Interlanguage pragmatics study of indirect complaint among Japanese ESL learners

Junko Baba

(Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, University of South Carolina, Columbia SC 29208, United States)

Abstract: This interlanguage pragmatics study of linguistic expressions of affect focuses on how Japanese learners of English may express themselves in an affect-laden speech act of indirect complaint. The English as a Second Language (ESL) learners' data are compared with the baseline data of native speakers of Japanese (JJ) and American English (AA). The functions of linguistic expressions of affect are classified into intensifiers and specifiers and further breakdown is made in terms of lexical and morpho-syntactic variables. Some major findings include the ESL learners' negative transfer from First Language (L1) Japanese into Second Language (L2) by using dislocation and the adversative passive structure, while simultaneously using hedges and aggressive words. Their avoidance of such expressions of affect as hyperbole and curse words can be partially attributed to insufficient vocabulary in L2 English. Conversely, they make an excessive and conscious effort to avoid using the Historical Present (HP) in order to match the tense, which can be interpreted as a sign of hypercorrection of the linguistic specific features in the L2. The paper sheds light on a new area of the linguistic affect as shown by the Asian ESL learners whose first languages are significantly different from their L2 English.

Key words: interlanguage pragmatics; indirect complaint; affect; intensifier; specifier

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate how Japanese ESL learners encode linguistic affect in an emotionally charged speech act of indirect complaint and identify areas that should be taught with caution in the ESL classroom. The data are compared with baseline data from their L1 Japanese (JJ) and L2 American English native speakers (AA). In particular, the major focus of this paper is to find out how ESL learners may deviate from their baseline data. This is determined through analysis of the following interlanguage phenomena: (1) negative language transfer from the Japanese ESL learners' L1 American English, (2) overgeneralization or hypercorrection of L2, (3) avoidance strategy, and (4) the general interlanguage phenomenon of incomplete mastery of L2.

2. Interlanguage pragmatics

When dealing with interlanguage pragmatics, Thomas (1983) provided useful schema to analyze learners' pragmatic failures. She posited two levels of pragmatic failures for learners: pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Pragmalinguistic failure "occurs when the pragmatic force mapped by S(peakers) onto a given utterance is systematically different from the force most frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the

Junko Baba, Ph.D., associate professor of Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, University of South Carolina; research fields: applied linguistics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics.

target language" (Thomas, 1983, p. 99) or when speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2. Sociopragmatic failure refers to the social conditions placed on language in use "caused by different beliefs about rights, mentionables" (Thomas, 1983, p. 100).

The former is a more purely linguistic issue, while the latter is a meta-linguistic issue and refers to the usage of the language in social context. Pragmalinguistic failure can be illustrated by the transfer of the Russian word "*koneso*" (of course) that is used in place of "*da*" (yes) in English, for example,

Example 1: "Are you coming to the party?"

"Of course." (Thomas, 1983, pp. 101-102)

When "*koneso*" is transferred into English in the Example 1, it may be interpreted as a "peremptory response" or, in the worst case, as "an insult", as if the first speaker is asking a question that is stupid to ask or for which the answer is self-evident (Thomas, 1983, p. 102). As for the possible areas of sociopragmatic failure, Thomas gave an example of misjudgment of size of imposition, social taboos (including sexual and religious ones), assessment of relative power and distance. An example of misjudgment of the size of imposition would be a Russian speaker's asking an American for a cigarette on the assumption that cigarettes are virtually free in the United States as they are in Russia (Thomas, 1983, p. 105).

Since the author is more concerned with linguistic issues than social contexts alone, the social contextual variables are controlled and narrowed down to conversations between persons of equal status and to the focus on pragmalinguistic issues.

3. Definition of affect

Horst and Janney (1991) defined affect as emotive communication appropriate to linguistic displays of the speakers' emotion under given circumstances, in accordance with cultural expectation. Thus, affect should be clearly distinguished from uncontrolled emotion or person-centered psycho-physiological sensation. Other pragmatic variables, such as personal involvement level and signs of the relative importance of the given topic in the given situation, are also found to be subject to the degree of intensity of linguistic affect (Horst & Janney, 1991).

In his study of integration and involvement in speaking and writing, Chafe (1982) found that emotive involvement with the audience is much higher in informal spoken language, which is characterized by frequent use of linguistic affect, whereas formal writing rarely uses it. Thus, the spoken role-play within the informal context is adopted as a measure of this empirical study. With respect to pragmatic context, the speech act of indirect complaint is chosen, owing to its high level of emotive discourse, which is ideal for the study of intensified variables of the linguistic expressions of affect.

4. Review of each linguistic affect variable

Based on the exhaustive lists of linguistic affect in the past studies (Ochs & Shieffelin, 1989; Besnir, 1990), the author has chosen in the paper some comparable linguistic affects used cross-linguistically in both Japanese and American English data and further classified them into lexical and morpho-syntactic areas. In each area, six linguistic variables are compared. Linguistic variables in lexicons are divided into regular lexicon (emotional words, cursing/blaming words and mimetic words) and discourse markers (intensifiers, interjections and

weakeners)[1]. As for morpho-syntax, the use of modal auxiliary (*would*/*te-shimau)*, passives (adversative and get-passive), left/right dislocation, repetition of words, the use of historical present tense (HP) and particles including the Japanese final "*ne*", which is comparable to English the discourse marker "*y' know*". Furthermore, the same linguistic variables are classified into linguistic intensifiers and linguistic specifiers (Ochs & Shieffelin, 1989). The former consist of discourse markers, left/right dislocation, repetition of words and Historical Present (HP), and the latter include regular lexicon, modal auxiliary and passives.

Although American English may have more varieties and frequent occasions for the use of swear words compared with Japanese, Japanese is richer in emotional expressions than American English and Japanese speakers do not hesitate to use swear words in intimate contexts among friends and family members (Maynard, 1997).

5. Aggression within the speech act of complaint

In this paper, the core speech act that expresses the speaker's explosion of aggression, or the most intensified affect, is evoked in indirect complaint about an absent third party.

Researchers in applied linguistics have studied the former type of direct complaint in the interlanguage of Japanese ESL learners (Tatsuki, 2000), and compared English learners of Hebrew with the baseline data of Hebrew (Olshtein & Weinbach, 1993). Other researchers have conducted a cross-linguistic study between German and English (Kasper, 1990). Their findings show English native speakers express more downgrades and use less directness compared with German or Hebrew speakers. Tatsuki (2000) also found that Japanese ESL learners use more severe complaints in English than in Japanese in the same context, though she attributed the reason for the discrepancy to the learners' lack of competency in downgrading their severe complaints in English. Although the current study is not on direct complaint, the author would like to adopt the severity scale of complaint used by Olshtein and Weinbach (1993) in order to show how the intensified aggression of complaint may vary from group to group:

> Level 1 Below the level of reproach:
> "Such things happen."
> Level 2 Expression of annoyance or disapproval:
> "Such a lack of consideration!"
> Level 3 Explicit complaint:
> "You are inconsiderate!"
> Level 4 Accusation and warning:
> "Next time I'll let you wait for hours!"
> Level 5 Immediate threat:
> "I'm not moving one inch before you change my appointment." (p. 111).

The Olshtein and Weinbach (1993) severity scale seems to be more useful than other models, because it subsumes other comparable models, while showing more varying degrees of aggression. For example, Trosborg (1995) also reported the first four levels of aggression in complaint, though the highest level of immediate threat was not found in her data.

Rosenweig (1978) posited the construction of complaints into three types: extrapeditive, extrapunitive and

[1] Three discourse markers (intensifiers, interjections and weakeners) can be categorized as hedges. Both strengtheners and weakeners are called either "intensifier" or "hedge" in a broad sense of the term (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Examples of strengtheners are "really", "certainly" and "exactly" (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and interjections such as "wow" and "yuck!" (Wierzbicka, 1992); weakeners are "sort of" and "I think" (Holmes, 1986).

extrapersistive. Extrapeditive is simply a recognition and verbalization of the presence of a frustrating obstacle; extrapunitive is the expression of blame on some person or thing as the cause of trouble; and extrapersistive refers to the direct confrontation in order to solve the frustrating situation (Rosenweig, 1978). Since the author's current paper deals with indirect complaint (or commiseration) without the presence of the third party who caused the problem, the extrapersistive can be interpreted as the highest threatening form of aggression manifested in the narration of the speaker (comparable to Level 5 above) without confrontation by or the presence of the third party. In the current study, the extrapeditive is recognized by the presence of annoyance (comparable to Levels 1 and 2 above), whereas the extrapunitive is associated with cursing or blaming words about the third party who is the cause of problems (comparable to Level 3 and 4 above). In her study of interlanguage pragmatics on complaints, Tatsuki (2000, p. 1015) found that Japanese ESL learners use more extrapeditive responses such as "*komatta doooshiyoo*" ("What a problem!") in Japanese, whereas they use more extrapersistive responses in English.

The past studies on complaints, including the study on the intensity of aggression scale (Olshtein & Weinbach, 1993; Trosborg, 1995; Rosenweig, 1978; Tatsuki, 2000), have dealt with the illocutionary force of the speech act and have not included the information of other linguistic strategies in morpho-syntax or the use of lexicon. The paper incorporates detailed linguistic strategies in addition to the above classification.

6. Research design and method[2]

In the current study, the informants were shown a comic strip and were asked to perform the role-play as if the story had happened to the informants. The story of the comic strip is about a boy on a bike who is almost hit by a reckless driver who runs him off the road. Upset, the boy tells his close friend about his mishap. The informants were told to perform the role-play dialogues with as much emotion as possible. All data were tape-recorded and transcribed.

A total of 13 ESL learners participated in this study. The ESL students were enrolled in an intermediate level ESL program at an American university at the time of the study. Their stay in the United States varied from three months to one year. They averaged about eight years of formal education in Japan prior to their arrival in the United States. Their data are compared with 14 American college students (AA) and 13 Japanese college students (JJ) who study at an American university. The gender ratios for all groups are kept about equal.

7. Data analysis

First, the mean of occurrence of linguistic affect for each subject in each group is summed up within each group and the mean of each group is compared. A statistical test of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program and the result was found to be significant at $p=0.00$ ($p<0.05$ and $df=3$).

It is clear from Table 1 that JJ shows the highest use of linguistic affect in role-play (41.9) , followed by AA (21.5) and ESL (10.46). The lowest frequency of the use of linguistic affect by ESL learners may explain why they lack of proficiency in English. However, more detailed analysis will follow. In the following section, the breakdown of the linguistic expressions of affect will be analyzed.

[2] The research design of the current study in part replicates a prior study (Baba, 2002; 2003) and some of the native speakers' baseline data of the prior study are used in the current study and reanalyzed along with the new research data and new research focus on Japanese ESL students and their interlanguage phenomenon.

Table 1 Summary of the mean of linguistic expression of affect in role-play

	Mean
AA	21.50
JJ	41.90
ESL	10.46

7.1 Intensifiers vs. specifiers

A statistical test of ANOVA was run by SPSS, and it was found that the difference in the use of linguistic affect types (linguistic intensifiers versus linguistic specifiers) among groups is significant at $p=0.00$ ($p<0.05$) with degree of freedom at 3 level. Table 2 shows the mean for each group between linguistic intensifiers and specifiers.

Table 2 Summary of intensifier vs. specifier

	Intensifier	Specifier
AA	17.21	4.29
JJ	25.00	16.92
ESL	7.30	3.15

All groups show the same pattern of more use of intensifiers than specifiers. Both JJ and AA use about the same amount of intensifiers; JJ uses the higher mean of specifiers (16.92), which is almost four times than that of the AA counterpart (4.29). Since linguistic specifiers appear in Japanese and are considered to be language specific, ESL learners seem to be aware of this significant difference in the use of specifiers between the two native speakers' groups, so they approximate the mean (3.15) of their L2 group (4.29).

7.2 Lexicon vs. morpho-syntax

A statistical test of ANOVA was run by SPSS and it was found that the difference in the use of lexical and morpho-syntactic variables of linguistic affect among groups is significant at $p=0.00$ ($p<0.05$) as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Summary of lexicon vs. morpho-syntax

	Lexicon ($p<0.0001$)	Morpho-syntax ($p<0.0001$)
AA	15.14	6.36
JJ	24.23	17.69
ESL	6.08	4.38

All groups show a higher mean of lexicon than morpho-syntax, JJ has the highest mean of lexicon (24.23), followed by AA (15.14) and ESL (6.08). JJ shows the highest mean in both variables. The remarkably low frequency of the mean in the use of lexicon by ESL learners is probably due to their limited vocabulary in their L2, whereas they approximate morpho-syntactic variables (4.38) to their L2 group (6.36).

8. Detailed analysis of linguistic variables in role-play

Each linguistic variable used in role-play in lexicon and morpho-syntax for each group is compared by its mean. First, the result of each linguistic variable in lexicon is compared in Table 4.

Clearly, in Table 4, most linguistic variables except intensifiers are marked the highest for JJ, while AA shows the outstandingly high occurrence of intensifiers (6.36). An interesting contrast here is the use of intensifiers by AA (6.36), in comparison to JJ's use of weakeners (3.38). ESL learners seem to be aware of this sharp contrast between

their L1 and L2, because they use intensifiers (2.28) more than other linguistic variables here.

Table 4 Lexicon comparison in role-play

	Intensifier	Interjection	Weakener	Vulgar words	Emotion	Mimesis
AA 14	**6.36**	0.42	0.64	1.92	1.72	1.72
JJ 13	3.6	**4.3**	**3.38**	**2.31**	**2.92**	**5.00**
ESL 13	2.28	1.0	0.54	0.39	1.85	0.54

Note: The means that are the highest among all groups are marked in bold.

The means of the use of each variable for each group in morpho-syntax are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Morpho-syntax comparison in role-play

	y' know	would	Passive	Dislocation	Repetition	HP
AA	1.21	1.29	0.43	0.00	0.29	**3.0**
JJ	**9.8**	**3.6**	0.54	**0.92**	**0.85**	2.0
ESL	1.15	1.38	**1.38**	0.46	0.15	1.54

Note: The highest among all groups are marked in bold.

JJ outnumbers nearly every linguistic variable and in particular is characterized by the frequent use of the final particle "*ne*" or "*y' know*" (9.8), and the modal auxiliary "*te-shiamu*/*-chau*" form (3.6). However, there is no significant negative transfer by ESL learners in these variables. The areas in which ESL learners have problems are (1) dislocation, (2) the use of Historical Present (HP) and (3) passives. The ESL learners' use of dislocation and adversative passives seem to be evidence of negative transfer from their L1 Japanese, since these variables are very rare in American English. On the other hand, the avoidance of the use of HP may be attributable to their avoidance and/or hypercorrection of the tense match. While there are no instances of dislocation or inverted sentence structure by American native speakers, ESL learners show some moderate usage (0.46), which may indicate that they negatively transfer from their L1 use of dislocation (0.46). As for the use of HP and passives, detailed discussion and analysis are given below.

AA is characterized by the highest use of HP (3.0). As for the use of HP, ESL learners tend to use past tense and avoid using HP as a linguistic expression of affect in the role-play data. They may be overly concerned with the consistency of matching tenses in L2 speech, because it is the linguistic specific feature in the L2. An ESL student shows his keen consciousness of monitoring this grammatical concept and clearly self-corrects it in line 4 in Data 1:

Data 1: ESL

(1) B: That's terrible.

(2) P: Yes.

(3) B: Oh no.

(4) P: <u>he drive—he drove</u> at high speed.

Interestingly, ESL students who use slightly higher modal auxiliary (1.38) than AA group (1.29) and significantly higher passives (1.38) than JJ group (0.54) may reflect their negative transfer from L1 in which they attempt to show their regret or feelings of victimization by translating those language linguistic affects of modal auxiliary "*te-shiamu*" and adversative passives in their L1. ESL learners' typical error of using the adversative passive is illustrated in Data 2:

Data 2: ESL

(1) U: and then a car,

S: a car hit you

(2) U: yes

(3) I-I was fell down,

(4) and at-on the side,

This kind of negative transfer from the adversative passive in their L1 Japanese is observed among three other ESL students. The verb "fall" as shown in Data 2 and the verb "hit" as in "he was hitted by that driver" are mistakes typically made by Japanese ESL learners in transferring adversative passives from their L1 Japanese or in the conscious effort to make correct passive forms. This seems like a direct translation from Japanese, since one Japanese informant uses the adversative passive, saying "*pattan to taosaret*e", and another Japanese ESL learner expresses its comparable equivalent in English "I was fallen (by this person) BANG". Those verbs indicate the direct cause and effect of the accident, and the informants seem to emphasize the way they were victimized in order to appeal to the hearers' sympathy. Notice that these subjects of the regular passive are not the patient but the experiencer of the adversity, for which the semantic theta-role rules out the use of regular passive.

The level of intensity of complaint is coded from Level 1 to Level 5, based on the aforementioned aggression intensity scale model by Olshtein and Weinbach (1993) and the number of occurrences of complaints for informants of each group is tabulated and summed as it is shown in Table 6.

Table 6 Intensity level of complaint in role-play

Intensity level of complaint	AA	JJ	ESL
Level 5	0 (0.00%)	2 (10%)	0 (0.00%)
Level 4	9 (47.4%)	5 (25%)	1 (7%)
Level 3	6 (31.6%)	7 (35%)	3 (21%)
Level 2	2 (10.5%)	2 (10%)	3 (21%)
Level 1	2 (10.5%)	4 (20%)	7 (50%)
Total	19	20	14

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the occurrence of complaints by the informants in each group.

The average number of explicit complaints falls between 0 to 2 times for each informant, regardless of the group. None of the repeated words of complaint within the same speech-turn of the discourse is counted. It has been shown that 47.4% of the AA has the intensity level of 4. While none of the AA achieves the level 5 intensity, 10% of JJ show level 5. It should be noted that 71% of ESL learners use level 1 and level 2 of the aggression level combined, compared with their L1 JJ (30%) or their L2 AA (21%). Moreover, this remarkably high use of level 1 (50%) may indicate their avoidance to show annoyance in their L2 target language, due to their lack of competency in English.

Some subjects use more hedges when they use a higher intensity level of complaint. As to the reason for this, the researcher hypothesizes that it is as an effort to soften the illocutionary force of a crude and harsh expression of criticism. Thus, correlation between the use of hedges and the intensity level was performed through the Spearman correlation test by the SPSS program. First, all the occurrences of hedges are summed up and divided by the number

of subjects to compute the mean. Next, the correlation between the mean frequencies of each level of intensity was sought. The Spearman correlation test was performed for each group and the results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 The Spearman correlation test on intensity and hedges

Group	Spearman's rho	Significant level ($p<0.05$)
AA	-0.02	0.945
JJ	0.777	0.002
ESL	0.481	0.096

While JJ shows a remarkably significant correlation of 0.777 between intensity level and the numbers of hedges, AA shows a negative correlation of -0.02 at the significance level of 0.945 ($p<0.05$). Interestingly enough, ESL learners show negative transfer from their L1 in the correlation pattern of these variables by showing a positive correlation of 0.481. The following discourse data represents a typical Japanese native speaker's effort to avoid extremely intense aggression by the use of weakeners (see Data 3).

Data 3: JJ

(1) un, honmani, moo, (hh) nanka Moo, koroshi-te
yeah, really: INJ somehow INJ: kill-and
"Yeah, really, gosh, somewhat really kill"

(2) yaritait-te iu kanji
give-and:QT say feeling
"him or something like that"

One may observe in Data 3 that the interjection "*moo*" and a hedge such as "*nanka*" or "somewhat" alternate. These words are followed by the aggressive words "*koroshite yaritai*" or "wanted to kill him". Further, in line 2 these words are followed by "*te-in kanji*" or "something like that". All of these hedges above seem to be devices to mediate aggressive language.

In a similar manner, one ESL informant who used curse words attempted to mitigate it with the weakeners "kind of" and "anyway" as shown in Data 4.

Data 4: ESL

(1) B: I can't believe that.

(2) T: oh yeah. He's kind of a son of a bitch anyway.

(3) I troubled and then um,

(4) I stumbled outside of a road now.

(5) and I got lots of scar, you know.

In contrast with JJ and ESL, AA tends to intensify a greater variety of curse words or blaming words with the repetition of intensifiers as in "this horrible, horrible, horrible man" and/or the simultaneous use of cursing and blaming words such as "*stupid jerks*" or even with additional intensifiers as in "just stupid, very bad man". Likewise, the hyperbole, or exaggerated expression, is only observed by AA. Fifty seven percent of AA subjects open their conversation using expressions including the word "believe", as in "Oh my god, you wouldn't believe the story". Conversely, three out of thirteen JJ use an attention-getting strategy such as "*kiite kureru?*" ("Hey listen!"), or "*chotto miteyo*" ("Hey look!") or they start narrating the story in time sequence, starting with "*iya jitsuwa nee*" ("to tell you the truth").

The ESL group also shows similar negative transfer from L1, using "*y' know what?*" to open conversation.

Other examples of typical hyperbole in American English that has no Japanese equivalent can be seen in the way the speaker exaggerates the speeding of the car by saying the car is "*doing like a hundred fifty miles an hour around the corner*". Observe the following speech by the same male speaker who uses the typical hyperbole (see lines 3 and 9 in Data 5).

Data 5

(1) B: yeah, yeah, really [what happened to your bike
(2) P: ghh hh [I hit-I hit
(3) Uhh it did about twenty FLIPS <in the air>,
B: ghh oh my goodness, then what
(4) P: u::h (0.1) hit the ground'n'
(5) its front wheel and bounced over'n'
(6) I went over to it
(7) and front wheel was all wobbled up…
(8) that's why it took me so LONG to get here
(9) because I felt like I was riding on an egg

This type of hyperbole is used to animate speech in American English; however, the occurrence of this type of hyperbole is not frequently observed except in the case of male speakers.

It is plausible that due to this type of hyperbole and curse words, American English speakers may give the impression of using speech that is more emotionally laden with high affect than Japanese speakers. It seems that there are the lexicons that ESL learners in particular are either unfamiliar with or consciously try to avoid due to lack of familiarity and practice. For example, one ESL informant later commented that he did not feel comfortable using curse words or hyperbole in English simply because he was not sure of how to use them appropriately.

9. Conclusion

Overall, Japanese ESL learners show far less aggression when expressing their annoyance, compared with the baseline data of their L1 and L2 speakers. This result runs counter to aforementioned Tatuki's (2000) study that Japanese ESL learners use more direct complaints in English than in their L1 Japanese which is partially due to their lack of competency in English. Furthermore, a close look at their use of linguistic expressions of affect indicates their interlanguage characteristics as follows:

Japanese ESL learners use four different strategies to express affect in L2 English: (1) they accommodate to the L2 patterns, (2) they avoid language specific features unique to L2, (3) they overgeneralize L2 linguistic rules, and (4) they demonstrate negative transfer from L1. The first strategy is similar use of intensifiers and less use of specifiers to accommodate the patterns of their L2. The second one is the avoidance of hyperbole and curse words in L2. When it comes to more complicated expressions that need further mastery of L2, such as the use of hyperbole in English, they tend to either simply avoid using them or find that they are not competent enough to express them. The third one is the hypercorrection of the tense match in English, which prevents them from effectively using HP as a linguistic expression of affect in L2. This is perhaps because tense matching is not part of the Japanese grammar, whereas aspect is more predominant in Japanese. The fourth one is their negative transfer from L1. ESL learners clearly indicate the negative transfer in the area of correlation between the intensity of aggression and the use of weakeners. In this area, both JJ and ESL students show a positive

correlation by using more weakeners when the intensity level of aggression increases. ESL learners show significant transfer from their L1 when they use the moderate case of inverted sentence structure for emphasis and when they use the wrong form of adversative passives, as in the instance of "I was fell".

As the author has mentioned earlier, encoding affect appropriately in the target language is not an easy task. What seems like an inappropriate performance or expression of affect may cause the ESL learners to question the sincerity level of the speaker or, in the worst case, may aggravate an already delicate situation.

For pedagogical application, it is highly recommended that L2 learners be exposed to authentic interaction with native speakers and become familiar with cultural differences in order to avoid possible mistakes in the interpretation of affect. Special attention should be paid in ESL classes to hyperbole, intensified blame, appropriate introduction of get-passive, and the effective use of HP, as well as to the possible misusage of the regular passive in English.

Inasmuch as the paper is limited in its sociolinguistic variables to one specific situational context among peers, other situational contexts as well as sociolinguistic variables of distance and power between the interlocutors should be studied in the future. Although the paper's adopted data are too small to deal with gender differences, gender difference is also another important area in the study of linguistic expressions of affect.

The author hopes this paper will shed light on a new area of interlanguage pragmatics by studying linguistic expressions of affect in L2 within the context of the speech act of indirect complaint.

References:

Baba, J. (2002). Linguistic affect and JSL: How do American learners express linguistic affect in the Japanese language? *SJL* (*Southern Journal of Linguistics*), 60-85.

Baba, J. (2003). Cross-linguistic study on emotion and linguistic affect: Japanese vs. Americans. *RASK, 17*, 54-101.

Besnir, N. (1990). Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 19*, 419-431.

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

Chafe, W. L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In: Tannen, D. (Ed.). *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy, vol. 9, Advances in discourse comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 35-53.

Holmes, J. (1986). Functions of "you know" in women's speech and men's speech. *Language in Society, 15*(1), 1-22.

Horst, A. & Janney, R. W. (1991). Verbal, prosodic, and kinesic emotive contrasts in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics, 15*, 521-549.

Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 192-218.

Martin, S. E. (1987). *The Japanese language through time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Maynard, S. K. (1997). *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text, 9*(1), 7-25.

Ochs, K. E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and socialization in Samoan village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Rosenzweig, S. (1978). *Aggressive behavior and the Rosenzweig picture-frustration study*. New York: Praeger.

Tatsuki, D. H. (2000). If my complaints could passions move: An interlanguage study of aggression. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 1003-1017.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*, 91-112.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). The semantics of interjections. *Journal of Pragmatics, 15*, 159-192.