11-3-1998

Complaint Patterns of Japanese English as a Second Language Students

Eriko Matsuda
Portland State University

Recommended Citation
Matsuda, Eriko, "Complaint Patterns of Japanese English as a Second Language Students" (1998). *Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 6374.
https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.3519

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Eriko Matsuda for the Master of Arts in TESOL were presented November 3, 1998, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[redacted]

Marjorie Terdal, Chair

[redacted]

Kimberley Brown

[redacted]

Suwako Watanabe
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

[redacted]

Jeanette Decarrico, Chair
Department of Applied Linguistics

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Eriko Matsuda for the Master of Arts in TESOL presented November 3, 1998.

Title: Complaint Patterns of Japanese English as a Second Language Students.

This study investigates cross-cultural production of speech acts of complaints. Speech acts are considered culture-specific. Speakers of different cultural background may have different ways of dealing with speech act situations. It is important for language educators to be aware of such differences. Previous studies show that second/foreign language learners tend to transfer their first language habits when performing speech acts in a target language. In this study, the complaint speech act performance of Japanese English as a second language students was compared to the performance of native speakers of English and native speakers of Japanese to see if first language speech act patterns were transferred to the second language production of speech acts.

A written discourse completion questionnaire was prepared, based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study, with changes in content to suit the subject groups for this study. The subjects of the study were twelve Americans responding in English (AE), twelve Japanese responding in English (JE), and twelve Japanese responding in Japanese (JJ). All subjects were students in universities in Northwestern United States and in Tokyo and Yokohama, Japan. The data were analyzed qualitatively according to the discourse functions of each sentence in the responses.

The results of the study showed that pragmatic transfer occurred in some areas of their production of speech act of complaints, most obviously in the opening moves, which was used by the speaker to get hearer's attention. Other discourse moves did not show obvious signs of transfer; however, there were several minor characteristics which indicate that JEs transferred speech act patterns of their first language. There were several points in which JEs used more discourse moves than AEs or JJs. This may be because of JEs' conscious efforts to make the speech act less threatening by giving more information to the hearer.

These findings add to previous research that suggests the occurrence of pragmatic transfer in the production of second language speech acts. This justifies the need for more instruction of pragmatics for the second and foreign language classrooms.

COMPLAINT PATTERNS OF

JAPANESE ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE STUDENTS

by

ERIKO MATSUDA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
TESOL

Portland State University
1998

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of my committee members, especially professor Terdal, for her patient guidance and advice, all my friends and relatives who supported me by encouraging me throughout my graduate school years, and those who helped me with proofreading.

I would also like to thank Steve Gardner, who was always there for me, and was a constant source of support and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Akira and Keiko Matsuda, to whom I am forever indebted for their unconditional support and trust throughout my life. Without them and their support, I would have never had this opportunity to further my education and pursue my interests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Justification

The need to develop communicative competence is emphasized in many language programs. Communicative competence includes not only grammatical knowledge but also pragmatic knowledge of the target language. In order to develop both, second and foreign language classrooms need to include instruction in both. Empirical studies are needed to build sound theories in the area of speech acts. These studies should include cross-cultural research because pragmatic knowledge is shaped by each society, and the conventions in one culture are not always the same in another culture.

This research will explore one area of pragmatics, namely the speech act of complaints. It is a sensitive act even between two native speakers of a language, because it has a potential danger for a speaker to harm the hearer's self-image by telling the hearer something that the hearer might not want to hear. The potential danger doubles when it is between interlocutors of different cultural background. Even when learners of a second language achieve a high level of grammatical skill, intercultural communication breakdown can still occur. Often, this is due to different conventions and cultural values. These differences could be seen even in basic daily conversation, such as how people ask for something or how they express gratitude. It is hard to detect the cause of this type of breakdown, because it is not as overt as grammatical errors. This kind of situation will often lead to miscommunication. Gumperz (1982) states that each culture has its own implicit convention of

conversation. When this convention is interpreted according to the different cultural expectations of the participants in each situation, it may lead to negative feelings. According to Gumperz, when the convention is not interpreted correctly,

> ... a speaker is said to be unfriendly, impertinent, rude, uncooperative, or to fail to understand. Interactants do not ordinarily notice that the listener may have failed to perceive a shift in rhythm or a change in pronunciation. Miscommunication of this type, in other words, is regarded as a social faux pas and leads to misjudgments of the speaker's intent; it is not likely to be identified as a mere linguistic error. (p.132)

As a nonnative speaker of English living in the United States, I have encountered situations similar to those described above. When an American friend complained to me, I felt hurt. I thought, since she complained to me with direct words, she must not like me. However, she did not show anything else afterwards that suggested that she did not like me. It puzzled me for a while, but now I wonder if it might have been because her way of making complaints was different from the way I was accustomed to.

Anybody interacting with a person from a different culture has the possibility of encountering these situations. If it is true that different cultures have different ways of making complaints and other such acts, it is useful for students of second and foreign languages to learn about such conventions. Along with linguistic competence, students need to develop sociocultural competence, "the speaker's ability to determine the pragmatic appropriateness of a particular speech act in a given context"(Olshtain & Cohen, 1983, p.33). Speech act behavior can be taught in the classroom to raise learners' consciousness about the possibly different speech act realizations in other cultures (Olshtain & Cohen, 1990). To develop effective lessons to ensure such classroom learning, it is important for language educators to understand the differences and underlying theories of speech acts.

In the past four decades, many researchers have been studying speech acts. Austin (1962) discussed the importance of an illocutionary act, that is, the act of making complaints, an apology, an offer, and so on, by means of the conventional force which is associated with the sentence. The illocutionary act is the core of the speech act, which is used by the speaker to achieve something by uttering the sentence. Speech acts generally include highly conventionalized acts such as requests, apologies, refusals, and complaints. Some speech acts are considered face-threatening acts, which are potentially dangerous to the interlocutor's need to keep a positive self-image (Brown & Levinson, 1987, Olshtain & Cohen, 1991).

Past research suggests that the concept of speech acts may be universal, but the realization of the acts is culturally specific. Several cross-cultural studies of speech acts have been done (see, for example, Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993; Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). The results of these studies show that the realization of speech acts is different among different cultures. Also, studies of speech acts targeting second language learners show that speech act behaviors of the first language transfer to the target language (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). The native speaker of the target language could perceive these diversions as rude or insincere. To minimize the risk, language teachers can provide explicit instruction on speech act behavior of the target culture. Olshtain and Cohen's (1990) study on the effects of instruction on speech act behavior shows that students can improve in production of subtle points of a culturally specific speech act with explicit instruction.

There are many empirical studies of requests, apologies and refusals; however, complaints have not been looked at as much as other speech acts. This study will examine the cross-cultural differences of the speech act of complaints. This study will contribute to the ongoing research of speech acts by adding empirical data.

1.2. Research Design

The purpose of this study was to find out if Japanese native speakers and English native speakers show differences in realization of a speech act, specifically, complaint, and if there are differences, how these realizations differ. This research focused on native Japanese speakers and native English speakers, and especially on Japanese learners of English to confirm previous research, which suggests that the native language convention of language use transfers to the second language use. The data were elicited using a written discourse completion questionnaire, and were analyzed qualitatively.

The following research questions are addressed:

1. Do Japanese learners of English perform the speech act of complaint differently from native speakers of American English speaking English and native speakers of Japanese speaking Japanese?
2. Are the Japanese learners of English affected by the knowledge of their first language (transfer) in the production of the speech act of complaint?
3. If so, in what situations does transfer occur?
4. a. Does the length of stay in the target culture affect the transfer?
   b. Does the length of study of the target language affect the transfer?

For the current study, the researcher will focus on the semantic formula of the complaints. A semantic formula refers to a word, phrase or a sentence which functions as a strategy for the speech act, or a speech act itself. A complaint is a speech act set or a speech event, which consists of a sequence of semantic formula, or discourse moves, including opening move, explanations, complaint act, and closing move (Hatch, 1992). The relationship of the status and the social distance of the interlocutors will also be examined.

The subjects of this study were 12 native speakers of English in the United States (AEs), 12 native Japanese speakers responding in Japanese (JJs), and 12 native speakers of Japanese responding in English (JEs). Subjects in this study were asked to answer a written discourse completion questionnaire, based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) discourse completion questionnaire. The discourse completion questionnaire included 12 items which contain complaint situations with varying social distance and social power. For each item, description of the situation was given, and the subjects were asked to write what they would say in the situation.

Each sentence in the discourse completion questionnaire was analyzed qualitatively according to the discourse moves within the speech act of complaint.

In chapter 2, previous research on speech acts is discussed, especially focused on the speech act studies which involve cross-cultural settings. In chapter 3, the research design is presented, along with the subjects' demographic information. The discussion of the discourse moves is presented in chapter 3. In chapter 4, the data collected are analyzed qualitatively, using the discourse move categories described in chapter 3. This is followed by chapter 5, which presents the conclusion of the study, answering each research question. Pedagogical implications of this study, the limitations, and suggestions for further research are presented also.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A considerable amount of research has been done on speech acts in the last four decades. Researchers realize the importance of empirical studies to build sound theories in the area of speech acts. In reviewing a selected body of available literature, a brief introduction of speech acts will be presented, followed by overviews of studies of various speech acts that focus on cross-cultural speech act realizations. The first two sections of this chapter discuss the basic concept of speech acts and politeness; the third section discusses the effect of native language transfer in pragmatics on the performance in second or foreign language setting; and the fourth and fifth sections provide the overview of the past cross-cultural research on speech acts of refusing, requesting, and complaining.

2.1. Speech Acts

Study of speech acts started in the 1960's, when Austin (1962) introduced the concept of "performatives." A performative "indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action" (p.6), unlike the previous concept of a statement as a description of state of affairs, or true or false fact. Both philosophers and linguists started to realize that there were kinds of statements which had particular functions other than just the description of facts. Searle (1975) refers to these functions as "indirect speech acts." In indirect speech acts, "the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic together with the general

powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer" (p.61). These indirect speech acts are the core of the study of speech acts.

Dimitracopoulou (1990) provides this definition of Austin's (1962) idea of three acts performed in an utterance:

> 1. Locutionary Act: the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference.
> 2. Illocutionary Act: the making of a statement, an offer, a promise etc. by virtue of the conventional force associated with the sentence.
> 3. Prelocutionary Act: the bringing-about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of the utterance. (pp.11,12)

A speech act refers to the illocutionary act described above, and is characterized by the speaker's intention to achieve a specific effect on the audience. Linguistic communication occurs within the context of a structured exchange between a speaker and a hearer, and meaning is regulated by social norms. To understand language, it is necessary to consider both of these factors together (Dimitracopoulou, 1990). Speech act theory attempts to look into a speaker's intentions and a hearer's assumption. Bach and Harnish (1979) assert that an act of linguistic communication is an expression of attitude by uttering something. The type of attitude expressed determines what kind of illocutionary act is being performed. If the hearer recognizes the attitude of the speaker as the speaker intends it, the act of communication is successful (p.xv).

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) define speech acts as a set of "patterned, routinized utterances that speakers use regularly to perform a variety of functions such as apologies, requests, complaints, refusals, compliments and others" (p.155). They are conventionalized utterances that have both illocutionary force and situational information. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) state that "a speech act set" is made up of

major semantic formulas, that is, a word, phrase or a sentence which functions as a strategy for the speech act, or the speech act itself (p.21).

2.2. Face

The notion of "face" is important when studying speech acts. Brown and Levinson (1987) assume that all competent speakers have "face," which they define as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p.61). This includes negative face, which is the freedom of action and imposition, and positive face, which contains the interactant's desire to be appreciated and approved. Interactants invest in "face" emotionally, and the face has to be maintained or enhanced, and needs constant attention during interaction. People in general cooperate in maintaining each other's face because if one threatens another's face, the other person can also threaten back. There are speech acts that inherently go against the interactors' face needs. Brown and Levinson include complaints as one such act, in which the speaker has a negative evaluation of the hearer's positive face (pp.61, 66). Brown and Levinson state that what constitutes face differs across cultures, but the use of strategies for face saving is a universal sociological principle. They claim that this desire to maintain face is what motivates the choice of linguistic forms (p.257).

Nelson claims that becoming competent in a language is "to become able to judge the situation properly and interact accordingly. In other words, there are rules of usage that one has to know to communicate adequately in a given language" (p.2). Lakoff (1973) gives the following three Rules of politeness:

1. Do not impose.
2. Give options.
3. Make A (addressee) feel good --- be friendly.

Lakoff claims that these are universal. Nelson (1984) studied the linguistic devices in Japanese used to communicate politeness, comparing them to Lakoff's rules of politeness. She claims that the use of unfinished sentences is very common in Japanese as an expression of politeness, because unfinished sentences make an utterance sound softer, making it more polite. This is in accordance with Lakoff's (1973) rules of politeness, avoiding imposition on the hearer by presenting the speaker's intention implicitly, and also leaving the option of interpretation on the hearer's part.

Nelson also claims that question forms are used as polite requests both in English and Japanese. Negative question form, such as "morae masen ka" ("couldn't I have it?") is commonly used in Japanese requests; it is considered more polite than positive question form because it implies small expectation of the speaker so the hearer does not feel too much burden of saying "no."

Nelson states that Lakoff's "making the addressee feel good" principle is working when Japanese prefer to use verbs of giving and receiving (kure/morae) to make an utterance more polite. These verbs make an utterance more polite because the speaker shows appreciation and acknowledgement of the favor given by the hearer and makes the hearer feel good. As in English, an intransitive verb is used to make an utterance more polite because the speaker can show humbleness.

2.3. Native Language Transfer

Although the notion that language transfer causes errors in second language learners' production has been minimized by some researchers (e.g. Dulay & Burt, 1974), there are many researchers who argue that transfer does exist at a pragmatic level (see, for example, Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Takahashi, 1996). There has been a

considerable amount of research in recent years focusing on speech acts and pragmatic transfer (see, for example, Beebe, Takahashi,& Uliss-Weltz, 1990; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993; Teufel, 1996).

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) state that the concept of the speech act may be universal to all cultures, but which strategies are preferred is culture-specific. The authors state that "when learning a new language, speakers are likely to transfer such sociocultural rules from their first language to the second language and often bring about unwarranted stereotyping" (p.158).

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) carried out a study to examine pragmatic transfer in refusals of Japanese English as a second language (ESL) learners. In their study, they compared 20 native speakers of Japanese (JJs), and 20 Japanese learners of English (JEs), and 20 native speakers of English (AEs). The researchers used the Discourse Completion Test (DCT), a questionnaire of written role-plays, which consists of 12 situations. These situations included refusals to requests, invitations, offers and suggestions, and had varying speaker-hearer status (high, low and equal). From the results of the examination of the data, the researchers concluded that there is negative transfer in the refusals made by JEs in the following three aspects: the order, frequency, and content of the semantic formula (for example, a statement of excuse, reason, and so on). That is, there were many situations in which JEs' responses were similar to JJs' responses and dissimilar to AE's responses.

Takahashi and Beebe (1993) did a similar study on transfer on the discourse level, focusing on the performance of the speech act of correction by Americans and Japanese, especially among people of unequal status. In this study, they focused on the use of positive remarks, softeners, and other strategies to reduce the threat of the speech act. Their subjects included 15 AEs, 15 JEs, and 25 JJs. The subjects were

given DCTs, which contained 12 items, 6 different types of speech acts of correction situations: correction of information, disagreement, chastisement, announcing embarrassing information, praise and persuasion. Each of these speech acts had two situations; in one, the speaker had the higher status, and in the other situation, the hearer had the higher status. The researchers found that the subjects shifted styles according to different factors such as status of the interlocutors and the content of the situation. The JEs shifted styles similarly to JJs. The researchers found that AEs used positive remarks as a politeness strategy more often than did the JJs. JEs used it more than JJs but less than AEs. Use of softeners as a politeness strategy also showed correlation among linguistic groups. When a speaker had the higher status, softeners were used by the AEs the most, JEs next, and JJs the least. When the speaker had lower status than the hearer did, this pattern was reversed. This study showed that transfer occurs not only in discourse patterns but also in style shift among speakers and hearers of different status.

Another study that looked at native language transfer and speech act production of second language learners is Teufel's (1996) study on refusal speech acts of German speakers of English compared with native speakers of English and of German. She used the DCT designed by Beebe et.al (1990). In the DCT, the participants were asked to complete a dialogue, which required them to make a refusal. From this study, she found that the German learners of English tended to be over-polite in one situation, but tended to use a high degree of directness, even risking the face of the hearer in situations where a refusal was justified in the speaker's mind. This seems to be transferred from the native German norm for the same kind of situation. Teufel states that since German and English have similarities in other areas, this difference might seem especially startling.

Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1987) studied the interlanguage performance of English and Hebrew learners in making requests. Blum-Kulka and Levenston used written questionnaires to elicit responses, and collected data from 174 native Hebrew speakers, 244 nonnative Hebrew speakers, 28 native English speakers, and 21 nonnative English speakers. The results of the study show that Hebrew native speakers and nonnative speakers differed in perspective (e.g."Could I?""Could you?") and modifications of requests, and English native speakers and nonnative speakers differed in their use of downtoners (e.g."a little"), and some blunt expressions (e.g."I want..."). The researchers concluded that these differences were due to overgeneralization and lexical simplification, and for the Hebrew learners, the differences resulted in unexpected pragmatic effects, such as "whining, excessive formality, inappropriate attention-getting" (p.168).

Niki and Tajika (1994) investigated the differences between Japanese and English in a situation in which "the speech acts of asking for permission" and "requesting" merge. They focused on verbs "borrow" and "lend." The subjects were 26 native English speakers and 64 native Japanese speakers learning English. The researchers used a discourse completion questionnaire, using social distance between the speaker and the hearer and the degree of imposition on the hearer as the variables. The data showed that the native English speakers preferred "asking for permission" (i.e. "Can I borrow...?"), whereas Japanese students used both "permission" and "requesting" (i.e. "Could you lend me...?") strategies, and they used "requesting" more than "permission" strategy. Native speakers changed their expression according to different social distance and imposition, but did not change their strategy throughout. However, Japanese students varied their expression and the strategies. They tended to switch from "permission" strategy to "requesting" strategy as the social distance and

imposition on the hearer became greater. Niki and Tajika explain this difference as the result of different interaction norms in Japanese and American society; native English speakers found it is more appropriate to use "permission" strategy because it implies that the hearer has the power to decide, making the request less imposing. The researchers state that since "mutual dependency is the appropriate social manner in the Japanese society, the strategy is to emphasize the fact that the speaker is indebted to the addressee. Naming the addressee as actor (benefactor), therefore, is a mitigating device" (p.121).

Takezawa (1995) did a study of the speech act of request made by native Japanese speakers and the learners of Japanese at a West Coast Canadian University. In her study, she used oral role-play and retrospective interviews as the method of data collection. She had four native Japanese and four Canadian learners of Japanese role play a situation in which the subjects had to borrow a book to write an assignment from an instructor they have never met before, because their teacher had lent the book to the instructor. Takezawa studied the data in terms of the ways subjects justified their requests, by comparing the kinds of strategies used and the amount of information given by the Japanese subjects and the Canadian subjects. The study found qualitative differences between Japanese and Canadian subjects in making requests. For example, Canadian subjects tended to introduce their requests before actually making the request, and Canadian subjects tended to give more information to justify their requests than did Japanese subjects, who tended to give only partial information. In making actual requests, Japanese subjects used request sentences embedded in a grounding sentence so that it is not a yes or no question. On the other hand, Canadian subjects tended to use a more direct request. Takezawa argues that an indirect request may minimize the imposition of their requests. It was apparent from

the role-play and the retrospective interview that there was an overall tendency for the Japanese subjects to wait until the instructor in the role-play made a decision, and Canadian subjects tended to negotiate with the instructor immediately. Japanese subjects might have thought that the instructor had the priority because she was older and had higher status, so they should not persist in making a request. Takezawa argues that these kinds of social relations may have more effect on Japanese subjects than on Canadian subjects, who do not have many linguistic differences in the their language according to the hierarchical differences.

LoCastro (1986) did a contrastive analysis of how Japanese and Americans agree and disagree. She was questioning the assumptions that speech acts are universal, which is a claim made by Fraser (1978). LoCastro taped informal interviews about food items to elicit agreement or disagreement in native Japanese speakers and native American English speakers. She used two different kinds of sentences to elicit responses for the same food item: one showed that the attitude of the interviewer toward the food item (avocado) was positive, and the other was negative. Japanese subjects seemed to hesitate (i.e. took long pauses) when they were disagreeing more often than American subjects did. Also, American speakers' disagreement was longer than their agreement, but Japanese speakers' disagreement was very short. LoCastro mentions the tendency in Japanese interaction to try to avoid the topic and not pursue it if it is leading to disagreement. She adds also that Americans are accustomed to stating their opinions unless the topic is a sensitive one such as politics or religion, but Japanese might still be hesitant because of the possibility of offending the other speaker, even when they are talking about food. LoCastro concludes that the differences between American English speakers and Japanese speakers in agreeing and disagreeing are not significant.

Existence of pragmatic transfer is widely accepted, but the relationship of transfer and the second language learners' proficiency in the target language has been controversial. Takahashi and Beebe (1987, cited in Takahashi, 1996) suggest that low-proficiency learners are less likely to transfer first language (L1) pragmatic knowledge because of their limited proficiency in the second language (L2). However, other studies show a contrary result. Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper and Ross's study (1996, cited in Takahashi) of apology strategies by Japanese ESL learners shows that low-level learners are more likely to transfer the L1 strategies than are high-level learners.

Takahashi studied the relationship between transferability and native Japanese learners' English proficiency. She used 142 Japanese college students of high- and low-proficiency in English. The subjects were asked to rate the equivalence of Japanese request strategy and English request strategy. The results showed that the subjects could not choose the functional equivalent English strategy but relied on their first language request strategy. Surprisingly, this study did not show any correlation between transfer and proficiency level of the learners. Takahashi suggests that the amount of exposure and the familiarity with the target language might affect transfer of first language knowledge more than does linguistic proficiency of the learners.

2.4. Speech Act of Complaints

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) mention two different kinds of complaints. In one, the speaker directly addresses the person who is responsible for the action that caused the speaker's annoyance, and in the other, the person addresses a third party, a person who is not responsible for the annoyance of the speaker. The latter is also called "gripe," "whinge" (a term used in Clyne's study in 1994) or "indirect complaint," and is described in more detail in Clyne (1994) and Boxer (1993). Because the focus of my

study is the direct complaint, past studies related to direct complaints will be discussed in more depth here.

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) describe the speech act of direct complaint as a hearer face-threatening act. The authors explain that there are two goals for the speech act of complaints. One is to let the accused know of the action that has caused annoyance of the speaker in order to relieve frustration and anger. The other is to request some repair for the action. Olshtain and Cohen list three types of strategies used in complaining: one is a "mild complaint," in which the speaker indirectly refers to the violation from the speaker's point of view; the second is "an explicit complaint," which includes the explicit statement of the responsibility of the hearer; and the third strategy includes threat or warning.

In Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) words, the speech act of complaints is an act in which "the speaker (S) expresses displeasure or annoyance--censure--as a reaction to a past or ongoing action, the consequences of which are perceived by S as affecting her unfavorably. This complaint is usually addressed to the hearer (H) whom the S holds, at least partially, responsible for the offensive action" (p.108). According to Olshtain and Cohen (1991), complaining takes place when S feels that the following conditions are fulfilled.

1. H performs a socially unacceptable act (SUA) that is contrary to a social code of behavioral norms shared by S and H.
2. S perceives the SUA as having unfavorable consequences for herself, and / or for the general public
3. The verbal expression of S relates post facto directly or indirectly to the SUA, thus having the illocutionary force of censure.
4. S perceives the SUA as: (a) freeing S (at least partially) from the implicit understanding of a social cooperative relationship with H; S therefore chooses to express her frustration or annoyance, although the result will be a "conflictive" type of illocution in Leech's terms (Leech, 1983, 104); and (b) giving S the legitimate right to ask for repair in order to undo the SUA, either

> for her benefit or for the public benefit. It is the latter perception that leads to instrumental complaints aimed at "changing things" that do not meet with our standards or expectations. The main goal of such instrumental complaints is to ensure that H performs some action of repair as a result of the complaint. (p.108)

Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study on complaints pattern of Hebrew speakers and English speakers focused on length of utterances used in complaints. A previous study by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) showed that nonnative speakers (NNSs) tend to produce longer utterances to negotiate situations than do native speakers (NSs), and that NSs tend to use more severe utterances than do NNSs. For this study, they administered a written DCT to 35 native speakers of Hebrew and 35 learners of Hebrew. The results showed that there were considerable differences in the length of the utterances, number of moves and the severity of the utterances between NSs and NNSs. Confirming the previous study, NNSs produced longer utterances and more moves to negotiate their intentions than did NSs. Also, NSs used more severe strategies than did NNSs, and NNSs used more softeners. The researchers explain this as the attempt of the NNSs, newcomers to the target culture, to pose less face-threat. Contrary to what was expected, however, the learners used more intensifiers than did the NSs. Olshtain and Weinbach explain this as the result of the NNSs' efforts to clearly convey the message, in which intensifiers were used as clarification rather than as intensification.

Olshtain and Weinbach also examined the relationship of social status, social distance and social obligation between the interlocutors. The results showed that for both NSs and NNSs, social distance was a significant element in determining the length and severity of complaints. However, there were no significant differences between the two groups. Both NSs and NNSs tended to use longer utterances with a slight acquaintance, whose relationship with the speaker was not as clear as the

relationship with friends, relatives, or even total strangers. With friends, relatives or total strangers, they used less negotiation. Social status was also a significant factor to both NSs and NNSs. However, the researchers found that NNSs used the longest utterances to negotiate when speaking to lower status hearers, negotiating the most. In terms of social obligation, both NSs and NNSs used longer utterances to negotiate when there was no explicit social obligation. When social obligation was explicit, they made their point directly, and extensive negotiation was not necessary. There was a significant difference between NSs and NNSs when the social obligation was implicit; in this situation, NNSs made much longer utterances with greater variability than did NSs.

Olshtain and Weinbach cite Hauser and Swindler's 1983 unpublished seminar paper at Tel Aviv University. The focus of this complaint speech-act study was culturally specific parameters set by the context knowledge. The subjects of this study were 20 Russian and 20 Moroccan immigrants in Israel, who responded to a written questionnaire. The two groups responded similarly in most situations, but there were two situations in which the two groups reacted differently. One situation, being unfair in public space (e.g. cutting in front of another car) was a more serious offense to Russians than to Moroccans; and another situation, not helping a friend financially, was considered a great offense by Moroccans but not so by Russians, thus explaining the different ways the subjects responded to these situations.

Olshtain and Weinbach cite a study done by Hoch-Pasko in 1988, also an unpublished seminar paper at Tel Aviv University. In this study, the researcher found that new immigrants from Romania and the Romanian immigrants who had been in the country for a long time had different ways of perceiving contextual features. The new immigrants tended to opt out from complaining when the offense was toward the

public, but tended to make more severe complaints when the offense affected the individual.

Park (1997) did a rhetorical analysis of complaint letters written by Korean and American business people. Her study showed that there were differences in rhetorical organization and style between these two cultural groups in the level of writing discourse. The results of the analysis showed that the American business letters were more direct than the Korean business letters, and ordering of the content was different. As for the rhetorical strategies of complaint acts in these letters, the strategies to lessen the imposition of the complaint used in American business letters made the statement softer; however, the strategies used in Korean letters made the statement vague. Also, the writing style of the American business complaint letters was consistently implicit except for the request for action, which made the letter formal and clear. On the other hand, the writing style of Korean business complaint letters varied from vague to explicit, which made the letter less formal and ambiguous in the point of complaint. Park explains these differences as the result of English language education the Korean business people have received and the norms of Korean writing.

Although there are many studies done on speech acts of requests and apologies, there are fewer studies devoted to the speech act of complaints. The major research on complaints is Olshtain and Weinbach's 1993 study, with Hebrew as target language. I have not encountered any previous studies which focus on Japanese speakers' production of the speech act of complaints.

2.5. Implications

Now that more empirical data are accumulating, it is important to know how these findings can be applied to teaching a second or foreign language. Olshtain and Cohen

(1990) looked at the effect of instruction on speech act behavior. They administered pre- and post-questionnaires to 18 native Hebrew speakers learning English, who were given explicit instruction on the speech act set of apology. The questionnaires included 11 DCTs and 7 multiple-choice items. Three lessons were given to the students, including presentation of model dialogues, discussion on the difference, description of the difference and the various strategies, practicing in role-plays, and feed-back discussion. Although the subjects in this study had advanced levels of English proficiency, the pre-teaching questionnaire showed that the learners had not reached a proficient pragmatic level. The results of the post-teaching questionnaire showed that the three lessons had effect on some points, and qualitative improvement was seen. Olshtain and Cohen suggest that the fine points such as types of intensification and downgrading, and strategy realization should be taught. The researchers warn, however, that the total attainment of native -like proficiency in pragmatics may be difficult; it is the residual awareness of the instruction that may enable the learners to be less likely to commit pragmatic failure.

2.6. Conclusions

The above review of literature shows that in some studies, the second language learners have shown to produce speech acts differently from the native speakers of the target language. Some studies have shown, also, that these deviations may have negative impression on the native speakers of the target language, and vice versa. The study by Olshtain and Cohen (1990) shows an encouraging result for language educators in teaching pragmatic aspects of language.

As the above review of literature shows, there still is a need for further research in the field of speech acts. There have only been a few previous studies done related to

the speech acts of complaining. This paper will examine the speech act of complaining with relation to Japanese learners of English as a second language.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this research. This research compares the speech act realization of American college students, Japanese English as a second language (ESL) students at the university level in the United States, and Japanese college students in Japan. The data were collected between the fall of 1997 and the spring of 1998, in Portland, OR, and Tokyo and Yokohama, Japan.

3.1. Data

The data were collected using a discourse completion questionnaire, based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study of speech acts of complaints. The discourse completion questionnaire requires the subjects to read nine written situations, and respond to the situation by writing the actual words that the subjects would say if they should encounter such a situation in real life. The situations are written so that they are likely to include complaints in the response of the subjects.

The basic format of the questionnaires was based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study; however, their published study contained only a few sample situations and the researcher was not able to contact them for the complete set of situations, so the researcher decided to compose a questionnaire that suits the subject groups of this study. Only one situation (situation #5 of this study) from the sample situation of Olshtain and Weinbach's study was used for this study. The researcher first asked American and Japanese university students to list actual complaint situations they have

encountered or witnessed, and from these lists compiled a questionnaire consisting of nine questions which included situations dealing with interlocutors of varying social status and distance. The researcher chose to include nine situations in the questionnaire to encompass all the combinations of varying social status (high, equal, and low) and social distance (distant, moderate, and close). The researcher chose the situations which contained the needed combination of social status and distance, and the situations which the subjects are likely to encounter in their daily life (See Appendix A).

Each question describes the situation including the relationship between the subject and another interlocutor in the situation. Each question has the social status and distance listed in Table I:

Table I

Social Distance and Power between S and H for Each Situation

	Social Distance	Social Power (S–H)
Situation 1	–	S = H
Situation 2	–	S > H
Situation 3	/	S > H
Situation 4	/	S < H
Situation 5	+	S = H
Situation 6	+	S > H
Situation 7	–	S < H
Situation 8	+	S < H
Situation 9	/	S = H

For each question, the respondents were asked to write what they would say or do in response to the situation described. The questionnaire does not contain the word "complaint," so that it would not influence the responses of the subjects. Also, the subjects were explicitly given the freedom not to make a complaint.

The situations in the questionnaire include three different types of relative social status between the interlocutors: (1) speaker (S) has higher status than the hearer (H) (2) S and H are equal in their social status (3) S has lower status than the H. The situations also have varying social distances, including (1) close relationship such as family, and close friends ("–" in the table above) (2) acquaintances ("/") and (3) total strangers ("+").

These situations were designed to elicit complaints, but speech acts other than complaint could be used in each situation as well, since complaint is a speech event which consists of various speech acts, such as greetings and requests.

There are two versions of the same discourse completion questionnaire. One was written in English to be used by American subjects and Japanese subjects in American colleges, and the other was in Japanese to be used by Japanese subjects in Japan. The researcher translated the English version to the Japanese version, and two teaching assistants in the Japanese Department at Portland State University checked the accuracy of the questionnaire (See Appendix B). The hearers in the English version were given English names, so that the subjects can assume that they were facing an American person. In the Japanese version the names of the interlocutors were changed from English names to Japanese names so that the situation would be more natural. The researcher made sure that all the situations in the questionnaire were plausible in the U.S. and in Japan, except for the fact that the Japanese subjects responding in English would not be likely to talk to their family members in English. The researcher

decided not to exclude these situations, since all other situations were hypothetical, and also to compare responses with varying social distance and power. After getting several people's confirmation that the situations sounded plausible, the researcher believed they were sufficiently plausible for the subjects to imagine what they would say even though they might not have had actual experience in any of the situations.

All of the discourse completion questionnaires included questions about subjects' gender and age, and the Japanese subjects responding in English were also asked to fill out questions about their length of stay in the U.S. and the length of studying English. The names of the subjects were not recorded on the actual questionnaire to maintain confidentiality. All the subjects were asked to sign a consent form so that the data taken from the questionnaires could be used in this study.

For the purpose of this paper, American refers to the people of the United States who are native English speakers.

3.2. Data Collection

A total of 45 students participated in this study. The researcher asked friends and acquaintances who were American and Japanese students to fill out the questionnaire. The researcher collected more than thirty-six questionnaires to allow for ones that might not be complete, and chose only the ones with all the information given, and then picked out randomly from the rest of the population to make up six for each category and gender.

There were three categories of subjects: twelve American subjects responding in English (AE), twelve Japanese subjects responding in English (JE), and twelve Japanese subjects responding in Japanese (JJ). Each category consists of an equal number of male and female to minimize male/female differences among the different

groups. All of the AEs and JEs were enrolled in public universities in the northwestern U.S. All of the JJs were students at a private university in Tokyo. AEs and JEs were friends and acquaintances of the researcher, or participating in courses offered by the Japanese department at the university. JJs were friends and acquaintances of a friend of the researcher, who attends a university in Tokyo and volunteered to collect the data for the researcher. Since all the JEs were attending university level classes, the researcher assumed that they have advanced level of English proficiency, since that is required for university admission.

Although all of the subjects are college students, there are age differences. For this study, I only required my subjects to be university students and set no limit on the age, so some groups have visible differences in average age. The average age for each group is listed in Table II.

Table II

Average Age of Subjects in Each Subject Group

	AE	JE	JJ
Female	34.8	26.5	22.5
Male	30.2	33.7	20.7
Female and Male	32.5	30.1	21.6

The JEs were also asked the length of their study of English language and the length of their stay in the United States. JE's average length of study of English and length of stay in the U.S. are shown in Table III below.

Table III

Average Length of Studying English and Stay in US in Years

	Length of studying English	Length of stay in US
JE (Female)	13.3	2.5
JE (Male)	11.8	6.25
JE (Total)	12.6	4.4

Each subject was handed a questionnaire and two copies of consent forms, and asked to fill it out at home so that each subject could spend as much time as needed. In the pilot study, the questionnaire took about 20 to 30 minutes to complete. After the completion of the questionnaire, the questionnaire was returned to the researcher, along with the consent form each of the subjects had signed. The subjects were told that they were participating in a linguistic study, but they were not told that the purpose of the study was to examine cross-cultural comparison of complaints.

The responses returned by the JJs were translated into English by the researcher, and then a fellow student who is also a native speaker of Japanese studying in the United States double-checked the accuracy of the translation.

3.3. Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the data qualitatively, situation by situation. Although the basic format of the discourse completion questionnaire was based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study on the speech act of complaint, the researcher decided to use a different method for the data analysis for this study. The researcher preferred to use a descriptive analysis rather than quantitative analysis, because each situation is so

different that it would not be possible to generalize enough to compare quantitatively between different situations in the questionnaire.

The sentences used in the responses were categorized and compared among different subject groups. First, the researcher checked to see if the subjects made any complaint or opted out completely. The questionnaire instructions stated that they might opt out from making any comment, but asked respondents to provide alternate action by the subjects for the researcher to understand why they had opted out. It is also possible that the subjects responded verbally to the situation but without any intention of complaining, in which case it was not considered the speech act of complaint.

When analyzing, the researcher examined only the functional aspect of sentences making up the speech act, rather than the formal (linguistic) aspect of the sentences since inclusion of formal aspects was beyond the scope of this study.

A speech act of complaint is a complex speech event, which could consist of many moves. Hatch (1992) lists the following components included in the speech event of complaint: opening, identification of the complainer, an explanation for the complaint, the complaint act, a justification of the addressee's action, an apology, a negotiated remedy, and a closing (p.144). The researcher modified the list slightly after conducting a pilot study. Each sentence in the responses was categorized as one of the moves described below. A complaint may contain the following optional elements:

1. Opening move
2. Introduction move
3. Explanation move
4. Complaints
5. Directives

6. Closing move

Of the above moves, the speaker can choose which moves to use as the complaint strategy depending on the level of frustration the speaker is feeling, social distance and status differences. The act could even be without an overt complaint statement, but to be considered a complaint, a response must contain at least one statement of either explanation, complaint or directive move (For the sample data and analysis using discourse moves, see Appendix C). The above terms used in this study are defined below.

1. Opening move

Opening move contains term of address, for example, "John," or an attention getter, such as "Excuse me" (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1987). This is used to first get the attention of the hearer (H).

2. Introduction

This is an element which a speaker may use to start a conversation. It may or may not be related to the offense which the speaker is going to complain about, for example, "I'm glad to have you here helping, but..." "I was just wondering how you liked the CD?" and "Listen to this!"

3. Explanation move

The speaker explains the situation to the hearer, or explains why the speaker is going to make a complaint to the hearer. It may be a description of the damage which the speaker is suffering because of the socially unacceptable act (SUA) which the hearer has committed. The examples may be "There was a big scratch on my CD." or "we're not getting things filed fast enough." It may also be the reason why the speaker is making complaints; for example, "I have to get up early tomorrow morning" would be used as a reason for complaining about the noise late at night.

4. Complaints

When the speaker receives a SUA, the speaker may decide "to express her frustration or annoyance," and by doing so, it will give the speaker "the legitimate right to ask for repair in order to undo the SUA, either for her benefit or for the public benefit" (Olshtain and Weinbach, 1993).

The researcher considers the subjects' responses containing explicit complaint statement, accusation, warning, or threat to be direct complaint, and the responses which do not contain those, but mentioning the offense to the hearer as indirect complaint. Some complaints may be included in other moves, such as in an explanation move or in a directive, but the researcher considered only the statement which had an overt accusatory tone toward the hearer to be the complaint statement. Some examples include statements such as "I really hate it when you tell that story."

5. Directives

The speaker might want the hearer to correct something after the hearer has committed the SUA. The speaker might use the speech act of request to ask for the repair for the offense. The following sentences are examples: "could you finish it quicker?" "Could you please lower your music?"

6. Closing move

This might not appear frequently in this particular study because of the format of the discourse completion questionnaire. Since the speaker is opening a conversation in the situations, and the speaker is anticipating some comment back from the hearer, the responses for the situations are not likely to be the end of discourse. The respondents might leave this out completely. If the closing move is present, it might be something like "Thanks" or "I appreciate it."

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis of the complaint patterns of Japanese English as a second language (ESL) students compared with the native speakers of American English. The data from native speakers of Japanese were also collected to compare with that of the Japanese ESL students to see if some of the features seen in the Japanese ESL students' responses resulted from pragmatic transfer. Since each situation has different characteristics and it is not possible for the researcher to generalize enough to run a statistical analysis, the situations are analyzed qualitatively. The results will be presented situation by situation. For each situation, discourse moves will be presented in the following order:

1. Opening move
2. Introduction move
3. Explanation move
4. Complaints
5. Directives
6. Closing move

The presentation of discourse moves will be followed by a summary of each situation.

Complaint speech acts are a complex speech event. The complaint speech acts do not necessarily contain an overt complaint statement, which directly expresses the speaker's annoyance to the hearer. If the speaker's statement contains the complaint statement, the researcher considered the statement to be a direct complaint; otherwise,

the researcher considered the statement to be an indirect complaint. In analyzing the data, the researcher looked at the verbal responses of the subjects. There were no data about intonation, body language or other factors that may convey intention of the speaker. In the following analysis, all the responses of Japanese speakers responding in Japanese (JJs) were translated from Japanese into English.

4.1. Situation #1

The first question on the questionnaire deals with a friend to friend, equal relationship between the speaker (S) and the hearer (H). The situation written on the questionnaire is as following: A friend of yours, Anne (Akiko), borrowed your favorite CD. When she returned it, it had a big scratch, and you could not even listen to it. The scratch was not there before, but when she returned it, she did not say anything to you.

In this situation, there are two socially unacceptable acts (SUA) which S might want to complain to H about. They are:

1. H returned S's CD with a scratch on it
2. H did not mention anything about 1 to S

The responses of the subjects may thus include a complaint statement for either or both of the above acts, and repair for the act.

Only one subject opted out from making any direct comments to H. The 24 year-old female JE wrote, instead, that she would not do anything and just give up on the CD.

4.1.1. Opening Move

There was a recognizable difference in the way different subject groups opened their statement. Ten American subjects responding in English (AEs) opened their

statements with either "Hey Anne," or "Anne," and two AEs did not use H's name to open their statement. However, only four Japanese subjects responding in English (JEs) used H's name, and seven used no name. None of the JJs' responses started with H's name, even though two of them used attention getters such as "hey" or "well..."

4.1.2. Introduction Move

Table IV

Introduction moves used for situation #1

	AE	JE	JJ
"I'm not accusing you" "I don't want to offend you"	1	1	0
"I hate to tell you"	0	1	0
"could you listen to this?"	0	1	0
"Listen to this"	0	1	0
"About the CD you borrowed..."	0	1	2
Total	1	5	2

As shown in Table IV, a total 8 out of 35 subjects who made any comments for this situation included introduction moves. One AE, 4 JEs, and 2 JJs used introduction moves of some kind. Two JEs and 2 JJs used an introduction to simply name the topic in phrases such as "About the CD I lent you" (JJ 8). One AE and 2 JEs started their discourse with an introduction which served as a softener, such as "I'm not accusing you, but..." (AE 7), "I don't want to offend you" (JE 1) and "I hate to tell you, but..."(JE 10). A softener has an effect which mitigates the imposition. In the above cases, those softeners introduced either a reason statement or a clarification question

described below. On the other hand, there was one JE who used an intensifier as an introduction. He used a sentence, "Listen to this," which intensifies the request or complaint.

4.1.3. Explanation Move

As seen in Table V below, 9 AEs, 7 JEs, and 12 JJs used an explanation move. An explanation move lessens the imposition of the complaint or directive because it gives H reasons why S is complaining; thus making it more legitimate and logical. The explanation move used by most AEs and JJs was the fact that the subjects found a scratch on the CD they had loaned to H. More JEs used the fact that they could not listen to the CD as the explanation than the fact that they found the scratch. AEs and JJs also used the fact that they could not listen to the CD as explanation.

Table V

Explanation Moves used for situation #1

	AE	JE	JJ
"I found a scratch in the CD I loaned to you"	8	3	10
"I can't listen to it any more"	3	4	5
"When I lent it to you, it didn't have any scratch"	0	1	1
Other	0	0	1
Total number of subjects using explanation move	9	7	12

Most examples of the explanation move were very similar to each other with few individual or group differences. It is interesting to note that all of the JJs used the explanation move. Three of the JJs used only the explanation move and no other

moves. This was not seen in any other subject groups. Also, the number of explanation moves used by individual subjects was greater for JJ subjects. The average number of explanation moves used by AE subjects was 1.2, JE subjects 1.1, and JJ subjects 1.4. It is common in Japanese to explain the situation to H and let the H assume the rest of what S wants to ask, and it is expected of H to understand what S wants. This suggests that the explanation move has great importance to JJ subjects. It is interesting, however, that fewer JEs used explanation moves than either AEs or JJs. Without an explanation move, the complaints or directives sound more direct and more threatening. The JEs in this case may have decided that they did not need to be indirect since H is a close friend.

4.1.4. Complaints

Only 2 AEs, 2 JE, and 2 JJs used complaint moves. The complaint moves used by those subjects were individual, and none of them were similar to each other. Two subjects (AE 12, JE 3) accused H of ruining the CD ("it was ruined" AE 12, and "What the hell you've done with my CD!" JE 3). JE 11 and JJ 8 expressed how they felt about the damage. AE 4 and JJ 3 accused H of not mentioning the offense; however, AE 4 used an indirect sentence ("I know that you would've mentioned the scratch if you'd known about it"), but JJ 3 used a more direct accusation ("There's no way you don't know!").

4.1.5. Directives

Three different kinds of directives were used in this situation. One was to ask what happened to the damaged CD, another was to ask for the future care for the CD, and the other was to ask for replacement for the damaged CD. Although asking what

happened does not seem to fit the usual directive definition, the researcher decided to categorize this as a kind of directives, since S seems to request the fact to be told.

The clarification question asking H what happened to the CD was used by a large number of subjects, as seen in Table VI below. Six AEs, 5 JEs, and 2 JJs used this kind of question. In this situation, because S has not seen H do the SUA, many of the subjects thought that it was necessary to first confirm H's responsibility in questions such as "Do you know anything about that?" (AE 8). Although the questions were simply asking what happened, the real intention of the subjects seemed to be to get some kind of responses out of H, such as an apology or an explanation.

There were also some subjects who asked H if she had noticed a scratch on the CD when S had lent it to her. Three AEs, 1 JE, and 1 JJ used this type of question. There was an even more indirect question, "Did it play OK?" (AE 9, JE 11, JJ 9), and "Is your CD player broken or something?" (AE 2). These questions also ask for some kind of responses from H but more indirectly than the above type of question.
Some of these clarification type statements were more accusatory than the kind of questions talked about above. For example, "I guess you put this scratch, right?" (JE 5) sounds more accusatory than asking, "Did you notice a scratch on the CD I lent you?" (AE 6).

Not many subjects actually asked for replacement for the damaged CD. Two JEs and 2 JJs asked for replacement. This was not done by any AEs, so it is possible that H is more likely to be expected to take responsibility among Japanese native speakers than among English native speakers living in Northwest United States.

Table VI

Directives used for situation #1

	AE	JE	JJ
"Do you know what happened?"	6	5	2
"Did you notice a scratch on the CD I lent you?"	3	1	1
"Did it work OK?"	1	1	1
"Did you do this?"	1	3	3
"Is your CD player broken?"	1	0	0
"How did you like the CD?"	1	0	0
"Why didn't you say anything?" "I wanted you to tell me"	1	0	1
"Please be careful with this CD"	1	0	0
"Please pay for the CD"	0	2	2
Total number of subjects using directives	12	10	9

Only 2 subjects mentioned anything overtly about H's not saying anything about the scratch, in phrases such as "Why didn't you say anything?" (AE 5) and "Don't do this to me. I wanted you to tell me honestly" (JJ 3). Other subjects used the clarification questions described above to take care of the immediate problem first. They might have asked the same question as the AE 5 after they received the response about the first point; however, it was not possible to elicit the second point from this format of data collection.

One subject (AE 12) explicitly asked H to be careful with the CD. This type of request for repair concerning future action was not used by any other subjects.

One AE subject said she would ask how the H liked the CD, instead of letting her know that she knows about the scratch.

4.1.6. Closing Move

Only one JJ used a closing move to soften what she had told H in the following sentence: "It's OK if you didn't do anything" (JJ 11). Since many of the responses ended with the clarification questions, it was not appropriate to use any closing moves for this situation for many of the subjects. None of the AEs or JEs used any closing moves.

4.1.7. Summary for Situation #1

The subjects used two main strategies to complain about the scratch on the CD to the offender, H. One was the "fact statement," and the other was the "clarification." In the "fact statement," S tells H about the offense, such as how he/she found a scratch on the CD, and/or how it is impossible to listen to the CD anymore. The fact statement in situation #1 in most cases served as an explanation for why S was making the comment. Many of the fact statements were similar, as seen in the following examples: "I tried listening to it last night but the scratch was so bad I couldn't." (AE 1); "That CD you returned had a big scratch in it" (AE 8); "It's got a huge scratch on it and I can't even listen to it any more." (AE 10); "I noticed that my CD is scratched" (AE 11).

Some of the JJ subjects used explanation moves only without any other moves. The fact statements simply describe the situation in a neutral tone, so by avoiding using other possibly face-threatening moves such as requests and complaints, S

displays the intention to be polite toward H. On the other hand, some complaints made by JJs and JEs seemed harsher than the AEs' complaint.

4.2. Situation #2

The situation in item #2 is as follows: Your younger sister, Beth (Takako), does not do any housework, even though you are very busy and doing all the house chores. She is obviously not doing anything right now, but she does not help you.

In this situation, there are two SUAs which the respondents might want to complain about. One is about the sister not helping the speaker right now, and the other is that she does not help with house chores usually. In this situation, however, just because S does not mention the repeated offense does not mean that S does not consider it. S might have chosen different wording if this was the first time the offense occurred.

Since the hearer is a younger sister of the speaker, the social distance is very small. The power differences are not big, but the speaker may be considered to have a slightly higher status because the speaker is older.

For situation #2, one JE and one JJ opted out completely from making any complaints. The JE who opted out commented that he would stop doing any housework. The JJ who opted out commented that she was helping with housework on her own will, and it had nothing to do with her sister, so she would not say anything to her sister.

4.2.1. Opening Move

Table VII shows opening moves used for this situation. As with the opening move in situation #1, many AEs used H's first name to get H's attention. Three JEs used H's name to get H's attention, 1 JE used attention getters without H's name. Two JJs

used attention getters without H's name. None of the JJs used H's name. As stated in 4.1.1, the low number of JE subjects using H's name seems to be the result of native language transfer, and some of the JE subjects have learned AE's tendency to use H's name in the opening move.

Table VII

Opening moves used for situation #2

	AE	JE	JJ
"(Hey) Beth"	8	3	0
"Listen" "Well" etc.	1	1	2
"Excuse me"	1	0	0
Total number of subjects using opening move	10	4	2

4.2.2. Introduction Move

Four JEs included an introduction move in their responses. Three of these introductions were questions asking if H was busy at the moment: "What are you doing?" (JE 6), "Are you doing something now?" (JE 8), and "Are you busy?" (JE 12). One of the introductions was calling attention to the messiness of the house: "don't you think it's messy around here?" (JE 10). Only one AE included an introduction move. AE 2 used a joking comment to H: "Is your leg broken?" None of the JJs included introduction moves in their responses. Many of the AE subjects used opening moves described above in the beginning of the response, and JEs used opening moves and introduction moves. None of the JJs used introduction moves. Only 2 JJs used either opening moves or introduction moves, starting instead with an explanation move or directives. This seems to make the discourse more abrupt than

the responses with either opening moves or introduction moves. This may have been compensated for by the intonation of JJ subjects when the responses were uttered.

4.2.3. Explanation Move

Table VIII

Explanation moves used situation #2

	AE	JE	JJ
"I need help"	1	0	0
"There's a lot of work" "I'm doing a lot"	1	0	1
"You are not doing anything right now"	3	1	0
"I am busy"	1	1	1
"We need to share responsibility"	1	1	1
"Mom says you have to"	1	0	0
"A girl should help with housework"	0	0	2
Total number of subjects using explanation move	7	3	5

More AE subjects used explanation moves than JJ subjects did, and more JJ subjects used explanation moves than JE subjects did, as shown in Table VIII. Three AEs and 1 JE used the fact that H was not doing anything as the reason for making this response. One subject from each subject group told H that S was busy. The statements that H was not doing anything and the statement that S was busy were preferred as an explanation by more number of subjects than the other facts. There was also the reason that the housework is a family duty; thus H should help S. One

subject from each subject group used this "sharing responsibility" explanation move. Two male JJ subjects used the notion that "a girl should help with housework" as the reason for the directive. This seems to be due to the division of labor common within Japanese families. One AE subject used other authority figures such as the mother as a reason for the directive.

4.2.4. Complaints

Table IX

Complaints used for situation #2

	AE	JE	JJ
"How come you never do any housework"	1	0	0
"It's always only me"	0	0	2
"What's your problem?"	1	1	0
"I'm saying so as your older brother"	0	1	0
Threat	0	1	2
Total	2	3	4

One AE complained that H never does any housework and 2 JJs complained that it is always S who does the housework (See Table IX). These are similar in content but the perspective is different. One JE used himself as an authority figure in the following sentence: "I'm saying so as your older brother" (JE 1). This is based on the notion that an older brother has an authoritative power against a younger sister. Threats used by the subjects varied in content. Two subjects used a light warning: 1

JE told H if H was not going to help her, she would not do the housework, and 1 JJ told H if H was not going to help her, H would not get a meal. One JJ used a warning concerning H's future, saying that H would not be popular in the future if she was lazy like this. This also seems to be cultural just as the explanation move made by JJs about division of labor.

4.2.5. Directives

All the directives, shown in Table X, used in this situation were about asking H for help with the housework. All but one JJ asked H to help with the housework directly. That JJ asked H to be cooperative. This request is more general, so this may be concerning H's personality trait rather than simply asking to help with the housework.

Table X

Directives used for situation #2

	AE	JE	JJ
"Can/Could/Would you (mind) help(ing) me?"	5	2	1
"Help with housework" "I need you to …"	3	1	7
"Why don't you help me?"	2	5	2
"You wanna give me a hand here please?"	1	0	0
"I would /could use/ appreciate your help"	3	0	0
"Be more cooperative"	0	0	1
Total number of subjects using directives	11	10	10

All the other requests were directly asking to help with the housework. Five AEs, 2 JEs and 1 JJ used modals "Can/Could/ Would you...?" This was seen mostly in AE subjects. AEs also used somewhat indirect requests such as "I could use your help." JJs used the imperative "Help with housework" the most. Three AEs, 1 JE, and 7 JJs used this type of request. More JEs used a suggestion form "Why don't you...?" to ask for help. Five JEs, 2 AEs and 2 JJs used this form.

4.2.6. Closing Move

None of the subjects used a closing move for this situation. This may be because the relationship between S and H was close and it is continuous, so the subjects did not feel the need to close the discourse.

4.2.7. Summary for Situation # 2

In this situation, JJs seemed most direct. AEs used the name of H or other attention getters to start the discourse, and some JEs included an introduction move to start the discourse; however, most JJs started their discourse without any opening or introduction. This makes an utterance more abrupt than the responses made by AEs and JEs. Also, JJs used more imperatives than any other subject groups in their directives. Both AEs and JEs used directives which contained some kind of softening effects such as interrogatives or suggestions.

4.3. Situation #3

In this situation, H has been hired to help S to do some filing job. The situation reads as follows: A temp office worker, Cory (Yoshio Matsumoto) is hired to help you

with your filing for a few weeks. He does not finish his work on time, however, and several of the files have been filed incorrectly.

In this situation, there are two things that S may want to complain about. One is the fact that H does not finish work on time, and the other is that the files were filed incorrectly. Since S is in a way supervising H, S has the higher social power. Their relationship is a work relation, so it is most likely that their social distance is medium, not as great as with a total stranger, but not as close as a member of a family or a close friend.

One AE and 3 JJs opted out from making any comments. The AE subject stated that he would finish the filing himself, and may say something if it happens again. One JJ stated that H did not mean to make mistakes, so he would not say anything. Another JJ stated that she would tell the supervisor to change the temp person to someone else.

4.3.1. Opening move

As with situations #1 and #2, opening moves were used by most of the AE subjects but not many JE or JJ subjects. Table XI shows opening moves used for this situation. Ten out of 11 AEs, 2 out of 12 JEs, and 3 out of 9 JJs who did not opt out used opening moves in their responses. Nine out of 10 AEs, 2 out of 2 JEs, and 1 out of 3 JJs who used any opening moves used H's first name. One out of three JJs used H's last name. It is more common to use last names between colleagues in Japan, so the JJ who used H's first name must have felt they were close. It is possible that from the context, S may have thought that H was close in age, so they would be closer than other colleagues. One JJ used "I'm sorry" ("Mooshiwake nai n desu kedo"), which is usually used with H of greater social power and distance.

Table XI

Opening moves used for situation #3

	AE	JE	JJ
H's first name	9	2	1
H's last name	0	0	1
Other attention getters	1	0	1
"I'm sorry"	0	0	1
Total	10	2	4

4.3.2. Introduction Move

Table XII

Introduction moves used for situation #3

	AE	JE	JJ
"Did you put this file here/ have trouble filing?"	2	3	0
"I'm not accusing you" "I'm sorry to tell you"	1	1	0
"I appreciate the help you are giving me"	3	1	1
"What's going on with you?"	0	1	0
"Can I talk to you?"	0	1	0
"It takes time to get used to a new job..."	0	1	1
"It's OK if it takes time"	0	0	3
Total number of subjects using introduction move	5	7	5

All subject groups showed different preferences for introduction moves, as seen in Table XII. Three AEs, 1 JE and 1 JJ used an introduction move to show that S appreciates H's help. Three JEs and 1 AE asked about the files to direct the attention to the files S was going to talk about. Three JJs first told H that it was OK to take time to tell them about another problem of misfiling.

4.3.3. Explanation Move

Table XIII

Explanation moves used for situation #3

	AE	JE	JJ
"The files have been filed wrong"	5	6	3
"We are not getting things filed fast enough"	2	2	0
"That's your responsibility"	0	1	0
"It's only a short time you are here"	0	0	1
Total number of subjects using explanation move	6	8	4

The explanation moves used by the subjects were somewhat uniform, as Table XIII shows. Five AEs, 6 JEs, and 3 JJs told H that the files which H had worked on were filed incorrectly. Even though the slowness of H was also a factor, fewer subjects told H about it. Only 2 AEs and 2 JEs told H that the files were not filed on time. None of the JJ subjects said anything about it as an explanation move. One JE told H that it was H's responsibility to complete the work correctly. This is a notion more valued in Japanese society, that it is each person's responsibility to work hard to keep the whole

group going. There was one JJ who told H that H should pay more attention because he is here only for a short time.

4.3.4. Complaints

Not many subjects used overt complaint moves in this situation. The subjects who did use the complaint move used threats. One JE and 1 JJ told H that they would have to ask for a replacement if H does not change his ways. One JE asked H, "Are you working for free, aren't you?" As with the explanation one JE used the responsibility to do the job correctly; this complaint also implies that H should be more efficient since he is getting paid. None of the AE subjects used complaints. Since this was not a repeated action and the mistake and slowness of H were not something H meant to do, S may have felt that it was not appropriate to express frustration directly to H, risking the face loss of H.

4.3.5. Directives

Although the explanation move was quite uniform and there were not too many variations, Table XIV shows that the directives used for this situation varied greatly.

There were several different kinds of content in the directives used by the subjects. One AE and 1 JE asked H to tell S how the mistakes happened. This seems to have a slight accusatory tone, since how the mistakes happened is not really what S wants to know. In these questions, S assumes H's responsibility, and S asks for some kind of apology or correction of the action by H.

Table XIV

Directives used for situation #3

	AE	JE	JJ
"Could you tell me how this happened?"	1	1	0
"Let me show you" "This is how it works" "Let's..."	6	0	0
"Would you like me to show you how this works?"	1	0	0
"Feel free to ask me if you have any questions"	2	3	0
"Could/Will you refile these?"	1	1	0
"Please refile these"	2	2	0
"You're gonna have to /I have to ask you to hurry"	2	1	0
"Maybe we can brainstorm (do the job quicker)"	1	0	0
"Can you start finishing them quicker?"	0	0	2
"You can't leave here until you finish..."	0	1	0
"Could/Can you take a little more care...?"	0	0	3
"Please take a little more care"	1	3	4
"Why don't we pay a little more attention"	0	0	1
"Tell me what it is (that bothers you)"	0	1	0
Total number of subjects using directives	11	11	9

Seven AEs offered to show H how the filing system works. Since S did not mention any wrong doing by H, S was trying to correct the situation without endangering H's face. Similarly, 2 AEs and 3 JEs told H to ask any questions if H had

any. This is even more indirect than showing H how the filing system works, because H may not realize that there is anything to be corrected and may not ask any questions. Three AEs and 3 JEs simply asked H to refile the files. This along with the explanation move that tells H that there were some mistakes, would be an effective and business-like way to get H to correct the mistakes.

Three AEs, 1 JE, and 2 JJs asked H to finish filing quicker. One AE used a casual request ("You're gonna have to pick up a tempo a little" AE 3), and another AE used a casual indirect request, "and maybe we can brainstorm about how you can get your work done on time" (AE 8). JE 8 used a more formal order, "I have to ask you to hurry a little bit." Two JJs used requests such as "Could you finish it quicker?" (JJ 12) and "Can you start finishing them up quickly?"

One AE, 3 JEs, and 8 JJs asked H to be more careful with the job. Considerably more JJs used this type of request than AEs or JEs. This type of request is more general than requests used by many AEs and JEs, asking H to refile, be quicker and so on. This may sound less imposing than the specific requests.

4.3.6. Closing Move

One AE and 1 JE used the closing phrase "Thanks" (See Table XV). One AE told H that it was OK to take time. This shows S's understanding for H, so it lessens the threat of the request not to make mistakes. One JJ also used a closing move to show her consideration towards H. This JJ and another JJ added a word of encouragement to show S's support. These are said in a very common phrase in Japanese, "Ganbaroo," which does not have an exact translation in English, so it is understandable that only JJs used it and none of the AEs and JEs used this phrase.

Table XV

Closing moves used for situation #3

	AE	JE	JJ
"Thanks!"	1	1	0
"I don't care if it takes time"	1	0	0
"Everybody makes mistake, so let's try our best"	0	0	1
"Your time is up in a little more so let's try hard"	0	0	1
Total	2	1	2

4.3.7. Summary for Situation #3

In this situation, the biggest difference among different subject groups appeared in the content of directives. Many AEs suggested showing H how the filing system worked, and asking him to refile the file. However, many of the JJs used a more general approach and asked H to be more careful. JEs had responses similar to both AEs and JJs.

4.4. Situation #4

The description of the situation is as follows: Your boss, Mr. Davies (Mr. Tanaka), is making you work overtime without any pay. Since you are new at the job, you have not said anything so far, but now it is getting too much.

In this situation, S is faced with her superior at the company, so H has more social power than S. Some of the subjects chose to complain about not being paid for the overtime work, and some others chose to complain about too much overtime work.

Three subjects, one AE and two JEs opted out from making any comments directly to the H. One AE responded that he would tell H's supervisor. One JE responded that he would tell a lie and avoid the job. This JE seems to avoid confrontation about the repeated offense, but just temporarily gets out of work for that day. One JE responded that she would not say anything to her superior, but she would complain to her co-workers instead. All the JJs responded with a comment of some kind directly to H.

4.4.1. Opening move

Ten AEs, six JEs, and two JJs used an opening move, as seen in Table XVI below. Nine out of 10 AEs and all of the JEs and JJs who had an opening move used the name "Mr. Davies" or "Mr. Tanaka." Since more JEs than JJs got H's attention by calling his name, they could be said to have adapted to the English discourse.

Table XVI

Opening moves used for situation #4

	AE	JE	JJ
"Mr. Davies" "Mr. Tanaka"	5	4	2
"You know" "Well, Mr. Davies"	1	1	0
"Excuse me Mr.Davies"	3	1	0
"I'm sorry to bother you"	1	0	0
Total	10	6	2

4.4.2. Introduction Move

Four AEs and four JEs used introduction moves, as Table XVII below shows. All four of AEs, and 3 of 4 JEs introduced the topic with sentences such as "I need to speak to you for a moment about working overtime without pay" (AE 10). None of the JJs used an introduction. An introduction move seems to help smooth transition into a difficult speech act such as a complaint and a request, so the lack of introduction moves could mean a more abrupt utterance.

Table XVII

Introduction moves used for situation #4

	AE	JE	JJ
"Can I talk to you about..." "I need to talk to you"	4	3	0
"I don't mean to disobey your instructions"	0	1	0
Total	4	4	0

4.4.3. Explanation Move

Three out of 5 AEs, 1 of 5 JEs, and 2 out of 5 JJs told H the fact that they have been doing a lot of overtime work as an explanation move, as shown in Table XVIII. Also, 3 AEs and 2 JEs told H the fact that S had not been paid, and that overtime work should be paid. None of the JJs used this as the explanation; however, the JJs used different phrases as explanation. Two JJs and one JE told H that S was still new at the job; thus the workload is too much. The "Other" includes phrases which also indicate that the work is too much, rather than that S has not been paid. For example, the following phrases were used: "I have my things to do after work and this overtime work keeps me busy" (JE 11), and "I'm home late every day and my mom is worrying

about me" (JJ 9). This reflects what S is going to ask in the directive move. The explanation described above included either that S has been working too much, or that S has not been paid for the work.

Table XVIII

Explanation moves used for situation #4

	AE	JE	JJ
"I have been doing a lot of overtime lately"	3	1	2
"Overtime work should be paid" "I haven't been paid"	2	2	0
"I am an exempt salaried employee"	1	0	0
"I am still new at the job"	0	1	2
Other	0	1	1
Total number of subjects using explanation move	5	5	5

4.4.4. Complaints

As seen in Table XIX below, AE subjects and JJ subjects used more complaints than JE subjects did. Two AEs and two JEs complained that the overtime work they had been doing was too much. One AE and one JE complained that the supervisor did not tell them that there would be so much overtime work when they were hired. None of the JJs used these complaints. Intstead, some JJs used a threat as a complaint. Two JJs along with two AEs used a threat that if they were expected to work over time, they needed to be paid. Two other JJs and one AE used a more explicit threat, such as "if this condition is going to last, ...I would like to quit" (JJ 8). These complaints,

however, also serve as requests at the same time. These complaints are also discussed in the directives section below.

Table XIX

Complaints used for situation #4

	AE	JE	JJ
"It's been too much"	2	2	0
"You didn't tell me there would be so much OT"	1	1	0
"If you want me to continue, you must pay me"	2	0	2
"If I don't get paid for OT, I'll be looking for work..."	1	0	2
"This job is tough, isn't it"	0	0	1
Total	6	3	5

From these data, the JJs seem to use stronger complaints, but there was one JJ who complained implicitly. JJ 3 said "This job is tough, isn't it," which is a hint to tell his superior that the job is too much for him. However, this statement is so indirect that it would seem difficult to get a desired effect of either changing the condition or relieving the frustration.

The JEs used fewer complaints than the other subject groups, and the content of their complaints resembled the content of AEs' complaints more than the JJs'.

4.4.5. Directives

Table XX shows that nine AEs, ten JEs and nine JJs used requests. Out of these subjects, eight AEs, six JEs, and six JJs asked for payment for overtime work. Some

of them were direct, but others were indirect. The AEs seemed to ask more indirect requests than the JJs. For example, AEs tended to ask requests such as "I was wondering what the policy on overtime work and pay is around here?" (AE 3), but JJs asked more directly, such as "I would like overtime pay" ("zangyoo teate ga hoshii n desu kedo" JJ 2). However, two AEs asked to be paid in a threat-like request, which the researcher mentioned in 4.4.4. Except for these two AEs, AEs tended to ask indirect requests.

Table XX

Directives used for situation #4

	AE	JE	JJ
"I'd appreciate it if you consider my situation"	2	2	0
"How long do I have to work OT without pay?"	1	1	0
"I was wondering what the policy on OT and pay is?"	3	1	0
"Would you tell me why I don't get paid?"	0	1	1
"I would like OT pay."	2	1	5
"I would like to have regular time day"	0	0	1
"May I go home at five?"	0	2	1
"Do you mind if I get Mr. X to help me?"	1	0	0
"Please teach me how I finish my job quickly"	0	1	0
"If it gets harder, can it be accepted as OT work?"	0	0	1
"Is this kind of ritual or something?"	0	1	0
Total	9	10	9

The JEs were also indirect in their requests. Instead of asking directly to get paid, the JEs asked, "How long do I have to work overtime without any pay?" (JE 1). The requests directly asking to be paid for the overwork were hedged, as in the following sentence: "I'd appreciate your considering to pay to me for the overtime" (JE 3).

One AE, four JEs, and three JJs used directives other than the requests for overtime pay. Two JEs and one JJ asked if they could go home at five o'clock. These requests seemed to be asking to be excused only for the day, and not for the future. One JJ asked if she could have a regular time day at least once a week. AE 6 asked if it was OK to have someone else help him finish the work so that he did not have to work overtime. JE 4 asked to be taught how to finish the job quickly. JE 4's request seemed to be asking for help so that he can benefit the company.

One JJ asked, "If the work gets any harder than this, can it be accepted as overtime?" (JJ 1). JE 2 asked, "Is this kind of a ritual in this company?" It seems to serve as a hint to get the supervisor to realize the situation was not normal. For the directives, AEs and JEs used more indirect ways of asking for payment than the JJs did. This and the low number of opening moves and introduction moves suggest that the JJs in this situation were more direct than AEs and JEs, and JEs' responses were more similar to the AEs' responses than to JJs'.

4.4.6. Closing Move

None of the subjects used any closing moves. Since H in this situation had more social power than S, the subjects may have felt that they needed to wait for H's response to take any further action.

4.4.7. Summary for Situation #4

The JJs' responses were qualitatively different from the AEs' and the JEs' responses in several points. The JJs used fewer opening moves and introduction moves than AEs or JEs. As stated in the section for introduction moves, this may appear abrupt if there is no opening or introduction.

All subject groups used a fair amount of explanation moves, but the content varied among subject groups. AEs mentioned their right to be paid as much as the claim that they have been working too much. JJs, on the other hand, used the fact that they were new at the job as a reason why they think it was too much work for them. JEs' responses were spread; some subjects responded similarly to the JJs, and others similarly to the AEs. This suggests that the JEs still have the characteristics of JJ responses, but assimilated somewhat to the AE tendencies.

For complaints, the AEs and JEs tended to tell H that the work has been too much, or to use warning, but JJs complaints were a threat or a warning and a vague hint.

4.5. Situation #5

Situation #5 reads as follows: You have just moved into an apartment. It is past midnight, but the music from upstairs is too loud to sleep. You have never met the person who lives upstairs, but you have to work early in the morning. You decide that you must do something about it, so you knock on their door and say...

In this situation, S and H are not acquaintances, since they have never met before, so the social distance between them is far. Since they are both renters in the same apartment complex and no specific description of H is given, it is likely that there would not be a great difference between the social status of S and H. Twelve AEs, 10 JEs, and 9 JJs chose to complain or comment directly to H. One JE responded that

instead of complaining he would do nothing. One JE and 1 JJ responded that she would call the manager. One JJ responded that he would try to sleep, and 1 JJ responded the noise would not keep him from sleeping.

4.5.1. Opening Move

Since the situation describes this as S's first encounter with H, many of the subjects used the opening move to start the conversation. However, JE subjects used fewer opening moves than the AEs and JJs used still fewer.

Many of the opening moves were casual greetings such as "Hi," and attention getters such as "Excuse me," and "I'm sorry" (See Table XXI).

Table XXI

Opening moves used for situation #5

	AE	JE	JJ
"Hi / Hey"	5	4	0
"I'm sorry / Excuse me (for bothering you)"	5	3	5
Total number of subjects using opening move	9	7	5

Five AEs and 4 JEs used "Hi" or "Hey" as attention getters, but none of the JJs used them. Five AEs, 3 JEs and 5 JJs used "I'm sorry" or "Excuse me" as an attention getter. There is simply no Japanese greeting phrase equivalent to "hi" that can be used with strangers. Instead, they tend to use "excuse me" to get H's attention rather than greetings when they are facing strangers in a situation such as this.

4.5.2. Introduction move

Introduction moves in this situation were used because S has never met H before, and since S is standing at H's door late at night, more subjects may have felt the need to clarify who the S was before they made any comments.

Table XXII

Introduction moves used for situation #5

	AE	JE	JJ
"I'm your neighbor/I live downstairs"	3	5	2
Introducing name	1	0	0
"I don't want to be a bitch"	1	0	0
"Nice to meet you"	0	1	0
"Sorry for visiting in midnight"	0	1	0
Total number of subjects using introduction	3	5	2

The most commonly used introduction was the comment to let H know that S is the neighbor of H, as seen in Table XXII. It is reasonable that S is making a complaint if S is a neighbor of H and directly being affected by the action of H. All subject groups used this type of introduction; however, more JEs used it than other subject groups. In an attempt to be more polite in a foreign language, the JEs might have felt that they needed to give more information to H to help him understand S's being there complaining to H. Interestingly, the subjects who had other kinds of introductions all said that they were the neighbors of H. One AE responded that she would introduce

herself by her name. None of the other subjects did so. One JE responded that he would say "Nice to meet you," but without giving his name. He may have omitted the name exchange from the written response, or may not have known that one has not "met" someone until the names are given. Two other responses have the effect to soften the complaints, by letting H know that the S does feel bad for making the complaint.

4.5.3. Explanation Move

Table XXIII shows that eleven AEs, 5 JEs and 4 JJs used some kind of explanation moves. More AEs used this move. This could be because not being considerate of others in your neighborhood is a more obvious offense to the JEs and JJs, so they did not feel the need to use any excuses.

There were not many variations of reasons used by the different subject groups in this questionnaire situation.

Table XXIII

Explanation moves used for situation #5

	AE	JE	JJ
"I have to get up early for work tomorrow"	8	2	1
"I need to get to sleep" "I was trying to sleep"	2	1	0
"It's late/ past midnight"	2	1	3
"I have to finish my job til tomorrow morning"	0	1	0
Total number of subjects using situation/reason	11	5	4

Eight out of 11 AEs, 2 out of 5 JEs, and 1 out of 4 JJs told H that they had to get up early the next morning to get to work. Two AEs and one JE told H that they had to get to sleep. Two AEs, one JE, and 3 JJs told H that it was late at night. Excuses such as this one are meant to appeal to the common sense of H about consideration for neighbors; it is thought to be natural to be quiet at the time; thus no other reasons are necessary. One JE told H that he had to work still and get up early the next morning. This was not seen in other subjects. This could have been done to get H's sympathy, or the subject was used to taking the work home to finish it, and it was a natural reason to tell H.

4.5.4. Complaints

There were three ways of expressing annoyance about the loud music late at night. One was to say that the music H was playing was loud, another was to simply say that it was noisy, and the other was to say that the S was not able to sleep.

Table XXIV

Complaints used for situation #5

	AE	JE	JJ
"Your music is really loud"	3	3	2
"It is noisy" "The music is loud"	1	2	2
"I can't sleep"	1	4	2
Total number of subjects using complaints	4	7	4

Three AEs, 3 JEs, and 2 JJs complained that the music H was playing was loud, as seen in Table XXIII. This complaint is stronger than "It is noisy" or "The music is loud" because it names H as the doer of the action. By avoiding naming H, S manages to mitigate the imposition of the latter complaint. More JEs than AEs or JJs complained that S was not able to sleep. Except for 2 JEs, all of these complaints accompanied other complaints, such as "your music is really loud."

4.5.5. Directives

Among the requests to turn the music down, there were many strategies that S used. Table XXV shows the strategies used by S.

Table XXV

Directives used for situation #5

	AE	JE	JJ
"I was wondering if you could..."	1	0	0
"Would you/ could you/ can you please"	6	4	6
"Do you / Would you mind..."	4	0	0
"Do you think it would be possible to..."	1	0	0
"It would be very nice of you if you..."	0	1	0
"I would appreciate it if you..."	0	1	0
"Please turn down the music /Turn down the music"	0	2	2
Total	12	8	8

The directive used by the majority of subjects was the request to turn down the music. Twelve AEs, 8 JEs, and 8 JJs made such requests. One JJ used a different kind of request: "Could you think about other people a little more?" ("moo sukoshi ki o tsukatte itadake nai deshooka" JJ6). This response supports the idea that the Japanese are more sensitive about being considerate to the surrounding people. H's loudness is not only disturbing S, but everybody else in the neighborhood.

More than half of the subjects used the modal "would/could/can you..." to ask H to turn down the music. Another strategy used by several subjects was hedging, such as "I was wondering if you could turn your music down a little" (AE 7), and "I would appreciate it if you could turn it down a bit" (JE 10). Two JEs and 2 JJs used imperatives such as "Turn off the music" (JE 12) and "Please be a little quiet" ("sukoshi shizuka ni shite kudasai" JJ 2). These direct requests were not used by any AEs; this might also support the idea that to JEs and JJs, the offense was so great that they did not feel the need to soften the imposition on H.

All of the AEs and JJs who did not opt out completely used a direct request for H to quiet down; however, 2 JEs did not make a direct request. The two JEs used only a complaint statement, and let H assume what was asked. Omitting part of a sentence is common in Japanese discourse to avoid appearing to be giving orders. One JE responded as follows: "I can't sleep because... I think the music is too loud... Thanks" (JE 2). However, the other JE's response seems harsher: " Hi, it's too noisy, I could not go to sleep" (JE 3).

4.5.6. Closing Moves

There was basically only one kind of closing move for this questionnaire situation. Expressing gratitude toward H shows H that S is trying to keep the social

harmony which might have been threatened by the imposition of the request or expression of complaint. Four AEs and 2 JEs told H "Thanks," and 2 AEs and 1 JE told H that they would really appreciate it. None of the JJs used any kind of closing moves. The JJs may choose to say something, but the word of gratitude in Japanese may be inappropriate for this particular situation in which the action to be thanked has not taken place yet.

4.5.7. Summary of Situation #5

The biggest difference among different subject groups was that the JEs and JJs used fewer explanation moves than AEs did. Distribution of the subject groups suggests that JEs made explanation moves more similar to JJs. The fact that the JJs and JEs made more direct requests without much effort to mitigate the imposition also suggests that this offense was more serious and the subjects felt no need to lessen the imposition toward H.

4.6. Situation #6

In situation #6, the social distance is very far, a customer in a shoe store and a store clerk. The customer is more likely to have higher social power than the clerk who serves the customer. The situation reads as follows: You need assistance at a shoe store to find the right size of shoes for you. You see a store clerk chatting and giggling on the phone for quite a while. She does not respond to you when you try to get her attention. Now she is finally off the phone.

Since S does not know H in person, making a direct complaint to H will benefit S in allowing him/her to vent his/her frustration, or may benefit the general public. Many of the subjects opted out from responding to this question. There were two

kinds of solution the subjects chose other than to express their frustration directly to H, as seen in Table XXVI. One is to leave the store without saying anything, and the other is to ignore the problem and just ask for what they need.

Table XXVI

The subjects who did not complain (Situation #6)

	AE	JE	JJ
Leave the store	4	5	0
Ask for shoes without complaining	4	3	8
Total number of subjects who did not complain	8	8	8
Total number of subjects who did complain	4	4	4

A fair amount of AE and JE subjects said they would leave the store; some even commented that the store did not deserve their money. However, none of the JJ subjects said they would leave the store. All the JJ subjects who did not make complaints chose to ask for the shoes and did not express frustration by making explicit complaints. It is possible that the respondents were trying to convey their frustration through intonation; however, that aspect of discourse was not possible to detect from the written responses, so it will not be discussed in this paper.

For this section, since the responses which did not contain complaints did not seem to have the intention of indirect complaint, the researcher will look at only the responses containing complaints.

4.6.1. Opening Move

Table XXVII shows that two AEs, one JE, and one JJ used opening moves. Except for the JE subjects, the opening move used was "Excuse me." The JE's opening phrase, "OK," suggests that the JE had been waiting and was finally able to get H's attention, and that the JE had the intention of letting H know about it.

Table XXVII

Opening moves used situation #6

	AE	JE	JJ
"Excuse me"	2	0	1
"O.K."	0	1	0
Total	2	1	1

4.6.2. Introduction Move

None of the subjects used introduction moves. Since the situation is a discourse between two strangers, and S, the customer, has higher social power than H, the store clerk, S may have felt no need to make the discourse smooth.

4.6.3. Explanation Move

There were two kinds of explanations, as shown in Table XXVIII. One was the fact that they had been waiting for the clerk to get help to find the right size shoes. One subject from each subject group used this kind of explanation moves. Two JJs also told H that S was in a hurry.

Table XXVIII

Explanation moves used situation #6

	AE	JE	JJ
"I had been waiting for you to get your help"	1	1	1
"I'm in a hurry"	0	0	2
Total	1	1	3

4.6.4. Complaints

The complaints used in this situation varied greatly among individual subjects as seen in Table XXIX below. None of the subject groups had many complaints, but only one JJ complained.

Table XXIX

Complaints used for situation #6

	AE	JE	JJ
"Could I have a customer satisfaction form?"	1	0	0
"perhaps I'll just wait for your supervisor"	1	0	0
"I guess I need a Geiger counter to get you"	0	1	0
"You care to help me!"	0	1	0
"You couldn't see me?"	0	1	0
"Don't you think you should pay attention..?"	0	0	1
Total	2	3	1

4.6.5. Directives

Unlike other situations in which many of the subjects who did not opt out used directives, the number of subjects who used directives in this situation was low, as shown in Table XXX. All except one directive was a request to get the right size shoes for S. One AE used a request which was an indirect complaint about H's not helping S.

Table XXX

Directives used for situation #6

	AE	JE	JJ
"Could you please get me this shoe in a size X?"	1	1	2
"I could use some assistance with shoes!"	1	0	0
Total	2	1	2

4.6.6. Closing Move

None of the subjects used closing moves.

4.6.7. Summary for Situation #6

A large number of subjects opted out from responding to this situation, or responded but no intention of complaints was apparent in the responses. It seems that complaining to H who is a complete stranger working in a shoe store does not benefit S in a way that other complaint situations may benefit S. The main reason for complaining in this situation seems to be to express S's frustration. Since the total number of subjects who responded with intention of complaints was small, and the

content varied from individual to individual, it is not possible to draw any conclusions from these data about the subject group differences.

4.7. Situation #7

The relationship between S and H in situation #7 is a father and a son/daughter. S is to complain to his or her father in the following situation: Your father always tells embarrassing stories of your childhood whenever your friends come over. As a friend was visiting, he told the same story again today. You decided to say something to your father after your friend left.

It is a situation between father and a daughter/son, so the father is more likely to have higher social power, and in many cases, it is a close relationship. It is not common for native speakers of Japanese to make complaints to their fathers in English; however, the situation was left in the questionnaire to see if the JE subjects would make complaints any differently from friends, acquaintances, and strangers when they make complaints to their relatives in this hypothetical situation.

One AE subject responded that she would not talk to her father directly about the issue. She noted that she would tell her mother about it instead. One AE and 1 JE subject responded that they would not say anything in this situation. All the other subjects chose to say something directly to their father.

4.7.1. Opening move

Table XXXI shows opening moves used for this situation. All but 1 AE who responded directly to H used opening moves, which was invariably, "Dad," or "Hey Dad." Four JEs and 3 JJs also used "Dad" as an attention getter to open the statement. There were 2 JEs who used "Father" as an attention getter. It might be because the JEs

wanted to show that they respect their fathers and used a more formal title, as opposed to the AEs who are accustomed to calling their fathers by "Dad." Most of the JJs did not use any opening moves.

Table XXXI

Opening moves used for situation #7

	AE	JE	JJ
"(Hey) Dad"	9	4	3
"Father"	0	2	0
Total	9	6	3

4.7.2. Introduction

There were two responses which could be categorized as introduction moves. AE 12 asked the H, "could you do me a favor?" and AE 8 started by saying, "I know you like to tell those old stories about me." It seems that a close relation as father and a child does not require an elaborate introduction which may be seen in other situations.

4.7.3. Explanation Move

For the explanation move, one JE stated "you told them the same story before," another JE stated "You're making me blush in front of my buddies" (JE 8, 7), and one JJ stated, "You always tell that story, but to tell you the truth..." (JJ 11). These can be counted as facts they tell H before making complaints or repair for the cause of annoyance. The other subjects' responses also included fact statements which are reasons for making the directives for repair of the SUA; however, many of them

served as complaints because of accusatory wording. Such sentences are included in the following complaint section.

4.7.4 Complaints

Ten AEs, 8 JEs, and 9 JJs used complaints for this situation. The description of these complaints is listed in Table XXXII.

Table XXXII

Complaints used for situation #7

	AE	JE	JJ
"Why do you keep telling/ like to tell embarrassing stories"	2	2	0
"You always make me embarrassed when..."	0	2	0
"(you know how much) I hate it when you tell those stories""	4	0	3
"You talk too much in front of my friends"	0	0	1
"I think it's enough to tell my friend your old stories"	0	1	0
"I'm tired/sick of listening to those stories"	0	2	0
"I can't understand your tasteless manner"	0	1	0
"It's so/too embarrassing/ annoying"	2	2	1
"It embarrasses/bothers me " "I am embarrassed"	4	2	4
Insult	0	0	1
Total number of subjects using complaint	10	8	9

Some of the complaints are more accusatory than others. AEs tended to avoid having "you" (H) as the subject of the sentences. None of the AEs used "you" as the subject of the main clause of the sentence, but three JEs and 1 JJ made complaint statements including "You" as the subject of a sentence, placing the responsibility of the SUA on H. Others used either "It's embarrassing," "I hate it when..," or "It embarrasses me." Some of the AEs' sentences have "you" as a subject of the sentence; however the sentences are made into interrogatives, making it slightly less accusatory. For example, "why do you like to embarrass me in front of my friends?" (AE 8) is slightly less accusatory than "You always make me embarrassed when my friends come over" (JE 8).

4.7.5. Directives

Seven AEs, 9 JEs, and all 12 JJs used some kind of directives in their responses, as Table XXXIII shows. All but 2 JJs' requests were for H to stop telling the embarrassing story about S's childhood. One of the JJs who did not ask H to stop made a request for an alternative action, which was "Can you tell other stories next time?" (JJ 9). The other JJ asked H to "think about the one who is being talked about" (JJ 6).

In all the subject groups, more people used the imperatives ("Please stop..." "Don't tell...") than the interrogatives ("Could you stop?"). In AE subject group, 4 subjects used imperatives, 2 subjects used interrogatives; in JEs, 5 subjects used imperatives, 3 subjects used interrogatives; and in JJs, 7 subjects used imperatives, and 2 subjects used interrogatives.

Table XXXIII

Directives used for situation #7

	AE	JE	JJ
"Please stop / don't tell the story"	3	2	0
"Stop / Don't tell the story"	0	2	7
"You've got to knock it off!"	1	1	0
"Could/Would/can/will you stop/not tell the story"	2	3	2
"Would you mind not doing it?"	1	0	0
"Why don't you stop..."	0	1	0
"I wish you'd stop..."	1	0	0
"I beg you to stop..."	0	0	1
"Think about the one who is being talked about."	0	0	1
"Can you tell other stories next time?"	0	0	1
Total number of subjects using directives	7	9	12

Some subjects used other strategies, including more indirect requests, such as "Would you mind not doing it?" (AE 5), "Why don't you stop..." (JE 3), and "I wish you'd stop..." (AE 4). One JJ made a request stronger than others did: "I beg you to stop..." (JJ 2).

4.7.6. Closing Move

Only two subjects used a closing move. One AE added "Thanks" (AE 12) at the end, and one JE added, "No, I mean it, Dad" (JE 7) to emphasize the claim. The AE's closing move could soften the effect; however, in this case, it seems to be a more conventional use of a closing word which does not mean much. The JE's closing phrase intensifies the request given before.

No other subjects used a closing move as a part of the complaint strategy.

4.7.7. Summary of Situation #7

The difference in subject groups was not too obvious, but JEs had more variations in complaints than AEs and JJs did. The JJs and JEs seemed to have used complaints that were harsher than AEs, directly accusing H in sentences such as "You talk too much in front of my friends."

4.8. Situation # 8

The situation in item #8 reads as follows: You are a manager at one of the finest restaurants in town. A friend of the owner of the restaurant who comes in is often very loud. You have asked the friend of the owner, Mrs. East (Mrs.Yamamoto), to be quiet for the other customers, but she has not changed her ways and is still loud today. The customers around her seem annoyed also.

The SUA in this situation is caused by the friend of the restaurant owner. Because she is rather loud and causing annoyance of other customers more than once, the respondents are to complain to her or ask her to do something (request for correction of her behavior), or choose not to do either. The situation describes that the complaint has already been made once; however the situation has not gotten better, so the

respondents may refer to the previous complaint. Since H in this situation is a friend of the owner who S works for, H is considered to have higher social power than S.

Examination of the data revealed that some subjects opted out from making any complaints or comment directly toward H. Table XXXIV describes what those subjects who did not make comments would do instead.

Table XXXIV

Solution chosen by the subject who opted out (situation #8)

	AE	JE	JJ
Discuss it with the owner	2	3	1
Move her away from other customers	1	0	0
Try to tell her with eyes	0	0	1
Total	3	3	2

The above table shows that some subjects would rather discuss the problem with the owner or take other measures than to confront H. A few commented also that they would talk to the owner because talking to H directly had not worked.

4.8.1. Opening move

In other situations, JJs usually had the lowest number of subjects who used any opening moves; however, in this situation, JJs used more opening moves than other subject groups, as shown in Table XXXV. Five JJs started their comments by saying "I'm (very) sorry but..." The original Japanese, "Mooshiwake gozai masen ga" is used commonly to politely get customers' attention by clerks or servers in Japan. This form is more formal than "sumimasen ga..." ("Excuse me"). The customary use of this term

in Japanese explains the unusual number of subjects using the opening move for this situation.

Table XXXV

Opening moves used for situation #8

	AE	JE	JJ
"Mrs. East" "Mrs. Yamamoto"	3	3	2
"Ma'am"	0	0	1
"Excuse me (Ma'am)" "I'm sorry but..."	2	1	5
"Good evening..."	1	0	0
"Patty"	0	1	0
Total	6	5	8

One JE used H's first name. This is interesting to note because none of the subjects in any other subject groups used the first name. The fact that the first name was not given in the original description might have prevented others from using it. However, the whole statement the JE made was much more informal than any other subjects' responses, so she may have perceived the situation differently from the other respondents.

4.8.2. Introduction

This situation is a difficult one for S because S has to tell H something that H would not want to hear, and H is of higher status. Many of the introductions before actually going into the difficult part contain phrases which could mitigate the

imposition of the request and complaint. These introductions show H that the complaint is not personal. Five AEs, 3 JEs, and 1 JJ included introduction moves which serve as mitigation (See Table XXXVI). One JE included an introduction which works to intensify the imposition ("I love this restaurant so I do not want to hear any customer complaints, but it's almost happening"). There were varieties of introduction moves, as seen in the following table.

Noticeably fewer JJs used introduction moves in this situation, suggesting that possibly the JJs were more direct in making comments or complaints to H, or they show politeness by being formal but they tend not to show friendliness toward people who are not close in social distance.

Table XXXVI

Introduction moves used for situation #8

	AE	JE	JJ
"Thank you for coming in today"	2	2	1
"I'm sorry to bother you"	1	0	0
"I hope you are enjoying your meal"	1	0	0
"You are a VIP"	1	1	0
"How are you?"	0	1	0
"I don't want to hear complaints"	0	1	0
Other	2	0	0
Total number of subjects using introduction move	5	4	1

4.8.3. Explanation Move

Six AEs, 6 JEs and 7 JJs used explanation moves before or after the directives or complaints, as shown in Table XXXVII. All of the subjects used other customers as a reason for asking for a repair for the SUA or complaint. One JE added also as a reason for repair that he did not want to hurt the owner's restaurant. Four AEs, 1 JE, and 1 JJ told H that the customers were complaining about the volume of her voice, and 4 JJs, 1 AE, and 2 JEs told H that the other customers would be annoyed by H's voice. Also, 3 JJs and 1 AE told H that it was a public place and there were other customers around her. Noticeably more JJs used being in public places as a reason than AEs or JEs. The JJs may have hoped that H would have enough general consideration to guess what S was trying to tell her by saying that the other customers would be annoyed and that it was a public place, rather than telling H that the customers have complained. On the other hand, more AEs told H that the customers have complained, and that S would like other customers to enjoy their meals. This seems to suggest that the AEs may have made the comment or complaint as a server trying to satisfy the customers, as opposed to the concern for the customers as general public.

Although the subjects may simply be telling H the fact that the other customers are annoyed, these statements could be serving as a function of complaints also. Some of the subjects were more blunt than others. For example, "We've had some customer complaints about the volume at this table" (AE 8) sounds less threatening than "Because you speak a little bit too loud, it bothered the customers"(JE 5). The latter using H as the doer of the action sounds accusatory.

Table XXXVII

Explanation moves used for situation #8

	AE	JE	JJ
"It will annoy other customers"	1	2	4
"Other customers are complaining"	4	1	1
"This is a public place" "there are other customers"	1	0	3
"Others are also important" "I want them to enjoy"	2	1	1
"Others can hear you"	1	1	0
"Don't want to hurt your friend's restaurant"	0	2	0
Number of subjects using explanation moves	6	6	7

4.8.4. Complaints

Table XXXVIII

Complaints used for situation #8

	AE	JE	JJ
"If happens again, you will be asked to leave"	1	0	2
"If it happens again, I'll call the owner"	1	0	0
"unless you wish to drive away the customers"	0	1	0
Total	2	1	2

Five complaints made by the respondents were threats. Two AEs and 2 JJs made threats, telling H if the same SUA happened again, H would be either refused to enter the restaurant, asked to leave, or S would call the owner. One JE used mild sarcasm which could be taken lightly. Although the number of subjects using the complaint statements is small, the subjects' annoyance may have been conveyed in other moves such as the explanation move. For this study, however, the responses including overt complaints as described in this section will be considered direct complaints, and other responses, which include covert complaints will be considered indirect complaints.

4.8.5. Directives

Many of the subjects who did not opt out included directives in their responses. Table XXXIX shows directives used for this situation. Nine AEs, 8 JEs, and 9 JJs who made any comments directly toward H included directives. The contents of directives used by the subjects were similar among different subject groups, as seen in the table below.

These directives are in various forms. The most frequently used form by JEs and JJs was "Could/would you...?" Eight JJs, 5 JEs and 2 AEs used it. Three AEs and 2 JEs used "please..." Others used hedging such as "I was wondering if you could keep it down" (AE 12).

Most of the directives used here have something to do with being quiet, but 2 JEs and 1 JJ responded differently from most others. JE 4 told H, "you are a one of the friend of a wonderful owner. Therefore I want you to behave like the owner, because I suppose the owner expect that you would do so." This response basically asks the same repair as other requests which ask H to be quiet, but it has more moralistic tone, since it is asking for a personal change. JE 8 tried to convey the message in a joking

manner. JE 8 asked H "would you PLEASE PLEASE listen to what I say...?! I can HEAR YOU well. (Like a joke)" (capitalization, parenthesis original). These two responses could possibly offend H more than necessary, considering the social power between H and S.

Table XXXIX

Directives used for situation #8

	AE	JE	JJ
"keep it down/ quieter/ tone down"	3	3	2
"keep your voice down/ lower your voice"	3	0	1
"talk(speak) quietly, more quietly"	2	1	2
"be quiet"	1	2	3
"behave like an owner"	0	1	0
"listen to what I say"	0	1	0
"I would like to hear what you think"	0	0	1
Total	9	8	9

Other subjects seemed to keep distance and remained formal. One JJ used a different strategy. JJ 9 told H "Today, we chose and are playing the songs Mrs. Yamamoto might like. I would like to hear what you think later...," hoping that H would pay attention to the music and become quiet. This strategy seem less threatening than mentioning H being loud, but it may not be as effective.

4.8.6. Closing move

Only 3 AEs and 2 JEs added a closing move. Two AEs and 1 JE used a closing move which could soften the request, such as "Thank you" and "I'm sorry for bothering you." However, 1 AE and 1 JE used closing phrases which intensify the request, such as "So please" (JE 5). None of the JJs used any closing phrases.

4.8.7. Summary for Situation #8

In other situations, JJs tended to use fewer opening moves, but for this situation, JJs used more than AEs and JEs. This may be due to a customary phrase in Japanese. JEs did not show particular similarity to JJs in this move. For the introduction move, JEs did not resemble AEs or JJs in content, but they did use many more introduction moves than JJs, resembling AEs. The attempt of JEs to say something positive before starting the difficult act may have been learned in the second language setting, since very few JJs did so.

There were distinct differences in preferences of explanation moves used by AEs and JJs, but JEs' explanations were not particularly similar to either one.

Content of the directives was similar among all subject groups, but the forms were different. JJs used more interrogatives than AEs or JEs, although in other situations, the AEs and JEs seemed to use more interrogatives.

4.9. Situation #9

Situation #9 is as following: Your co-worker, Fred (Yuji Sasaki), always finds excuses to get out of difficult tasks. It is burdening you with extra work, making you work overtime. Today, he has brought another task to you. He says he is working on another task, but you are also busy working on a project.

In this situation, SUA is that the co-worker always gets out of a task and burdens S with an unfair amount of work. The first response of the speaker could be to refuse H's request for S to do the task. Then, the speaker is left to make decisions about making a complaint or not. Since there was a refusal element in the situation, none of the subjects had blank responses to this situation.

4.9.1. Opening move

Six AEs, 6 JEs, and 1 JJ had some kind of opening move in the response, as seen in Table XL. Most of them included the name of H, either by itself ("Fred,") or with other attention getters ("Well, Fred,"). One person (JE 2) used only an attention getter ("Hey") without H's name, and JE 7 used a term "Dude." Only one JJ used any kind of opening move in this situation, "Mr. Sasaki" (JJ 8). This can be explained that the Japanese are less likely to use H's names as an opening phrase. It is also natural to call co-workers by their surnames in Japan.

Table XL

Opening moves used for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
"Fred"	4	3	0
"Hey"	0	1	0
"Gosh/Well/You know, Fred"	2	1	0
"Dude"	0	1	0
"Mr. Sasaki"	0	0	1
Total	6	6	1

It seems that the JEs have learned to call first names of H. However, even though there were the same numbers of JEs and AEs using H's name, JEs' opening moves seem more informal. This could be a result of an overgeneralization of a habit learned in the second language setting to be friendly.

4.9.2. Introduction

Since this situation includes an element of a request, the initial response of the subject to the situation would be either to accept or refuse the request made by H. Because of the way this situation is described, it would be most natural for S to refuse the request of H. The subjects might refuse with a direct refusal statement, or choose to use other strategies, such as giving excuses. The researcher decided to classify the refusal in the beginning of the response as the introduction move, since it leads to the complaints or directives. By refusing the request of H to take on another task, S would have an opportunity to mention the repeated offense by H.

Some subjects placed refusals at the end of the responses as a closing move. Those cases will be discussed in the closing move section.

Nine AEs, 7 JEs, and 3 JJs had an introduction move of some kind in their responses, as shown in Table XLI. Among these introduction moves, 6 AEs and 5 JEs refused the request overtly in phrases such as "I can't do it." None of the JJs used direct refusals seen in AEs and JEs. Two AEs and 2 JEs expressed their refusals in phrases such as "I'm sorry."

One AE and 1 JJ used an offer for an alternative action without giving direct refusal, in the following phrases: "I'd love to help you"(AE 7) and "If I was free or something, I don't mind doing that task" (JJ 12). There were 2 JJs who used a

different kind of introduction. JJ 5 asked H, "What is the other task you are talking about?" and JJ 11 started with "Although Mr. Sasaki, you might be busy also..."

Table XLI

Introduction moves used for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
"I can't do it"	6	5	0
"I'm sorry"	2	2	0
"I'd love to help you but..."	1	0	0
"If I was free..."	0	0	1
Other	0	0	2
Total	9	7	3

The biggest difference among the subject groups seems to be the use of direct refusal as an introduction. All of the introduction moves made by the AEs (9) and JEs (7) were refusals, direct or indirect. However, JJs' introduction contained only one refusal, and it was a mild indirect refusal. This could be in accordance with the common belief that the Japanese tend to avoid direct refusals. It is interesting to note also that most of the AE introductions were very similar to each other, but JEs and JJs' introductions were more individual. This could be because direct refusals are used commonly in English; thus the English speakers have developed formulaic sentences to make refusals, whereas the Japanese speakers, who do not use direct refusals as much, have other ways of conveying refusal to H. For this element, JEs seemed to

have adopted similar strategies to the AEs, although JEs' refusals were slightly less formulaic than the AEs'.

4.9.3. Explanation Move

Eight AEs, 11 JEs and 9 JJs used explanation moves, as shown in Table XLII. The explanation moves for this situation serve as reasons why the subjects refused the request of H about taking on the task H is supposed to do. The reason more than half of each subject group chose was being busy. Four AEs, 6 JEs, and 7 JJs said that they were busy. Among them, 2 AEs, 3 JEs, and 2 JJs said that they were busy because of the current work project they were working on. Two AEs, 3 JEs, and 4 JJs also said they were busy, but they did not mention any specific projects. Three AEs, 3 JEs, and 1 JJ simply stated that they have a deadline for a project, or that they have a project to work on.

Table XLII

Explanation moves used for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
busy (with work)	4 (2)	6 (3)	6 (4)
have another task	3	3	1
have another appointment	1	0	1
general, moral	0	2	1
Total	8	11	9

One AE and 1 JJ used excuses other than their work to express that they cannot stay late to work for H, such as, "I've got an appointment right after work tonight" (AE 10), and "today I have --"(JJ 4). Two JEs and 1 JJ used moral statements as the

explanation for the complaint. These moral statements all have to do with being a member of a group (company) or working with others as partners. Social harmony and loyalty to the company are important aspects of Japanese culture. This might explain the fact that these statements were seen in JJs and JEs, but not in AEs. Ideas about the society and what one is expected may be hard to learn for nonnative speakers of a language. This kind of reasoning will probably not be effective toward H if H is a native speaker of English in the US.

4.9.4. Complaints

Only 7 subjects (3 AEs, 1 JE, 3 JJs) made direct complaint statements, as Table XLIII shows. Two AEs and 2 JJs complained that the speaker had to do all the work that the H was supposed to do. One AE used an authority figure, the supervisor, to make a point in the following sentence: "If you have a problem, go talk to your boss" (AE 12). One JJ complained of a personality trait of H, saying, "why are you always this way" (JJ 6).

The JE's complaint was slightly different from either the AEs' or the JJs'. The JE's complaint was a moral comment on how one should cooperate with others. The JE responded as follows: "you should think about another co-worker's task. Each person has each job, so you should do it by yourself and, if you cannot make it by yourself, you should ask someone to help you" (JE 4). This JE also added what sounds like an insult: "Moreover, you are adult aren't you?" Possibly the offense done by H was considered high enough that the JE felt that he had the right to moralize his co-worker in the above manner.

Table XLIII

Complaints used for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
"I have to work over-time for you"	2	0	2
"If you have a problem, go talk to your boss"	1	0	0
"You should think about other co-workers"	0	1	0
"Why are you always this way?"	0	0	1
Total	3	1	3

4.9.5. Directives

Table XLIV shows directives used for this situation. Eight AEs, 7 JEs and 8 JJs used directive moves. The directive used by most subjects was the request asking or telling H to do the task himself instead of asking S to do it. Seven AEs, 4 JEs, and 5 JJs asked or told H to do the task himself. A variety of forms were used to express this. Two AEs, 2 JEs, and 1 JJ told H to do the task himself, using imperatives such as, "Do your own work yourself!" (AE 1), and "so do your task by yourself" (JE 4).

Since the SUA committed here is quite obvious for both parties and since they have basically equal social status, some subjects might have felt that they could use strong imperative or advice. One AE said, "you need to do something with it yourself" (AE 9), and 1 JJ said, "I'm not saying you should do it always, but you should do it at least sometimes" (JJ 11).

Table XLIV

Directives used for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
"do your own work yourself"	7	4	5
"Can you ask someone else?"	2	2	2
"Don't get out of task" "Don't push it to others"	0	1	1
"Let's do our tasks ourselves"	0	0	1
"Use your time more efficiently"	0	1	0
"Can I help you tomorrow?"	1	0	0
Total number of subjects using directives	8	7	8

However, some other subjects used strategies which mitigate the threat of the request. Two AEs used hedges to tone down their requests, in sentences such as the following: "I think it's time you start doing your own work" (AE 4) and "I guess you're going to have to stay and finish your own work tonight" (AE 10). One JE also used a hedged request as follows: "I would appreciate it if you would do it on your own" (JE 10). Two AEs and 2 JJs used "could/can you do it yourself?" One JE used a different strategy for asking the same request. Instead of asking directly in a sentence such as "Could you do it yourself?" JJ 5 said, "Why don't we do our own tasks ourselves." By including S himself, the JJ made the request sound less threatening.

The next most used directive was the request to ask someone other than S for help. Two subjects from each subject group asked H if he could ask someone else to do the

work for him. Most subjects except one JE used "could/can you, but one JE used "would you..?" instead. Although as seen above, when the subjects were asking H to do the task himself, some imperatives were used, when the subjects were asking H to get help from other people, they used more polite interrogatives such as "could/can/would." This could be because the subject decided to appear more polite when others were involved.

4.9.6. Closing move

Four AEs, 3 JEs and 5 JJs had any kind of closing moves, as seen in Table XLV. The most frequently used closing move among the AEs and the JEs was an apology "(I'm) Sorry" (AE 6,7,11, JE 8, 11). One JJ used "sorry" as a closing move also, but the most frequently used phrase was "I can't do it"(JJ 2,4,11). AEs and JEs also have this phrase but they placed it in the introduction as a part of the refusal.

Table XLV

Closing moves for situation #9

	AE	JE	JJ
"(I'm) Sorry"	3	2	1
"I can't do it"	0	0	3
"I'm done and outta here"	1	0	0
"I'll help you when I'm done"	0	1	0
"Let's help each other"	0	0	1
Total	4	3	5

This difference could be due to the discourse structure of Japanese. It is natural for the Japanese to put the main point at the end of the statement rather than at the beginning of the sentence. From the data above, none of the JEs used this pattern, suggesting that they have learned that such refusals come at the beginning in English.

"Sorry" type closing move serves to soften the refusal, and "I can't do it" type intensifies the refusal in English, but in original Japanese forms, it does not act as an intensifier.

Other closing moves were individual: 2 (1 JE and 1 JJ) of them served to soften the complaint and the request, and 1 AE's served to intensify the refusal.

4.9.7. Summary for Situation #9

As with many other situations, JJs used much fewer opening moves than AEs or JEs. However, the biggest difference among subject groups was in the placement of their refusals. Many AEs placed their refusals in the introduction move, so did some JEs. However, very few JJs did so. Instead, some JJs put their refusal at the end, as a closing move. A considerable number of JJs did not have overt refusals. This shows that the JJs tend to make indirect refusals rather than overt direct refusals. There were not obvious differences among subject groups in explanation moves or directives. Not too many AE and JJ subjects made explicit complaints, but JEs used fewer complaints than AEs or JJs. This may be the result of the JEs' efforts to be polite.

4.10. Conclusion

From the data analysis, several points were apparent, though not as clear-cut as the researcher anticipated. There was some evidence that supports the idea that the native language pragmatics does transfer. Some of the JE subjects' responses were

sometimes different from both AE and JJ subjects. These may be the result of their efforts in their learning process to be polite and not to offend the hearers in the target society. These will be discussed in chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the results of a study in the speech act of complaint performed by American and Japanese subjects. Speech acts are considered culture-specific. It is important for language educators to be aware of such differences. Some studies show that second/foreign language learners tend to transfer their first language habits when performing speech acts in a target language (see, for example, Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990). In this study, the second-language complaint speech act performance of Japanese English as a second language students was compared to the performance of native speakers of English and native speakers of Japanese.

A written discourse completion questionnaire based on Olshtain and Weinbach's (1993) study was prepared, with changes in content to suit the subject groups for this study. The subjects of the study consisted of 12 Americans responding in English (AE), 12 Japanese responding in English (JE), and 12 Japanese responding in Japanese (JJ). All subjects were students in universities in Northwestern United States and in Tokyo and Yokohama, Japan. The data collected were qualitatively analyzed according to the functions of each sentence in the responses.

5.1. Research questions

The following research questions were raised:

1. Do Japanese learners of English perform the speech act of complaint differently from native speakers of American English speaking English and native speakers of Japanese speaking Japanese?

2. Are the Japanese learners of English affected by the knowledge of their first language (transfer) in the production of the speech act of complaint?

3. If so, in what situations does transfer occur?

4. a. Does the length of stay in the target culture affect the transfer?

b. Does the length of study of the target language affect the transfer?

The following section will discuss the findings related to each research question.

5.1.1. Research question #1: Do Japanese learners of English perform the speech act of complaint differently from native speakers of American English speaking English and native speakers of Japanese speaking Japanese?

The results show that the complaint speech act performance of JEs was different from that of AEs and JJs in several points. The data were not large enough, so there were not sufficient amount of responses to make any generalizations for the subject group as a whole; however, the individual responses of JEs showed that some subjects responded differently from AE subjects, and others from JJ subjects. For example, the directive asking the superior permission to go home for the day without asking for the long-term repair for situation #4 was used by JEs and JJs, but none of the AEs used it. This suggests that the JEs transferred the contents of the directives from their native language to the second language. On the other hand, in the same situation, other JEs used directives which were used by AEs but not JJs. The indirect request asking the superior about the policy of the overtime pay was used by 3 AEs and 1 JE, but none of

the JJs. This suggests that the JEs may have used the strategy that they had learned in the target language society.

5.1.2. Research Question #2: Are the Japanese learners of English affected by the knowledge of their first language (transfer) in the production of the speech act of complaint?

From the results of this study, there were some elements which suggest the occurrence of pragmatic transfer. The researcher considered that transfer had occurred when JEs' responses were the same as the JJs' but different from the AEs', or when they had similarity to both JJs' and AEs' responses.

The most obvious transfer was seen in the opening moves of many situations. JEs used opening moves such as "Hi Fred," or "Excuse me," more than JJs, but used fewer opening moves than AEs.

As Table XLVI shows, JEs used some opening moves, but not as many as AEs. The same thing could be said about the use of first name of the hearer (H) as an opening move. The total number of first names of H used as opening moves by the AEs was 33, JEs 13, and JJ 1. This suggests that some JEs did transfer their native language pattern of not using opening moves or first names as an opening move, but some JEs have learned the pattern of AEs to use opening moves or first names.

Table XLVI

Opening moves used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	10	4	2
Situation 2	10	4	2
Situation 3	10	2	4
Situation 4	10	6	3
Situation 5	9	7	5
Situation 6	2	1	1
Situation 7	9	6	3
Situation 8	6	5	8
Situation 9	6	6	1
Total	72	41	29

(Tables show the number of tokens for each moves, not the number of subjects who used each moves)

Native language transfer was also seen in the perception of situation. For example, JJ and JE subjects responded in more direct manner in some discourse moves for situation #5. JEs used more introduction moves which may suggest that they were trying to be considerate toward H; however, JJs and JEs used more direct requests than AEs and used fewer explanation moves than AEs did, which may suggest that the JJs and JEs considered the offense more severe than the AEs did.

There were no other situations or discourse moves in which pragmatic transfer was as clear as the opening moves. However, there were some minor discourse

characteristics and contents which seemed to have been transferred. These will be discussed below.

5.1.3. Research Question #3: If so, in what situations does transfer occur?

Regardless of the relationship between the speaker (S) and the hearer (H), JEs' transfer was seen in opening moves in all but one situation as seen in Table XLVI.

When social power of S was higher than or equal to H, the JEs used more introduction moves than other subject groups. S's social power was higher than or equal to H in situations # 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9, and JEs used more introduction moves than other subject groups in situations # 1, 2, 3, and 5, as seen in Table XLVII. For situation # 9, JEs used fewer introduction moves than AEs, but considerably more than JJs. For the situations in which S has lower social power than H (#4, 7 & 8), JEs used more introduction moves than JJs but used equal or fewer introduction moves than AEs. In situations # 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9, AEs used more introduction moves than JJs. The fact that JEs used more introduction moves than AEs is important. It suggests that JEs' use of introduction move was not the result of transfer from the first language pattern.

An introduction move, along with an opening move, makes a smoother start into difficult speech acts such as complaints and requests. In an attempt of JEs to make the speech acts less threatening in the second language, they may have used more introductions even though it may be more natural to use fewer introduction moves in their first language.

Table XLVII

Introduction moves used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	1	5	2
Situation 2	1	4	0
Situation 3	5	7	5
Situation 4	4	4	0
Situation 5	3	5	2
Situation 6	0	0	0
Situation 7	2	0	0
Situation 8	5	4	1
Situation 9	9	7	3
Total	30	36	13

As seen in Table XLVIII, JEs did not seem to show any signs of transfer in the number of uses of explanation moves. JEs used more explanation moves than other subject groups in situations with a co-worker and a temporary worker at the work place, and in a situation with the father (Situation #3, 7, & 9).

Explanation moves also make the face-threatening speech acts less threatening by offering legitimate reasons JEs may have used explanation moves more than they would in their first language to be more polite in the second language by explaining their actions, resulting in more explanation moves than AEs. However, this was not seen in other situations, so it is not possible to further support this idea with data from this study.

Table XLVIII

Explanation moves used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	9	7	12
Situation 2	7	3	5
Situation 3	6	8	4
Situation 4	5	5	5
Situation 5	11	5	4
Situation 6	1	1	3
Situation 7	0	2	1
Situation 8	6	6	7
Situation 9	8	11	9
Total	53	48	50

JEs used fewer complaints than AEs or JJs in situations in which S had lower social power than H (#4, 7, and 8), and S's social power was equal to H's (#1, 5, and 9), except in situation #5, in which S faces a stranger. In situations in which S had higher social power than H (#2, 3, and 6), JEs used more complaint moves than AEs. These are summarized in Table XLIX.

Table XLIX

Complaints used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	2	1	2
Situation 2	2	3	4
Situation 3	0	1	1
Situation 4	6	3	5
Situation 5	4	7	4
Situation 6	2	3	1
Situation 7	10	8	9
Situation 8	2	1	2
Situation 9	3	1	3
Total	31	28	31

These findings also suggest that the JEs were trying to be as non-threatening as possible by using fewer direct complaint statements in situations with H of higher and equal social power. However, when they were facing H of lower social power, they may not have considered that. In such situations, they may not have paid as much attention to be polite as when they were facing H of higher or equal social power, and end up appearing more direct.

From Table L, JEs did not seem to show any consistent similarity with JJs or AEs in the number of directives used.

Table L

Directives used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	12	11	9
Situation 2	11	10	10
Situation 3	11	11	9
Situation 4	9	10	9
Situation 5	12	8	8
Situation 6	2	1	2
Situation 7	7	9	12
Situation 8	9	8	9
Situation 9	8	7	8
Total	81	75	76

JJs used imperatives in their directives when they were facing family members. For example, eight out of ten in situation # 2 (H is S's younger sister), and seven in situation #7 (H is S's father) used imperatives. AEs used three in #2 and four in #7. JEs used one imperative in situation #2, and five in #7. It seems that in Japanese, it is natural to use an imperative when talking to close relations, which may seem blunt in form. In English, an imperative may sound too blunt for some people even with a close relationship such as between siblings. JEs seemed to use in-between polite requests and blunt imperatives, using the suggestion form such as "Why don't you...?" JE subjects might have felt that requests using modals were too formal but imperatives would be too strong for this situation.

The total number of closing moves seen in Table LI showed that the JEs used more closing moves than JJs did, but they used fewer closing moves than AEs did. This may suggest that JEs may naturally use fewer closing moves than AEs do, as the JJs did not use many closing moves; however, they may have seen AEs use closing moves in such situations and learned to do so.

Table LI

Closing moves used in all situations

	AE	JE	JJ
Situation 1	0	0	1
Situation 3	2	1	2
Situation 5	6	3	0
Situation 7	1	1	0
Situation 8	3	2	0
Situation 9	4	3	5
Total	16	10	8

There were several minor characteristics which seemed to have been transferred to the JE's performance of speech acts in English. For example, in situation #1, 2 JJs and two JEs asked H to replace the damaged CD, which none of the AEs had asked. This seems to be the case where it may be more natural to ask for such a repair in Japanese society than in American society, and the JEs who used this kind of repair simply transferred their native language characteristics. Also, 8 JJ and 3JE subjects used general requests ("be more careful") rather than a specific repair ("refile") for the action in situation #3; however, only one AE used such a request.

5.1.4. Research question #4 a. Does the length of stay in the target culture affect the transfer? b. Does the length of study of the target language affect the transfer?

Since the results of the data analysis did not show consistent results of transfer in JEs responses, it was not possible to answer these research questions in generalized way. However, even the responses which showed the signs of transfer did not seem to show any visible relationships between the length of stay in U.S. or length of English study and native language transfer in the subjects' responses to this study. For example, one JE whose stay in the U.S. was only six months responded more AE-like ("Hi! I live in up stair and sorry for visiting in midnight, but could you turn down the music a little? I have to get up early tomorrow. Thank you. I appreciate it.") than another JE whose stay in the U.S. was 20 years ("Hi. It's too noisy, I could not go to sleep") in situation #5.

5.2. Conclusions

From the results of this study, the following conclusions could be drawn:

The responses of AEs and JJs were different from each other in many situations, and the JEs did transfer some characteristics of their native language to the performance of this second language speech act. The most obvious transfer was in the JEs' usage of opening moves. The evidences of transfer was not apparent from the total number of discourse moves other than opening moves; however, there were qualitative differences in contents in some responses that suggest the occurrence of transfer.

There were several points in which the production of JEs' discourse moves exceeded AEs' and JJs'. This may be because of JEs' conscious efforts to make the

speech act less threatening by giving more information to H, which supports Blum-Kulka and Olshtain's (1986) findings of their study that nonnative speakers tend to use longer utterances than native speakers to negotiate in difficult situations.

From the results of this study, it was not possible to exactly pinpoint the effect of social variables on the performance of speech acts; however, social power seemed to have mattered more than social distance.

The length of stay in the target culture and the length of study of the target language need to be looked at more carefully in a future study. From this study, there did not seem to be any visible relationship between these variables and native language transfer.

5.3. Implications

Although the total numbers of discourse moves did not show consistent occurrence of transfer, when each sentence of the JEs' responses was looked at, there were some deviations from AEs' responses. For example, a complaint used by one JE in situation #1 "What the hell you've done with my CD!" seems more severe than any of the AEs' responses. These deviations are said to make a negative impression on the hearers of different cultural background as previous studies show (See, for example, Gumperz, 1982). Helping the language learners to function well and maintain a good relationship with the people in the target language society is an important goal in second/foreign language classrooms.

Although the JEs did not show too many improper uses of imperatives in this study, it is understandable if they did use the imperatives in situations which did not call for such direct requests in English, since JJs seem to use the imperatives more often than AEs, and JEs showed that they transferred some items. The instruction on the use of

imperatives, interrogatives, and ways to mitigate requests may be incorporated not only in conversation classes, but also in grammar courses. The use and the intensity of modals are difficult to learn for English as a second or foreign language students (ESL/EFL). The instructors of ESL/EFL may incorporate role-plays of complaint and request situations in classroom instruction as a learning tool for different levels of complaints and requests and grammatical lessons. The students can also collect real complaint situations and compare each situation with the situations other students collected. It may also be interesting to compare ways of complaining in the students' native regions, if there are students from varieties of background in the classroom, to become aware of possible diversities in realizations of speech acts. It would be a good exercise to rate the severity of each other's complaint and compare with the speaker's intention to learn how other people perceive their complaints.

As some of the JE subjects did show speech act realizations which were quite different from the AE subjects' responses, and they seemed harsher than the AE responses, it would be beneficial to have explicit instruction in speech acts in second and foreign language classes. As Olshtain and Cohen (1990) state, it may be difficult to attain a native-like level in pragmatics even with explicit instruction; however, the awareness of such pragmatic differences would make the students able to cope with difficult speech act situation better.

Since past speech act studies focused on different aspects of speech act than this study, the findings that Japanese learners of English use fewer opening moves, and use fewer first names of hearers as the opening moves than do native speakers of English in the U.S. are valuable. These findings can be used in the classroom situation to help illustrate some of the subtler aspects of communicating in a second language.

After conducting this study, I will be able to more clearly teach my future students the importance of learning different ways of using different speech acts. It is not enough to learn how to say a particular expression in the second language, but the students need to learn when and how to use it, and which expressions are used in a particular situation in the second language. The difference that the Japanese English learners showed was not that they said something wrong, but that they did not follow a common discourse structure of English native speakers. Subtle differences such as the different uses of opening moves used by nonnative speakers described above could give wrong impressions to the native speakers. I will be able to confidently teach in the classroom these aspects of speech acts which could be otherwise easily overlooked.

5.4. Limitations of the study

1. The written format

Since this study collected data through written questionnaire format, the responses may have been different from those found in the naturally occurring situations. For example, in situation #4 and situation #5, the JJs used fewer opening moves and introduction moves than the AEs or JEs. Since this result seems awkward even in Japanese, this may have been the result of the written questionnaire format. It is possible that in real conversations, the JJs and the JEs would start their conversation with some kind of opening move. For example, the Japanese use "Ano..." as a conversation opener which translates to "Ah..." or "Well...," but did not write it down because it is found in spoken discourse, not written.

Inclusion of intonation, collected with audiotapes would help clarify some of the subjects' responses. For example, in situation #6, subjects' responses which contained

a simple request may have included a complaint if the intonation was included in the data. A written neutral sentence could become an expression of anger with certain intonation.

Collection of natural data is preferred, but I chose to use the written discourse completion questionnaire. One reason is because of time limitations. Direct complaints are not frequent enough in daily conversations to collect sufficient data. Also, a written questionnaire allowed for more control over the situations, as well as enabled me to collect data from different kinds of situations.

2. Categorization

There was some overlap in the categorization which made classification more difficult, and unclear. Some sentences could be taken as two different discourse moves. For example, in situation #4, a sentence such as "If you want me to continue, you must pay me" contains elements of a complaint and a request. A better categorization system which has less overlap would be necessary for future research.

3. Translation

Although fluent in both languages, the researcher occasionally lacked the background in Japanese linguistics to properly determine what the equivalent linguistic forms in English are. The researcher tried to focus on the content categorized by discourse moves rather than linguistic clues to compare differences.

4. Context

Some of the subjects commented that they needed more specific information about the situation to comfortably respond to the questionnaire. Context is important but it would be almost impossible to describe every single factor that could make a difference and still keep the instrument concise for the ease of task for the subjects. It

would be a challenge to determine the minimal crucial information that subjects need in order to respond to situations accurately.

5. Content

Some of the situations were not appropriate for the JE subjects. It is not likely that the JE subjects would encounter a situation in which they have to make complaints to their close relatives, such as father or a sister, in English. However, these situations were used to include situations with various social distance and social power.

6. Social Variables

To compare responses for the interlocutors with different social power and social distance, it may be better to use the same situation with different variables, possibly with different subjects from the same subject group population. It was difficult to pinpoint the reasons for differing responses by the subjects because there were too many other variables for this study, such as how frustrated the subjects were, and how much need there was for the subjects to get the situation repaired.

5. 5. Suggestions for Further Research

Further research in this area using other methods would be beneficial. For example, a similar study conducted with quantitative method using a larger number of subjects may be helpful. Also, a similar study, analyzing spoken data obtained by audiotape recording role-plays instead of a written questionnaire format would be useful in collecting more natural data. To compare responses for the interlocutors with different social power and social distance, it may be better to use the same situation with different variables, possibly with different subjects of the same subject group population.

Finally, it would be interesting to show the responses made by the JEs and JJs to native speakers of English and see what their impression about those responses. It may depend on how aware each individual is of the cultural differences in speech acts to perceive severity of complaints made by other people.

The data collected and used for this study is kept at the Applied Linguistics Department, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

References

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.

Bach, K. & Harnish, R.M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella & S.T.Krashen (eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (55-74). New York: Newbury House.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper,G. (1987). Appendix: the CCSARP coding manual. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apology.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. (1987). Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9 (2), 155-70.

Boxer, D. (1993). Complaints as positive strategies: What the learner needs to know. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(2), 277-299.

Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dimitracopoulou, I. (1990). *Conversational competence and social development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24: 37-53.

Gumperz, J.G. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harada, Y. (1996). Judgements of politeness in L2 acquisition. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, 21: 39-56

LoCastro, V. (1986). Yes, I agree with you, but...: agreement and disagreement in Japanese and American English. Paper presented at the Japan Association of Language Teachers' International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning (Seiri Gakuen, Hamamatsu, Japan, November 22-24, 1986).

Niki, H., & Tajika, H. (1994). Asking for permission vs. making requests: strategies chosen by Japanese speakers of English. *Pragmatics and language learning. Monograph Series*, 5: 110-124.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7 (2), 45-65.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1991). Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (154-165). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Olshtain, E. & Weinbach, L. (1993). Interlanguage features of the speech act of complaining. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (108-122). New York: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, E. T. (1984). How to be more polite in Japanese. ORTESOL Journal, 5, 1- 18.

Park, M.Y. (1997). *Analysis of rhetorical organization and style patterns in Korean and American business fax letters of complaint in English.* Unpublished MA thesis, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

Searle, J.R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts (vol.5)*, 59-82. Academic Press.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 18, 189-223.

Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L.M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (138-158). New York: Oxford University Press.

Takezawa, C. (1995). *Politeness and the speech act of requesting in Japanese as a second language*. Unpublished MA thesis,

Teufel, C.M. (1996). *A cross-cultural study of the speech act of refusing in English and German.* Unpublished MA thesis, Portland State University, Portland.

Appendix A

Discourse Completion Questionnaire

(English)

Discourse Completion Questionnaire
Age:_____
Gender:_____

Please read following description of situations, and write exact words of what you would say for each situation in quotation marks(" "). If you think you would not say anything, please write what you would do instead.

Situation 1: A friend of yours, Anne, borrowed your favorite CD. When she returned it, it had a big scratch, and you could not even listen to it. The scratch was not there before, but she did not say anything to you. You would say to her:

Situation 2: Your younger sister, Beth, does not do any housework, even though you are very busy and doing all the house chores. She is obviously not doing anything right now. You would say to her:

Situation 3: A temp office worker, Cory, is hired to help you with your filing for a few weeks. He does not finish his work on time, however, and several of the files were filed incorrectly. You would say to him:

Situation 4: Your boss, Mr.Davis, is making you work overtime without any pay. Since you are new at the job, you have not said anything so far, but now it is getting too much. You would say to him:

Situation 5: You have just moved into an apartment. It is past midnight, but the music from upstairs is too loud to sleep. You have never met the person who lives upstairs, but you have to work in the morning, so you knock on their door and say:

Situation 6: You need assistance at a shoe store to find the right size of shoes for you. You see a store clerk chatting and giggling on the phone for quite a while, and does not respond to you when you try to get her attention. Now she is finally off the phone. You would say to her:

Situation 7: Your father always tells embarrassing stories of your childhood, whenever your friends come over. It's not funny any more, so you decided to say something to your father.

Situation 8: You are a manager at one of the finest restaurants in town. A friend of the owner of the restaurant, who always come in is very loud. You have asked the friend of the owner, Mrs. East, to be quiet for the other customers, but she has not changed her ways and still loud today. The customers around her seem annoyed also. You would say to her:

Situation 9: Your co-worker, Fred, always finds excuses to get out of difficult tasks. It is burdening you with extra work, making you work overtime. Today, he has brought another task to you. You would say to him:

Appendix B

Discourse Completion Questionnaire

(Japanese)

アンケート

年令_____

性別_____

次の文章を読んで、下記の状況にであったとき、あなたならどのように答えるか、「　」にいれて書いてください。もし言葉では何も言わない場合は、どのような行動を取るか、説明してください。

1　友達の明子に、あなたの一番気に入っているＣＤを貸したら、返してくれたＣＤに、ひどい傷がついていて、ちゃんと聴くこともできません。貸す前はなんの傷もなかったのに、友達は、傷について何も言っていませんでした。あなたは友達に何と言いますか。

2　あなたの妹の貴子は、家の手伝いを全然しません。あなたは忙しいにもかかわらず、いつも家の手伝いをしています。たった今も、妹はどう見ても何もしていないのに、何の手伝いもしてくれません。あなたは妹に何と言いますか。

3　派遣会社から、あなたのファイリングの手伝いをするために２週間だけ来ている松本良夫さんは、仕事が遅いうえに、間違いも目立ちます。あなたは松本さんに何と言いますか。

4　このところずっと、残業手当なしで上司の田中博さんに残業させられています。まだこの仕事を始めて日が浅いので、これまで何も言いませんでしたが、この状態を続けるのがきつくなってきました。あなたは上司に何と言いますか。

5　引っ越したばかりのアパートで、夜、寝ようとしましたが、上の階から聞こえてくる音楽がうるさくて眠れません。上の階の人にはまだ会ったことがないのですが、もう１２時を過ぎているし、仕事で朝が早いので、どうにかしたいと思います。あなたは上の人に何と言いますか。

6　靴屋で欲しい靴を見つけましたが、ちょうどいいサイズがありません。店員はさっきからずっと電話で話中で、くすくす笑ったりしています。あなたが手振りで注意を引こうとしても、全然気が付いてくれません。ついに電話を切ったので、あなたは店員に何と言いますか。

7　あなたのお父さんは、あなたの友達が遊びに来るたびに、人に聞かせたくない子供の頃の話をするので、あなたはいつも恥ずかしい思いをしています。今日も友達が来たとき、また同じ話をしたので、あなたは友達が帰った後で、お父さんに何と言いますか。

8　あなたは高級レストランの支配人です。そのレストランにいつもやってくるオーナーの友人、山本晴子さんがとてもうるさいので困っています。　過去に何回か、「他のお客様のご迷惑になりますから」と言ったにもかかわらず、今日も大声で話しています。回りの客もやはり迷惑そうです。あなたは山本さんに何と言いますか。

9　会社の同僚の佐々木雄司さんは、いつも何か言い訳を付けては、面倒な仕事から逃げようとしています。そのせいで、あなただけが残業することになるなど、不公平です。今日もまた、別の仕事をやっている最中だから、と、同様に忙しいあなたに急ぎの仕事を持ってきました。あなたは同僚に何と言いますか。

ご協力、どうも有難うございました。

Appendix C

Sample Data Analysis

Sample Data Analysis

Situation #5

(1) AE 48 M
Could you please lower your music?
directive

(6) AE 20 M
I'm sorry to bother you but I have to get up very early in the morning.
opening explanation

Do you mind turning your music down? It is kind of loud. Thanks.
directive complaint closing

(2) JE 27 M (12 years, 6 years)
Hi, I'm your neighbor (I don't say which room is),
opening introduction

I can't sleep because... I think the music is too loud... Thanks.
explanation complaint closing

(7) JE 22 F (9 years, 4.5 years)
Excuse me, Hi, I live one floor down from you,
opening opening introduction

and it would be very nice of you if you can just turn the volume a touch!?
directive

(1) JJ 20 M
I'm the one downstairs, but I can't sleep because it's noisy, so please be a little quieter.
Introduction explanation complaint directive

(6) JJ 23 M
I can't sleep because it's loud. Could you think about other people a little more?
Explanation complaint directive