroom Interaction Sarlita Dewi Matra	82
Students' Perspectives on the Role of Open Access Centre and Language Laboratory as Supporting Units in Developing English Language Skills Wuryani Hartanto	112

ANALYZING COMPLAINTS BY INDONESIAN EFL SPEAKERS

Anna Marietta da Silva

anna.silva@atmajaya.ac.id

Department of Applied English Linguistics, Atma Jaya Catholic University, Jakarta

Abstract: The English language competence of an EFL learner can be reflected in his pragmatic competence. Yet, for language learners and teachers a mastery of the pragmatic competence may unconsciously be neglected. In other words, it may not be taught in line with the grammatical competence since the initial period of learning. The article centers on two problems: (1) the similarities and differences of speech act of complaints among Indonesian EFL learners, Indonesian EFL teachers and American native speakers, and (2) the evidence of any pragmatic transfer in the complaint performance. DCT was used to gather the data, which was then analyzed using Rinnert, Nogami and Iwai's aspects of complaining (2006). It was found that there were both differences and similarities of complaints performed by both the native and non-native speakers of English when power and social status were involved. Some evidence on pragmatic transfer was also tangible; mainly it was due to cultural differences.

Key words: pragmatic competence, speech act of complaints, pragmatic transfer

***Abstrak:** Kompetensi berbahasa Inggris seorang pembelajar bahasa Inggris dapat dilihat dari kompetensi pragmatiknya. Namun, penguasaan kompetensi pragmatik tampaknya belum menjadi prioritas utama para guru dan pembelajar bahasa Inggris. Dengan kata lain, penguasaan kompetensi pragmatik tidak seiring sejalan dengan penguasaan kompetensi tata bahasa Inggris sejak awal masa pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Artikel berikut ini berfokus pada dua hal: (1) persamaan dan perbedaan tindak tutur mengeluh dari para*

pembelajar bahasa Inggris, guru bahasa Inggris, dan penutur bahasa Inggris Amerika, dan transfer pragmatic dalam strategi mengeluh tersebut. Instrumen pengambilan data menggunakan Discourse Completion Test, yang kemudian dianalisa berdasarkan komponen tindak tutur mengeluh dari Rinnert, Iwai dan Nogami (2006). Penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat persamaan sekaligus perbedaan antara keluhan oleh penutur dan bukan penutur bahasa Inggris ketika melibatkan variabel kekuasaan dan status sosial. Juga terdapat bukti adanya transfer pragmatik, yang terutama disebabkan adanya perbedaan budaya.

Kata kunci: kompetensi pragmatik, tindak tutur mengeluh, transfer pragmatik

INTRODUCTION

Being competent second or foreign language speakers is demonstrated not only through the linguistic but also communicative competence (Hymes, 2001, p. 55). While the former covers one's performance with regard to grammatical forms including the phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical forms, the latter displays what functions that one can produce with his grammatical knowledge, e.g. requesting, thanking, inviting, and complaining (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 2). Nevertheless, one also needs what is called the strategic competence, which is all about one's capability in dealing with communication breakdown (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 27).

Thus, to be able to produce appropriate utterances in a target language learners need to be exposed to various situations containing different pragmatic aspects, e.g. deixis, implicatures, and speech acts, that may require different communication strategies (Prachanant, 2006, pp. 189-190). However, numerous research has shown that it is not easy for learners to create appropriate utterances that involve the pragmatic strategies frequently used by the English native speakers. The pragmatic awareness, though, is an integrated part of a language that has to be reflected in one's language performance (Rhurakvit, 2011; Tanck, 2002; Umar, 2006).

In addition, cultural differences and lack of exposures to the commonly employed pragmatic strategies can be some of the causes of the lack of learners' pragmatic competence (Prachanant, 2006, pp. 182-183; Rhurakvit, 2011, p. 39; Azarmi & Behnam, 2012, p. 85). Culture is a product of a longitudinal construction of a society in which a language learner is a

member of, which can present in “the repeated act of speaking . . .”, hence it is always contextual (Chaudary, 2004, pp. 56, 57). In other words, different cultures require different strategies in communicating different purposes, though many strategies may be universal or apply across cultures (Kramsch, 1998, pp. 17-18; Cutting, 2002, pp. 21, 33). That is why adjusting to the culture’s target language including the pragmatic aspects may create problems for many EFL or ESL learners, even if it is said that the notion of pragmatic coherence may be shared by speakers of different languages (Kramsch, 1998, p. 28). As a matter of fact, lack of pragmatic understanding and failure of applying the pragmatic knowledge may lead to conversational misunderstanding from the hearer’s point of view as well as frustration from the learners’ side (Kramsch, 1998, pp. 29-30).

Drawing from the above problems of pragmatic competence among FL learners, the study was aimed at answering the following questions: (1) what are the differences and similarities between the Indonesian EFL learners complaints in English with those of the English native speakers?, and (2) what is the evidence of pragmatic transfer, if any? It is expected that the result of the study can highlight the need to introduce more various expressions of complaints in various contexts as those are the missing points in the curriculum of English skills in the Faculty of Education, English Department, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia (based on e-mail correspondence with the Head of the Department, June 27, 2013).

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Speech act theory and politeness

Speech act theory is proposed by Austin in 1940s, which was later developed by Searle in 1957. It rooted itself from the philosophy of language, i.e. knowing the meaning of language and what the users can do with language. In other words, it is considered to be very crucial to discover and analyze how language has been used to fulfill human beings’ needs and serve their purposes including the effect of language to the users. Thus, language was not viewed as purely symbols or words from which merely descriptive analyses of the sentences and structures can be carried out (O’Keeffe, Clancy, & Adolphs, 2011, p. 84). Instead, people have used language to fulfill a number of minor to major functions in humans’ lives. Language actually reflects the interlocutors’ mind: what they think of, how they perform their propositions and even make others also conduct the propositions and

intentions of the speakers. To put it another way using language indicates the performance of some actions, hence, the Speech Act. (Cutting, 2002; O'Keeffe, Clancy, & Adolphs, 2011; Sbisá, 2009).

Austin (1962) in his Speech Act Theory suggests that one's utterance consists of a Locutionary Act, an Illocutionary Act, and a Perlocutionary Act. The sounds, words, symbols, texts and the meanings that uttered by humans are the Locutionary Act, whereas what the speakers actually mean with her/his utterance is the Illocutionary act. The Illocutionary Act therefore consists of the utterance and the proposition, which should meet several conditions so that it can be successfully carried out. It is imperative that the proposition and the meaning are correctly and completely understood by the hearer so that he can be expected to provide appropriate responses. The Perlocutionary Act then is the intended act performed by the hearers upon hearing the utterances (Cutting, 2002, p. 16; Mey, 2001, pp. 94-95; O'Keeffe, Clancy, & Adolphs, 2011, pp. 84-85; Sbisá, 2009, pp. 231-232).

The Speech Act is then categorized by Searle (1976) into Directives, Expressives, Declarations, Representatives and Commissives (Cutting, 2002, pp. 16-17; Mey, 2001, pp. 120-124; O'Keeffe, Clancy, & Adolphs, 2011, pp. 86-87). Each type of the Speech Act is characterized by different performative verbs, hence the classification is the improvement of Austin's performative verbs. As a speaker asks, requests, or commands a hearer to do some actions, he is performing a Directives Speech Act. When the speaker shows his feeling which is reflected in his utterances, he is presenting the hearer with Expressives Speech Act, and as the speaker gives utterances whose consequence is the alteration of the world, he is committing Declarations. Hence uttering a Representatives Speech Act, the speaker says his opinion, stance, or belief of the world's state of affairs (Mey, 2001, pp. 120, 124), and employing a Commissives Speech Act, the speaker shows that he is ready to do some particular actions in the future. The Speech Act of Complaint for example can be said to represent an Expressive Speech Act because a complaint represents the complainer's emotional state, feeling, and or opinion (Prykarpatska, 2008, p. 91; Azarmi & Behnam, 2012, p. 78)

The speech act of complaint is an example of the Expressive Speech Act for it represents the complainer's emotional state, feeling, and or opinion (Prykarpatska, 2008, p. 91; Azarmi & Behnam, 2012, p. 78). It may require politeness, whose degree is dependent upon social contexts (Brown & Levinson, 1992, p. 57). However, speech act may also inherently contain politeness, reflected in the choice of words, intonation, body language, facial

expressions or gestures (Leech, 2005, pp. 5-6). Hence, the utterances, through which one performs speech act of complaint, will consist of one's effort to express politeness. In that regard, 'face', or one's personal ideal self-representation before the society, should be taken into account. Face can be either positive or negative. The former refers to one's desire to be respected by others, while the latter is one's desire to be free from any inconvenience caused by others. Complaints, as well as insults and accusations, can potentially threaten the positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1992, pp. 61, 62, 66) if speakers produce inappropriate utterances, which may relate to improper diction, intonation, and context of EFL beginners (Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993, pp. 120-121).

B. Pragmatic transfer

Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) note that distinctive features across cultures have been one of the causes of the inappropriate pragmatic behavior reflected in the speech acts produced by EFL learners. If there is no communication breakdown resulting from the differences, both speakers and interlocutors may expect a positive pragmatic transfer shown across the L1 and L2 cultures. So, the higher the EFL learners' proficiency is, the more chances they have to create pragmatic transfer because they already possess ". . . control over the English . . ." to express their intended meaning in their cultures through English (Takahashi & Beebe, 1993, p. 152). However, when communication problems due to the cultural differences displayed in the pragmatic performances appear, there can be a negative transfer across the different cultures. The negative transfer does not always indicate lack of pragmatics competence, though.

A pragmatic transfer illustrates the effect of a speaker's L1 linguistic and socio-cultural aspect into the L2 (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). As cultures are different from one to another, even though some values are shared universally across cultures, it is always possible that not all of the pragmatic aspects in L2 can be easily understood and conveyed in the learners' speech act. For example, in a study of refusals performed by three groups: the American English speakers, the American Japanese speakers, and the Japanese speakers, it was found that the former two groups produced more direct refusals than the last group (Kawate-Mierzejewska, 2009, p. 203). The findings indicated a pragmatic transfer of the Americans who learned Japanese as a foreign language. Another example was a study of interlanguage pragmatics between Korean and English, in which a speaker's pragmatic

transfer may lead to the improper selection of particular lexical items that would cause misinterpretation by the interlocutor (Haugh, 2010, pp. 144-145).

C. Previous studies on the speech act of complaint

There has been much research on the difference between the pragmatic competence of EFL learners and English native speakers. Tanck (2002) found that the non-native speakers of English tended to produce inappropriate complaints that may lead to unexpected situations. In addition, the non-native speakers were likely to personalize complaints, which in the American culture can be irksome to the interlocutors. Likewise, Azarmi & Benham (2012) indicated that the intermediate and upper intermediate Iranian EFL learners did not perform appropriate complaints: they preferred direct and explicit complaints without considering the FTA strategies. In the case of complaining to someone having higher position, they did not regard power and social distance in FTA strategy realization because of cultural differences, absence of pragmatic transfer & limited linguistic and socio-pragmatic competence. Similarly, Umar (2006) noted that the speech act produced by the Sudanese students was very distinctive from that performed by the British, which was the result of cultural differences between the British and the Sudanese and the low level of the Sudanese pragmatic competence. Furthermore, Prykarpatska (2008) showed that the complaint strategies of the Ukrainians were more various, and could be put in a continuum. At one end was the least offensive complaint, and on the other end to the most severe complaint. The (AES) preferred indirect strategies. Ukrainians also opted for more direct and spontaneous complaints than those performed by the AES.

With regard to the components of complaints, Rinnert, Nogami, and Iwai (2006) discovered several components of complaints, i.e. main components (comprising Initiators, Complaints, and Requests), level of directness (indirect, somewhat direct, and very direct) and amount of mitigation. They found that with regard to the level of directness, the Japanese EFL learners showed higher levels of directness in comparison to the less fluent Japanese students and the English native speakers in both situations. The English native speakers showed low level of directness. In addition, the native speakers of English preferred the indirect complaints with a considerable amount of mitigations. On the other hand, the JEFLL learners viewed direct requests to be more effective. Rhurakvit (2011) found

that the Thai English learners in Thailand seemed to have similar complaint patterns to the native Thai speakers, whereas Thai English learners in the UK performed the complaint patterns which tended to be similar to the English native speakers. Another finding was that both groups of English learners in Thailand and UK did not use downgraders appropriately from the point of view of the English native speakers. The study implied that in terms of EFL learning, students must be also taught the sociopragmatic aspects of English which would enable them to produce daily utterances the closest possible to the ones produced by the native speakers.

The earlier studies have shown that pragmatic competence is a problematic for EFL learners. None of the above research raised the pragmatic competence of Indonesian EFL learners and Indonesian EFL teachers in comparison to that of the English native speakers, hence the focus of the present study.

METHODOLOGY

To collect the data I used the non-attested data since I want to get a clear picture on the subjects' pragmatic competence (Bednarek, 2011, p. 540). Hence, the study employed the Discourse Completion Tasks or Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) (Tanck, 2002; Rinnert, Nogami, & Iwai, 2006; Umar, 2006; O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., and Adolphs, S., 2011) which were distributed to Indonesian EFL teachers, Indonesian EFL students and American native-speaker teachers, who were selected based on convenient sampling. There were fourteen EFL students (henceforth the IES) of the Faculty of Education, English Department, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, ten Indonesian EFL lecturers (henceforth the IEL), of the same university one teacher of *LIA Language Course*, and eight American English native speaking teachers of the Regional English Language Office, Jakarta (henceforth the ANS) participating the study.

The DCT, consisting of four situations, two of which were distractors (vide Appendix 1) was analyzed using the components of complaints by Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai (2006). I am curious as to whether the IES and IEL would behave similarly or differently from the Japanese subjects in the study by Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai, bearing in mind there are some cultural similarities between the Indonesians and the Japanese such as respect and politeness to the older generation, and indirectness in speech acts that would potentially threaten the face of the hearers. The two distractors were taken

from Tanck (2002, pp. 20, 21), while the other two situations requested the subjects to produce complaints to an interlocutor of the same age in a queue (Umar, 2006, p. 36), and to a teacher about a low grade (Park, 2001, p. 190). The pragmatic transfer analysis was based on Kasper and Blum-Kulka's notion of pragmatic transfer (1993). In addition to the DCT, I had an Informed Consent and Demographic Survey (vide Appendix 1) in order to get the subjects' ages, genders, occupations, and language backgrounds. Also, I interviewed five IES to confirm several ambiguous lexical items that may provide several meanings.

RESULTS

In this section, I present my findings according to the situations for which the speech act of complaint was required. I will start by describing the third situation, followed by elucidating the fourth situation.

Situation 1:

You need to buy a ticket to travel to a nearby city to visit your family over the weekend. You go to the ticket office at the train station and you have to wait in a long line to get a ticket. The tickets are almost sold out. You have been waiting there for more than an hour. While you are standing in line, someone about your age, tries to cut in line in front of you. What would you say to him/her?

The data showed that there are some differences and similarities in terms of the following points: (1) lexical items used in Initiators, (2) level of directness, (3) mitigation and (4) patterns of complaints. In terms of Initiators, while around half of the IES used *sorry*, the Indonesian EFL teachers (55%) and the ANS (75%) preferred *excuse me* (vide Table 1). Thus, both the IET and the ANS would rather use *excuse me* than any other openings. Yet, the IET (27%) and IES (14%) used one word: *hey*, that was not chosen by the ANS.

For the IES the word *sorry* functioned to mitigate their complaints (Hau, 2013) (Karina, 2013) (Rosalina, 2013). Another purpose was to express politeness (Karina, 2013), and as an attention getter (Hau, 2013). Interestingly, one student admitted that she used *sorry* to remind the interlocutor that what he did (jumping the line) was not appropriate

(Purwanti, 2013). The same student, who is a Javanese, also employed *eh*, which functions as warm greeting, which was part of her culture (Purwanti, 2013) (cf. Kawate-Mierzejewska, 2009, p. 203; Haugh, 2010, pp. 144-145). Another lexical item that attracted my attention was *hey*, that was used by both Indonesian students and teachers. The interviews revealed that the lexical item *hey* was used for these reasons: (1) as an attention getter, (2) and to show a distant relationship with the interlocutor (Karina, 2013); (Purwanti, 2013). The ANS did not use *hey* at all, which might indicate that politeness was still maintained even when complaining to a stranger who had caused some inconvenience.

With regards to the level of directness, the IES (93%) and IET (73%) opted for a very direct complaint in which there was an explicit mention of offense or inconvenience the interlocutor had caused the speaker, and the interlocutor's responsibility to redress the situation (cf. Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai, 2006, p. 39), while the ANS used "somewhat direct" complaints (88%) in which the speaker told the interlocutor about his wrong doing, but does not ask the interlocutor to improve the situation (vide Table 1).

Employing very direct level of complaint, the IES and the IET did not seem to save both the positive and negative faces of their interlocutors (Mey, 2001, pp. 74-75) and might potentially lead to a negative pragmatic transfer (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993). The interviews with the IES presented some important points: the directness was a projection of their unhappy feelings and disagreement with the interlocutor's action, and or an attempt to have an effective complaint, i.e. the interlocutor knows that his behavior was inappropriate and would immediately redress the situation (Gabriella 2013; Hau, 2013; Rosalina 2013).

Despite their reasons, direct complaints may lead to a conflict between the subjects and their interlocutors (cf. Tanck, 2002, pp. 7-8; Prykarpatska, 2008, p. 94), especially when the complaint was compared to the ANS who employed somewhat direct complaint, the decision of which may be due to the politeness. One student, however, said that she performed an indirect complaint because she wanted her interlocutor to infer her complaint, the decision of which was influenced by her Javanese culture (Purwanti, 2013), which could indicate a positive pragmatic transfer from Javanese to English.

All groups used mitigation constantly, regardless of the level of directness. The IES liked to use *sorry* and *please* (50%, respectively) better than *could*, *better*, and *thank you*, which do not support similar research. Forty-

five percent of the IET, on the other hand, preferred *please*. Meanwhile, the ANS did not show strong preference for one or two particular words. Instead, they used various lexemes like *sorry*, *would*, *guess*, *think* and other forms, i.e. rhetorical questions.

The patterns of complaints used by the three groups were somewhat different (vide Table 2). Forty-three percent of the IES used I+C+R. Another 43% used I+R, the pattern which is not selected by the ANS. Meanwhile, more than half of the IET (64%) apply I+R, which seems to reflect their politeness. Finally, 75% of the ANS made use of I+C. Thus, both the IET and the ANS prefer one pattern to the others. The frequent use of Initiators by the three groups shows an awareness of face-saving strategies regardless of the different cultures (Leech, 2005; Murphy & Neu, 2005).

Situation 2:

You received your final grades. You were shocked that Professor Andrea Smith gave you a C. Her class was one of your favorites and you studied very hard. You got an A on your report, so you don't understand why your final grade was so low. You knock on the door of her office. You say . . .

In a different situation where subjects had to make complaints to their teacher, the IES and IET show similar ways in initiating a conversation (vide Table 3). More than eighty percent of the two groups employ address terms like *Ma'am*, *Professor* or *Sir*, that are accompanied by opening expressions like *would like* or *want to*, which is contrary to what Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai (2006) found. Thus, the IES' and IET's constant use of the above address terms shows that there is a pragmatic transfer (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, pp. 10-11; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993, p. 152; cf. Kawate-Mierzejewska, 2009, p. 203). Indonesians value seniority highly, hence rarely do Indonesians address their teachers or older acquaintances by merely their names. Instead, they used address terms such as *Bapak* for male, *Ibu* for female. On the other hand, only half of the ANS use the same address term. They also used *Hi* or *Hello*, the items of which are not used at all by IES and the IET. Besides, the ANS used chunk like *how are you*, which is not chosen by both the IES and IET.

With reference to the level of directness, the three groups do not show any strong preference of level of directness. The IES do not show a strong preference for one particular style. Less than half of the students (43%) perform very direct complaints; the rest are divided into those employing

'somewhat direct' complaints (29%) and indirect complaints (29%). On the other hand, more than half of the IET (55%) employ indirect complaints, and the rest (45%) very direct complaints. Interestingly, 38% of the ANS chose very direct complaints, 38% indirect complaints, and 25% somewhat direct complaints. It can be seen that in general, the subjects seem to avoid using very direct complaints when power and social distance are involved (cf. Behnam & Niroomand, 2011, p. 211).

With regards to the lexical items used in the mitigation, 43% of the IES use *would*, 21% *could*, and 14% *sorry*. Meanwhile, 36% of the IET employed *may*, 27% *would*, and 27% *could*. Hence, the frequent use of mitigation as well as the appropriate address terms by both IES and IET indicate a positive pragmatic transfer (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, pp. 10-11), which is opposed to Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai's findings (2006). The ANS also employ *would* (50%) as well as *just* (38%) and *wonder* (38%). Besides, they have other expressions like *a little*, *feel like*, *well*, *great* to mitigate their complaints. The ANS' use of more various expressions show the dynamicity and fluidity of language use, which Indonesian subjects lack.

The IES do not seem to have a preference for one pattern (vide Table 4); 36% of the students used I+R, 29% I+C, and 21% only I. On the other hand, over half of the IET choose one particular pattern, i.e. I or Initiators. The rest used I+C+R. The ANS' choice is almost similar to that of the IET. The ANS also used I (38%), and I+C+R (38%). In addition, they employ another pattern: I+R (25%).

The three groups had different patterns for the two situations. While the IES prefer I+C+R, and I+R (43%, respectively) for Situation 3, they opt for I+R (36%) for Situation 4. Meanwhile, IET mostly prefer I+R for Situation 3 (64%), but use I only (73%) for Situation 4. The ANS also have a tendency for using different patterns: 75% of them preferred I+C for Situation 3. However, they do not show a strong tendency for the other situation: they either employ I (38%), I+C+R (38%), and I+R (25%). The differences, I believe, are relevant to the contextual differences reflected in the two situations, particularly concerning the power and social distance between the speakers and their interlocutors (cf. Behnam & Niroomand, 2011, p. 211), which does not support Rinnert, Nogami and Iwai's findings (2006).

CONCLUSION

To this point, I have presented how the IES, the IET and the ANS performed the English pragmatic competence through the speech act of complaints. Due to cultural aspects and exposures to the English pragmatic competence, there have been several differences and similarities performed by the Indonesiansubjects and the ANS.

In a situation that involved no power and social status between the speakers and their interlocutors, the two groups had different preferences for the different lexical items used in the Initiators and Mitigation. In addition, both the IET and IES tended to be more direct or explicit to a stranger of their age than the native speakers did (cf. Abdolrezapour, Dabaghi, & Kassaian, 2012; Prykarpatska, 2008;) indicating the unawareness of the face-saving strategies which may potentially lead to a negative pragmatic transfer. Also, while the IET favored Initiators + Requests, and the Americans Initiators + Complaints, the IES did not show a preference for one pattern of complaint over the other patterns. That may be an indication of the IES' lack of pragmatic awareness in conversation (cf. Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai, 2006), which should be the attention of the syllabus maker (Celce-Murcia, 2007)

The similarities appeared in the situation where power and social status were taken into account, i.e. teachers or older people are considered to have more power and higher social status than students do (cf. Azarmi & Behnam, 2012; Prykarpatska, 2008). All groups evidently did not strong preference for very direct complaint which did not support findings of Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai (2006) in which the student subjects performed very direct complaints to their teachers. Besides, they used more mitigation, and employed it constantly, which was also contrary to the study by Rinnert, Nogami & Iwai (2006) in which the Japanese students used fewer mitigation when complaining to their teacher.

Finally, looking at the use of address terms and regular mitigation, I can conclude that there was a positive pragmatic transfer from Indonesian to English. Due to the limitations of the study, particularly concerning the sampling and validation of the DCT result, a further study covering more number of subjects with in-depth interviews should be conducted in the future.

REFERENCES

- Azarmi, A., & Behnam, B. (2012, February). The Pragmatic Knowledge of Iranian EFL Learners in Using Face Keeping Strategies in Reaction to Complaints at Two Different Levels. *English Language Teacher*, 5(2), pp. 78-92.
- Bednarek, M. (2011). Approaching the Data of Pragmatics. In W. Bublitz, & N. Norrick, *Foundations of Pragmatics (Handbooks of Pragmatics 1)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 537-559.
- Behnam, B., & Niroomand, M. (2011). An Investigation of Iranian EFL Learners' Use of Politeness Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement Across Different Proficiency Levels. *English Language Teaching*, 4 (4), pp. 204-220.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1992). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, pp. 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching. In E. A. Soler, & M. P. Jorda, *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 41-57
- Chaudary, N. (2004). *Listening to Culture: Constructing Reality from Everyday Talk*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Gabriella, F. (2013, June 14). Amount of Mitigation and Level of Directness. (A. M. da Silva, Interviewer)
- Hau, A. F. (2013, June 12). Amount of Mitigation and Level of Directness. (A. M. da Silva, Interviewer)
- Haugh, M. (2010). Intercultural (im)politeness and the Micro-Macro Issue. In A. Trosborg, *Pragmatics Across Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 139-166.

- Hymes, D. (2001). On Communicative Competence. In A. Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 53-73.
- Karina, F. (2013, June 14). Amount of Mitigation and Level of Directness. (A. M. da Silva, Interviewer)
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka, *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford, pp. 3-20.
- Kawate-Mierzejewska, M. (2009). Refusals in Japanese Telephone Conversation. In N. Taguchi, *Pragmatic Competence*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 199-226.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford.
- Leech, G. (2005). Politeness: Is there an East-West Divide? *Journal of Foreign Languages*, pp. 1-30.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Mofidi, M., & Shoustari, Z. G. (2012). A Comparative Study of the Complaint Strategies among Iranian EFL and ESL Students - The Study of the Effect of the Length of Residence and the Amount of Contact. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (11), pp. 118-124.
- Murphy, B., & Neu, J. (1995). My Grade's too Low: The Speech Act Set of Complaining. In S. M. Gass, & J. Neu, *Speech Act Across Cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 191-216.
- O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., and Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Olshtain, E., & Weinbach, L. (1993). Interlanguage Features of the Speech Act of Complaining. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka, *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford. pp. 108-137.
- Park, J. (2001). Korean EFL Learners' Politeness Strategies in Their Complaints. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 9 (1), pp. 185-209.

- Prachanant, N. (2006). *Pragmatic Transfer in Responses to Complaints by Thai EFL Learners in the Hotel Business*. Suranaree: Suranaree University of Technology.
- Prykarpatska, I. (2008). Why Are You Late? Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Study of Complaints in American English and Ukrainian. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, pp. 87-102.
- Purwanti, I. S. (2013, June 14). Amount of Mitigation and Level of Directness. (A. M. da Silva, Interviewer)
- Rhurakvit, M. (2011, December). *Complaints in Thai and English: An Interlanguage Pragmatic Study*. London: University of London.
- Rinnert, C., Nogami, Y., & Iwai, C. (2006). Preferred Complaint Strategies in Japanese and English. *5th Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference*. Shizuoka: Tokai University College of Marine Science. pp. 32-47.
- Rosalina, F. M. (2013, June 12). Amount of Mitigation and Level of Directness. (A. M. da Silva, Interviewer)
- Sbisa, M. (2009). Speech Act Theory. In J. Verschueren, & O. Jan-Ola, *Key Notions for Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 228-244.
- Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-Linguistic Influence in the Speech Act of Correction. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka, *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford, pp. 138-158.
- Tanck, S. (2002). *Speech Act Sets of Refusal and Complaint: A Comparison of Native and Non-Native English Speakers' Production*. Paper, American University, Department of TESL, Washington D.C.
- Umar, A. M.-T. (2006, July). The Speech Act as Realized by Advanced Sudanese Learners of English. *Umm AlQura University Journal of Education & Social Sciences & Humanities*, 18 (2), pp. 8-38.

APPENDICES:

Table 1:
Components of complaints to a stranger in a queue

COMPONENTS COMPLAINTS INITIATORS	OF SUBJECTS		
	IES n=14	IET n=11	ANS n=8
Sorry	50%	18%	13%
Excuse me	29%	55%	75%
Hey	14%	27%	0%
Hi	0%	0%	13%
Dude	0%	0%	13%
DIRECTNESS			
Very direct	93%	73%	13%
Somewhat direct	7%	9%	88%
Indirect	0%	18%	0%
MITIGATION			
Sorry	50%	9%	13%
Could	21%	0%	0%
Please	50%	45%	0%
Better	14%	0%	0%
Thank you	14%	0%	0%
Would	0%	9%	13%
Guess	0%	9%	13%
Think	0%	0%	13%
Others	0%	0%	25%

Table 2:
Patterns of complaints in a queue

PATTERNS OF COMPLAINTS	SUBJECTS		
	IES n=14	IEL n=11	ANS n=8
Initiators + Complaints + Requests (I+C+R)	43%	9%	13%
Initiators + Complaints (I+C)	7%	27%	75%

Initiators + Requests (I+R)	43%	64%	0%
Complaints + Requests (C=R)	7%	0%	0%
Complaints (C)	0%	0%	13%

Table 3:
Components of complaints about a low grade to a teacher

COMPONENTS OF COMPLAINTS	SUBJECTS		
	IES n=14	IEL n=11	ANS n=8
Good morning/afternoon	29%	36%	13%
Ma'am/Sir/Prof	86%	82%	50%
Would like/want to	64%	55%	63%
May I/can I/could I?	21%	36%	0%
Sorry	7%	0%	13%
Excuse me	29%	55%	0%
Do you have time/a minute?/	14%	0%	25%
Are you busy?/am I interrupting you?			
I need to / I come to . . .	0%	18%	0%
Hi/Hello	0%	0%	75%
How are you?	0%	0%	25%
I was wondering . . .	0%	0%	13%
DIRECT			
Very direct	43%	45%	38%
Somewhat direct	29%	0%	25%
Indirect	29%	55%	38%
MITIGATION			
Sorry	14%	9%	13%
Could	21%	27%	13%
Please	7%	0%	0%
Thank you	7%	9%	0%
Would	43%	27%	50%
Think	7%	0%	0%
Just	7%	9%	38%
Wonder	7%	9%	38%
May	7%	36%	0%
Others	14%	9%	75%

Table 4:
Patterns of complaints to a teacher

PATTERNS OF COMPLAINTS	SUBJECTS		
	IES n=14	IEL n=11	ANS n=8
Initiators + Complaints + Requests (I+C+R)	14%	27%	38%
Initiators + Complaints (I+C)	29%	0%	0%
Initiators + Requests (I+R)	36%	0%	25%
Complaints + Requests (C+R)	0%	0%	0%
Complaints (C)	0%	0%	0%
Initiators (I)	21%	73%	38%

Part 1:

Discourse Completion Test

Directions: Please write your response in the blank area. Do not spend a lot of time thinking about what answer you should provide; instead, please respond as naturally as possible and write your response as you feel you would say it in the situation.

1. A classmate that you have known for a couple of years stops by your desk at the library and invites you to lunch. You want to leave school early today, so you would rather work through lunch to get ahead on your project.

Classmate: "Hi. How have you been? Hey, do you want to go to the cafeteria and get a bite to eat?"

You: _____

2. You are working on a group project with three other students. Your group is having a discussion with your professor late Friday afternoon. It is 5:30pm. You are planning to pick up a friend at the airport immediately after the meeting and must leave the university within 15 minutes.

Professor: *“Hey, it’s getting late. Why don’t we all go down to the cafeteria? We can finish up there while we eat dinner.”*

You: _____

3. You need to buy a ticket to travel to a nearby city to visit your family over the weekend. You go to the ticket office at the train station and you have to wait in a long line to get a ticket. The tickets are almost sold out. You have been waiting there for more than an hour. While you are standing in line, someone about your age, tries to cut in line in front of you. What would you say to him/her?

You: _____

4. You received your final grades. You were shocked that Professor Andrea Smith gave you a C. Her class was one of your favorites and you studied very hard. You got an A on your report, so you don't understand why your final grade was so low. You knock on the door of her office.

Professor: *“Come in!”*

You: _____

Part 2.

Demographic Information

1. Age and Gender:
2. Nationality:
3. Occupation:
4. Educational background:
5. First language:

Thank You