

A Pragmatic Study of Complaints

SUMMIA FUAD ABDUL RAZZAK

College of Education for Women, Baghdad University

ABDUL KARIM FADHIL JAMIL

College of Education, Ibn- Rushd, University of Baghdad

Abstract:

The speech act of complaint could happen in every conversation even without being regarded. The use of this act of complaint in literary genre, and drama in particular, is a manifestation that reflects human life. The utterances of complaint acts vary in terms of their topics, degree, and responses. In the use of this act of complaint, the characters apply various utterances in the interaction to reflect his intention. The study aims at describing the ways of expressing speech act of complaint by the characters in the two selected plays by the American playwright Arthur Miller's All My Sons and Death of a Salesman. The study tries to demonstrate the functions of complaints used by the characters in the plays. It also highlights and identifies the complaint strategies manipulated by the characters in a variety of contexts. The forms of utterances are the research data, as uttered by the characters in the plays, and which are found in different dialogues. Trosborg's (1994) model and the five point-complaint severity scale suggested by Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) have been selected for analyzing the chosen extracts.

Key words: Pragmatics, complaint, speech act.

1. INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, people usually feel annoyed, dissatisfied or unhappy with other people or circumstances. Actually,

displeasing contexts often reflect an attitude of complaint. People select particular words and behaviour, relying on certain elements such as social status, gender, relationship between the interlocutors, and the complexity of situations, so as to reveal their reactions to the annoying events and reflect their feelings of dissatisfaction towards others, (Ayu&Sukyadi, 2011, p. 1).

A speech act in which disappointment or a grievance is expressed is called complaint (Clyne, 1996, p.49). Brown and Levinson (1978) claim that complaint is used to threaten the addressee, however, the main objective of a complaint is to get some action done to sort out the problem or fault. How things are said and how they are presented and significant, due to the conflictive nature of a complaint, (as cited in Fortanet, Palmer & Posteguillo, 2004, p.115). Accordingly, Searle's (1976) demonstrates that complaints are expressive, since speakers reflect their feelings (as cited in Meinel, 2014, p. 15). Complaint happens when people reject to accept that things which are wrong and attempt to do something about it (Baggini, 2010, p. 1). In the speech act of complaint, the speaker reflects or shows dissatisfaction, annoyance or rebuke because of a past or present action. As a result, the speaker affects the hearer negatively (Guillén-Nieto, Marimón-Llorca & Vargas-Sierra, 2009, p. 196). Investigating the strategies of the speech acts of complaints in some selected American plays will be the focus of the study; namely, Miller's *All My Sons* and *Death of a Salesman*.

2. PRAGMATICS: AN OVERVIEW

One of the most promising and swiftly developed field of study in recent linguistics and the philosophy of language is pragmatics. Nowadays, it becomes a major subject in "artificial intelligence, informatics, neuroscience, language pathology, anthropology, and sociology" (Huang, 2014, p. 1). Richards and

Schmidt (2002, p. 412) state that pragmatics deals with “the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences and the contexts and situations in which they are used”. Leech (1983), Sperber and Wilson (1986) argue that pragmatics becomes in the late 1970s, an advanced subfield of linguistics, it looks at how people understand and create an action or a speech act in a particular conversational context. It tries to distinguish two purposes or senses in each speech or expressive action of actual transmission. One is the intellectual intention or the clause sense, and the other is the expressive intention or sense (as cited in Byram, 2000, p. 693).

Yule (2010, p. 128) defines Pragmatics as “the study of “invisible” meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn't actually said or written.” Accordingly, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning, i.e., what the speaker intends to mean rather than the actual words or phrases he uses. Hence the explanation of what people indicate in a specific context and how the situation manipulates what is said is certainly embodied in pragmatics. It requires an insight on how speakers order what they should say in agreement with who they are speaking to, where, when, and beneath what events. Yule (1996, p. 3) adds that pragmatics is connected with the study of meaning conveyed by a speaker and illustrated by a listener.

To search how hearers are able to turn out deductions about what is uttered should be investigated in order to find an explanation of the speaker's meant concept or the hidden meaning. Scholars raise different viewpoints about the uttered and unuttered speech. What is more, the concept of distance is linked by the essential reply. Closeness, whether physical, social, or conceptual, presupposes shared experiment. Speakers pinpoint how much it needs to be said on the basis of how adjacent or remote the listener is. Thus, the study of the expression of relative distance is referred to as (Ibid).

3. WHAT IS THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINT?

Complaints can be regarded as examples of a different kind of speech acts. These speech acts show the speaker's reaction and quite frequently, they are considered 'expressive' speech acts as the speaker or complainer conveys negative feelings, emotions or attitudes, such as disapproval, negligence, anxiety, displeasure, indignation, censure, discomfort, grievance, dissatisfaction, culpability, discontent, or frustration. Those emotions, feelings or attitudes to the hearer's (or complaine) present or past behaviour are projected by the speaker, fails to meet expectations (Walaszewska, Kisielewska-Krysiuk & Piskorska, 2010, p. 168). Trosborg (1994, pp. 311-312) claims that complaint is "as an illocutionary act in which the speaker (the complainer) expresses his/her disapproval, negative feelings etc. towards the state of affairs described in the proposition (the complainable) and for which he/she holds the hearer (the complaine) responsible, either directly or indirectly".

4. TYPES OF COMPLAINTS

Boxer (2010, p. 163) claims that there are two different kinds of speech behaviours that are involved in the speech act of complaint, the first of which is direct complaints that are called face threatening acts and the second is indirect complaints that make solidarity in social interaction.

These two speech behaviours are actually quite different from each other. According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, direct complaint is different from indirect complaint. Direct complaint is typically a face-threatening act as it asks the addressee to remedy a complaint. For seeking agreement indirect complaint is done. As a matter of fact, the indirect complaint is not necessarily a source of solidarity-building, more than a request are there hidden for it. The fact

that the responses of indirect complaint can function in this manner among speakers makes it a speech act that could have positive dimensions for L2 users (Ibid).

A complaint directed to a person who is responsible for a perceived offense or in a role in which s/he can remedy the offense is called direct complaint. It is expected or suitable by context when one is heard to utter direct complaint in various situations. So, in a complaint department, direct complaint is expected. Such a place would be where, for instance, a customer returns an item to a store (Boxer, 2010, p. 164). Gass & Neu (1995, p. 219) define indirect complaint as “the expression of dissatisfaction to an interlocutor about oneself or someone/something that is not present” so the addressee is not responsible for a perceived offence in indirect complaints.

House and Kasper (1981) claim that in many cases, when complaints are made against the listener, they are 'anti-hearer'. Pragmatists therefore, referred to them as direct complaints. On the other hand, the speaker's lamentation about third party's conduct is expressed by indirect complaints. In this sort of complaints, the third party, i.e., the 'complainable', is holding the responsibility for the perceived offence, but not the hearer. In addition to that, pragmatists have also demonstrated that 'direct' or 'indirect' complaints can be accomplished by relying on the speaker's negative evaluation of the complaine's behaviour or the complainable is explicitly or implicitly reflected (as cited in Trosborg, 1994, p. 315). The following examples given by Boxer (1993, p. 280) illustrate the types of the direct and indirect complaints

- Direct complaint

“A is a male customer in restaurant; B is a male waiter:

A: Excuse me, I didn't order my hamburger well done. This is far from medium rare.

B: Sorry. We'll try again, but it will take a few minutes.”

In this situation, it may be the cook here who is ultimately responsible, whereas the addressee or the waiter, is the party capable of remedying the offense.

- Indirect complaint

“Two male friends:

A: I'll tell ya, New York is terrible!

B: It's a zoo. Insane.”

The two examples mentioned by Brown and Levinson (1978) illustrate that both direct and indirect complaints lead to lengthy interactions between speaker and addressee. Shared beliefs and attitudes can be expressed in an indirect complaint, one can find conversational material upon which Direct complaints are typically face-threatening acting by virtue of the fact that they confront the party that is either responsible for or can remedy the perceived offense (Ibid).

5. THE DIRECTIVE ACTS OF COMPLAINT

The three main functions of the directive acts of complaint in Trosborg's view (1994, p. 320) are:

a. Request for repair

Request for repair is the first directive act of the complaint. In the majority of cases, the main aim of passing a moral judgment is made by complaint. In order to stop the complaine from doing the wrong action, the complainer demonstrates a complaint described in the complainable. It is considered as an incentive for the complaine to remedy the complainable. Consider the following examples given by (Ibid):

“Situation: Passenger to fellow passenger smoking in a nonsmoking compartment in a train.

This is a non-smoker.”

b. Threat

Threat is the second directive act of the complaint. According to this case, by issuing a particular threat, a complainer may select to attack the complainees face openly. With an immediate result, she or he often states an ultimatum. To express the threat, swear words are usually used by the speaker (Trosborg's, 1994, p.321) .The following is the example of this type:

“Situation: A cassette was stolen from a shop

Now, give me back what you have stolen, or I shall have to call the police”

The above example shows that the complainees is threatened by the complainer, when the complainer says he will phone the police if the cassette is not given back to him .

c. Request for forbearance

Request for forbearance is the third directive act of the complaint. In this case, a complainer asks the complainees not to commit his or her mistake anymore, when performing this directive acts(Ibid, p. 322) .Consider the following example “Well, I'd like to find out about this because I'm hoping it won't happen again.”

6. COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

Trosborg (1994, p. 315) states four main categories. These categories are no explicit reproach, expression of annoyance or disapproval, accusation, and blame. Later, she drives sub-categories (strategies) derived from those four main categories. These categories and the strategies are outlined below.

a. No explicit reproach – Cat. I

Hinting strategies may be employed by the complainer to get rid of a struggle. In this case, the proposition does not comprise the complainable. Assertions are typical, though the content is

different from the propositional content of the complainable which are different from each other. The complainer indicates that he/ she informs about an insult and makes the complainee indirectly responsible, in expressing the assertion in the existence of the complainee. The complainee is unaware of the insult whether indicated or not, as the complainer indirectly clarifies that something is unsatisfactory. This strategy is regarded as a weak complaint strategy, yet it might be manipulated with success to make for more effective and influential strategies (Ibid, p.316) For example:

Str. 1. Hints

“Don’t see much of you these days, do I?”

b. Expression of annoyance or disapproval – Cat. II

Regarding a particular state of affairs he/she seems unfavorable for him/her, annoyance, dislike, disapproval, etc. which can be reflected by the complainer. The complainer takes the responsibility of the complainee but keeps away from pointing out him/her as the sinful person, by overtly affirming deplorable states in the complainee existence. The consequences producing from an insult, for which the complainee is covertly responsible for, may be reflected by the utterance (Trosborg, 1994, p. 316).

Str. 2. Annoyance

“You know I don’t like dust, I’m allergic to dust, didn’t you know it?”

Str. 3. Consequences

“I have already spar, spa, I’ve already spent ten minutes oh, quarter of an hour I think it was, cleaning up the bathroom itself.”(Ibid, 317).

c. Accusations – Cat. III

The agent of a complainable is set up by accusations. Trosborg mentions two levels of directness. The complainer can ask the hearer questions about the context or demonstrate that he/she

has to a certain extent linked with the offence. Thus, he tries to make the hearer a possible agent of the complainable (indirect accusation). On the other hand, the complainee could be directly accused by the complainer of making the offence (direct accusation). Consider the following accusations:

Str. 4. Indirect accusation

“Look at the mess; haven’t you done any cleaning up for the last week?”

Str. 5. Direct accusation

“You don’t even clean up after you when you’ve been there, you used to do it, what’s up with you now.”

d. Blaming – Cat. IV

The accused is guilty of the offence as it is presupposed by the act of blame. There are three levels that comprise the explicitness with which the complainer formulates his/her moral condemnation of the accused.

In most cases, a value judgment on the complainee is passed by the complainer. It may look as a modified expression of blame, or otherwise, it may be expressed as condemnation which is explicit either of the complainee’s action, or of the complainee as a person.

Str. 6. Modified blame

The disapproval of an action, which is modified, is conveyed by the complainer for which the accused is responsible for another approach not taken by the accused Trosborg (1994, p.318). Consider the following example:

“It’s boring to stay here, and I hate living in a mess, any way you ought to clean up after you.”

Str. 7. Explicit condemnation of the accused’s action or behaviour

An action for which the accused is held responsible (in direct terms) is bad, as the complainer clearly demonstrates that. For example:

“Ah, surely, I know but I think it’s irritating, really irritating the way I have to clean up every time after you, especially now today I found dirty clothes of yours in my cupboard, I don’t find that fair.”

Str. 8. Explicit condemnation of the accused as a person
What is implicit at all other levels is explicitly stated by the complainer, namely, that he/ she finds the accused a non-responsible social member (Ibid, p. 318- 319). For example

“Mette (swear-word), really, one can never (swear-word) trust you a damn.”

7 .THE SEVERITY OF THE COMPLAINT

Olshtain and Weinback (1987, p. 199) state five main severities on this scale, which are defined according to the position speaker takes with respect to hearer’s face. Each one of these is categorized on the basis of its linguistic features. Starting with the least severe, the following are the major severities:

a. Below the level of reproach

- Speaker selects to minimize hearer’s FTA as in
“Never mind, nothing serious happened.”

- Speaker keeps away explicit mention of offensive event as in
“Could we meet another time?”

- Speaker tries to minimize cost and benefit for hearer even at maximizing cost for speaker as in
“Such things happen all the time.”

Linguistic features: complete avoidance of direct or indirect reference to either the event or the hearer (Ibid, pp. 199,200).

b. Expression of disapproval or annoyance.

- Speaker selects to reflect disapproval or annoyance of the offensive event yet keeps away direct reference to hearer (Ibid, p. 200) as in

“What terrible bureaucracy!”

- An unknown third party is directed by the speaker's annoyance as in

“Such lack of consideration.”

- Reference to the act of offensive is done in a vague and general manner as in

“Is this acceptable behavior?”

Linguistic features: there is avoidance of explicit and direct mention of event or hearer, yet some event is regarded offensive by the hearer.

c. Explicit complaint

The speaker selects this strategy to accomplish an open face threatening act towards the hearer yet without incitement (Ibid).

- There is explicit reference to hearer as in

“You're not fair.”

- There is explicit reference to the Act as in

“You're inconsiderate.”

- There is explicit reference to both hearer and Act as in

“One should not postpone this type of operation.”

Linguistic features: the reference is either to hearer or Act, or both.

d. Accusation and warning

The speaker performs an open face strategy, when choosing this threatening act, and even implies potential sanctions for the hearer (Olshtain & Weinback, 1987, pp. 200-201)

- The hearer will be incriminated by the explicit reference to speaker's future act as in

“I'll speak to your supervisor.”

- Reference to hearer and Act are frequently there as well as in

“Next time I will let you wait for hours.”

Linguistic features: the speaker uses future tense and first person reference.

e. Immediate threat

In choosing this strategy, the speaker openly attacks the hearer's Face. Final and immediate results are frequently taken by this strategy (Ibid, p. 201).

- The reference to speaker's action implies explicit threat as in

“I'm not moving one inch unless you change my appointment.”

- The time expressions which are relating to the point of speaking are manipulated as in

“Pay the money right now.

Linguistic features: the speaker uses present tense with expressions of immediacy.

It is suggested that these five strategies are actually the five major strategies which identify the speech set of complaint in other words, when the preconditions for complaining occur, the speaker selects to reflect his/her feeling verbally, then any one of these five options exist for the realization of the complaining speech act.

8. METHODOLOGY

The present paper is qualitative in nature. Qualitative is the approach for finding out the meaning associated with a social or human problem. Making interpretations of the meaning of the data, collected in the participant's context, and analysed from particulars to general themes, are the basic requirements for this approach (Creswell,2014,p. 4).Two plays of the playwright

Arthur Miller will be the corpus of data analysis, which are written by specific rules, attitudes and concepts cast according to contemporary American culture and society. All the events, incidents and thematic patterns in his plays are mainly, integrated within the American past to express and show its valuable continuity and link with the present (Kumar, 2015, p. 54).

Arthur Miller's *All My Sons* run for 328 performances at the Coronet Theatre in New York 1947. It has attracted the attention of the public and then has got New York Drama Critics' Circle Award (Gale, 2000, p. 4). The relationships and interactions between family members were the source of much of the tension and struggle in Miller's plays. For the larger society, Miller's families act as microcosms, i.e., small worlds or communities; and each family member struggles to find his/her social right position. Miller notices that the "American family" is facing many barriers and difficulties, i.e., the members very often work against each other rather than in unity which cause so many struggles among their members. Sufficient responsibility is out of their daily life, and they do not reveal adequate and sincere trust in love for one another (Abbotson, 2000, p. 30).

The following are the main criteria adopted in selecting the extract for the analysis:

- a. Different complaint types are studied in the selected extracts, which express direct and indirect complaints.
- b. The selected extracts contain all the strategies of Trosborg (1994) and Olshtain and Weinbach (1987).
- c. The selected extracts comprise Trosborg's directive acts of complaint: request for repair, request for forbearance, and threat.
- d. The selected extracts involve the conflict, quarrel and disagreement among the characters of the two plays.

The procedures of analyzing the data are arranged and directed so as to get the whole results. There are five steps displayed logically and systematically in order to make the analysis smooth and easy, and the outcomes satisfactory. The adopted procedure in carrying out the analysis is clarified in the following table

Analysis procedure

Table (3.1)

Step	Procedure
First	Highlighting the plays acts
second	Adopting utterances from the chosen extracts
Third	Exploring the types, directives acts and strategies of complaints
Fourth	Distinguishing between direct and indirect complaints
Fifth	Applying an eclectic model of Anna Trosborg (1994) and Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) to the adopting speeches

1. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of the chosen extracts focuses on the strategies and directive acts of complaint. The adopted model of analysis is eclectic consisting of the eight strategies proposed by Trosborg (1994). These are hints, annoyance, consequences, indirect accusation, direct accusation, modified blame, explicit blame (behaviour), and explicit blame (person) and three from Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) which are explicit complaint, warning, and immediate threat. The analysis is also carried out in terms of directive acts identified by Trosborg (1994), namely: request for repair, threat, and request for forbearance. Finally, the analysis is conducted with the aid of statistical tables and percentages of the various strategies and directive acts manifested in the extracts. It is worth mentioning that the utterances of complaint in the selected extracts are written in bold type.

The Selected Extracts

The first extract

ANN: Maybe he's right. I don't mean that CHRIS is a statue, but –

SUE : Now darling, you know he's not right.

ANN: **I don't agree with you .CHRIS—**

SUE: Let's face it, dear. CHRIS is working with his father, isn't he? **He's taking money out of that business every week in the year.**

ANN: What of that ?

SUE: You ask me what of it?

ANN:I certainly do. [she seems about to burst out.] **You oughtn't cast aspersions like that, I'm surprised at you.**

SUE: You're surprised at me!

ANN: He'd never take five cents out of that plant if there was anything wrong with it.

SUE: You know that .

ANN: I know it. **I resent everything you've said.**

SUE [moving towards her]: **You know what I resent, dear?**

ANN: **Please, I don't want to argue.**

SUE: **I resent living next door to the Holy Family. It makes me look like a bum, you understand?**

ANN: I can't do anything about that.

SUE: **Who is he to ruin a man's life? Everybody knows Joe pulled a fast one to get out of jail.**

ANN: **That's not true!**

SUE: **Then why don't you go out and talk to people? Go on, talk to them. There's not a person on the block who doesn't know the truth.**

ANN: **That's a lie.**

(Miller, 2002, p.45)

Contextualizing the first extract

The first extract is a conversation between Sue Bayliss and Ann, taken from Act two, play I *All My Sons*. Sue tries to convince Ann that Chris is not right, but Ann does not agree with her. Sue tells Ann that Chris receives money out of his work as he works with his father. Yet Ann tells Sue that Chris doesn't take any cent because he feels it is wrong. Sue tries her best to explain to Ann what is the cause of her annoyance but Ann does not want to debate. Sue claims that her life like a bum if she lives next to such holy family. Again, she is talking about Joe and said "Who is he to ruin a man's life?" But Ann doesn't pay any attention and makes Sue angry as the latter tells her to go out and talk to people, saying that everyone in the block knows the truth.

Complaint's types, directive acts and strategies in the first extract.

Table (3.2)

The example	Types of complaints	Directive acts of complaints	Strategies of complaints
ANN: I don't agree with you.	direct	request for repair	annoyance
SUE: Let's face it, dear. CHRIS is working with his father, isn't he? He's taking money out of that business every week in the year.	indirect	request for repair	direct accusation
ANN: I certainly do. [She seems about to burst out.] You oughtn't cast aspersions like that, I'm surprised at you.	direct	request for forbearance	annoyance
ANN: I know it. I resent everything you've said.	direct	request for repair	explicit complaint
SUE [moving towards her]: You know what I resent, dear?	direct	request for repair	hints
ANN: Please, I don't want to argue.	direct	request for repair	annoyance
SUE: I resent living next door to the Holy Family. It makes	indirect	request for repair	annoyance

The example	Types of complaints	Directive acts of complaints	Strategies of complaints
me look like a bum, you understand?			
SUE: Who is he to ruin a man's life? Everybody knows Joe pulled a fast one to get out of jail.	indirect	request for repair	direct accusation
ANN: That's not true!	direct	request for repair	annoyance
SUE: Then why don't you go out and talk to people? Go on, talk to them. There's not a person on the block who doesn't know the truth.	direct	request for repair	consequences
ANN: That's a lie.	direct	request for forbearance	direct accusation

The second extract

CHARLEY: Without pay? What kind of job is a job without pay? (He rises.) Now, look ,kid, enough is enough. I'm no genius but I know when I'm being insulted.

WILLY: Insulted!

CHARLEY: Why don't you want to work for me?

WILLY: What's the matter with you? I've got a job.

CHARLEY: Then what're you walkin' in here every week for?

WILLY (getting up):Well, if you don't want me to walk in here—

CHARLEY : I am offering you a job.

WILLY:I don't want your goddam job!

CHARLEY: When the hell are you going to grow up?

WILLY (furiously) :You big ignoramus, if you say that to me again I'll rap you one! I don't care how big you are! (He's ready to fight.)

Pause.

CHARLEY (kindly, going to him) :How much do you need, Willy?

WILLY: Charley, I'm strapped, I'm strapped. I don't know what to do. I was just fired.

(Miller, 1949, pp. 71-72)

Contextualizing the second extract

The second extract is taken from Act two, Play II *Death of Salesman*. In this extract, Charley is surprised that there is a kind of job without pay. Charley offers Willy to work for him, but Willy refuses telling him that he has got a job. Charley feels insulted as his offer is always being refused. And Willy gets annoyed to fight Charley. However, Charley goes to him and kindly offers him money as he is being strapped and fired from his job.

Complaint's types, directive acts and strategies in the second extract.

Table (3.3)

The example	Types of complaints	Directive acts of complaints	Strategies of complaints
CHARLEY : Without pay? What kind of job is a job without pay? (He rises.) Now, look , kid, enough is enough. I'm no genius but I know when I'm being insulted.	direct	request for repair	annoyance
CHARLEY : Why don't you want to work for me?	direct	request for forbearance	direct accusation
WILLY : What's the matter with you? I've got a job.	direct	request for repair	hints
CHARLEY : Then what're you walkin' in here every week for?	direct	request for repair	explicit blame (behaviour)
WILLY (getting up) : Well, if you don't want me to walk in here—	direct	request for repair	consequences
WILLY: I don't want your goddam job!	direct	request for repair	annoyance
CHARLEY: When the hell are	direct		modified

you going to grow up?		request for repair	blame
WILLY (furiously): You big ignoramus, if you say that to me again I'll rap you one! I don't care how big you are! (He's ready to fight.)	direct	threat	immediate threat
WILLY: Charley, I'm strapped, I'm strapped. I don't know what to do. I was just fired.	direct	request for repair	Consequences

The analysis of the data reveals that request for repair is the most frequently used directive act in these extracts with a rate of occurrence sixteen of twenty utterances (80%). This clearly indicates that the sole purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments in most cases, but it functions as an incentive for the complaine to repair the damage he/she has caused or an attempt to stop or prevent repetition of the deplorable act.

Request for forbearance comes in the second place after request for repair occupying three out of twenty utterances, amounting to (15%). In the request for forbearance, the complainer requested the complaine to avoid performing the condemn action in the future. However, this type of request is regarded as a negative reinforce due to the subsequent repetition of such behavior by the complaine and may result in a promise for forbearance on the part of him/her. The least used directive act is threat with a frequency one of twenty utterances (5%).

In terms of strategies, the most frequently used strategy is annoyance which comprise five of eleven utterances in the first extract and two of nine utterances in the second extract, amounting to (35%). The complainers use annoyance to express that the situation is considered bad for him/her, yet they do not directly hold the complainees responsible for the problem. The complainer only states the annoying situation and proposes a request for a better condition. The second strategy is occupied by direct accusation with a rate of occurrence three out of eleven utterances in the first extract and one of nine utterances

in the second extract (20%). In the case of direct accusation, the complainer directly accuses the complaine of having committed the offence, trying to establish the agent of a complainable. Consequences is the third strategy used which obtains one of eleven utterances in the first extract and two of nine utterances in the second extract, amounting to (15%). The complainer uses consequences to express the consequences resulting from the offence caused by the complaine. The complainer holds the complaine responsible for the deplorable action, yet the former avoids mentioning the latter as a guilty person. Applying hints in which the complainer doesn't mention the complainable in proposition occurs with frequency one in each extract (10%). The complainer implies that he/she knows about the offence, still holds the complaine indirectly responsible. This is due to the fact that the complainer avoids a conflict with the complaine. Since the complainer does not state the complainable, so the complaine doesn't know whether an offence is referred to or not. It should be noted here that Troborg (1994) considers this strategy to be weak. The least frequent strategies are explicit complaint, explicit blame (behaviour), modified blame and immediate threat which hold one utterance for each strategy (5%). On one hand, in explicit complaint or face to face interactions, the complainer may express ill feelings towards the complaine or about the behavior of the third party. So in this type of complaint, the complainer avoids mentioning the hearer as the guilty person, because he/she wants to down tone the impact of the complainer on the complaine. While in explicit blame (behaviour), on the other hand, the complainer clearly indicates that the complaine hold responsible for the damage he/she caused and the complainer clearly indicates that the complaine hold responsible for the damage he/she caused. The case is completely different with modified blame as the complainer expresses disapproval of the action for which the complaine is responsible. In addition, the complainer would

prefer an alternative action which is not taken by the accused. Accordingly, it is presupposed that the accused is guilty, yet it is not expressed explicitly. Finally, practicing threat, the complainer explicitly states that the complainees responsible for the offence caused by him/her.

CONCLUSION

The main findings of this research include: the predominance directive act is request for repair in both extracts, and annoyance has the highest percentage compared to other strategies found in the data. Mireia Trenchs' study entitled *Complaining in Catalan, complaining in English: A comparative Study of native and EFL Speakers* (1994) focuses on how EFL Catalan speakers transfer pragmatic knowledge from their native language into English when accomplishing the speech act of complaining. Trenchs' study is different from the present paper in that the former is a comparative one while the later is not, that is to say the researchers of this paper have examined the concept of complaint in two literary texts (*All My Sons* and *Death of a Salesman*) following a substantial pragmatic model, the eclectic model of Trosborg (1994) and Olshtain and Weinbach (1987). Finally this paper has shed light on the fact that continuous disagreements, arguments, and even struggles which give an indication that the main characters in these extracts tend to grumble, show annoyance, accuse each other of telling lies, and even threaten each other. The relationships and interactions between the family members were the source of much of the tension and struggle. In general, the characters are indignant, furious and discontent and they do not show adequate and sincere trust in love for one another.

References

1. Abbotson, S. C. W. (2000). *Student Companion to Arthur Miller* (1st). United States of America.
2. Ayu, D. T. & Sukyadi, D. (2011). *Complaining in EFL Learners: Differences of Realizations between Men and Women*. Indonesia: Indonesian University of Education.
3. Baggini, J. (2010). *Complaint: From Minor Moans to Principled Protests*. London: Profile Books LTD.
4. Boxer, D. (1993). *Complaints as Positive Strategies: What the Learner Needs to Know*. Florida: TESOL.
5. Boxer, D. (2010). *Complaints: How to Gripe and Establish Rapport*. In Martinez-Flor, A. & Uso-Juan, E. (2010). *Speech Act Performance: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. John Benjamins Publishing co.
6. Byram, M. (Ed). (2000). *Routledge Encyclopedia of language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Routledge.
7. Clyne, M. (1996). *Inter-Cultural Communication at Work: Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: SAGE publications.
9. Fortanet, I. Palmer, J.C. & posteguillo, S. (2004). *Linguistic Studies in Academic and Professional English. Castello de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, D.L.*
10. Gale, C. L. (2000). *A Study Guide for Arthur Miller's "All My Sons"*. Farmington: Gale group.
11. Gass, S. M. & Neu, J. (1995). *Speech Acts Across Culture: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
12. Guillen-Nieto, V. Marimon-Llorca, C. & Vargas-Sierra, C. (eds) (2009). *Intercultural Business Communication and Simulation and Gaming Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang AG.

13. Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics*. (2nded). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Kumar, S. (2015). Theme of Relatedness in Arthur Miller's *All My Sons*. *International Journal in Commerce, IT & Social Sciences*. volume.2 (issue-06). Mullana: International Journal in Commerce, IT & Social Sciences.
15. Meinl, M.E. (2014). *Electronic Complaints: An Empirical Study on British English and German Complaints on eBay*. Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literature
16. Miller, A. (1949). *Death of a salesman*. London: Fletcher & Son Ltd, Norwich.
17. Miller, A. (2002). *All My Sons*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban Publishers.
18. Olshtain, E. & Weinbach, L. (1987). Complaints: A study of Speech act behavior among native and nonnative speakers of Hebrew. In Verschueren, J. & Papi, M. (Eds.), *The Pragmatic Perspective* (p.195-200). John Benjamins B.V.
19. Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Language Teaching and applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
20. Trosborg, A. (1994). [Interlanguage pragmatics: requests, complaints, and apologies](#). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
21. Walaszewska, E. & Kisieleska-Krysiuk, M. & Piskorska, A. (Eds.) (2010). *In the Mind and Across Minds: A Relevance-Theoretic Perspective on Communication and Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge School Publishing.
22. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University press United Kingdom.
23. Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. (4thed). New York: Cambridge University press.