

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	i
Statement	ii
Preface	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Abstract	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.3 Aims of the Study	5
1.4 Scope of the Study	6
1.5 Reason for Choosing the Topic	6
1.6 Significance of the Study	7
1.7 Research Design	7
1.8 Organization of the Paper	9
1.9 Data Analysis	10
2. THEORETICAL REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2. Politeness	12
2.2.1 Goffman's Face Works	13
2.2.2 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies	16
2.2.3 Grice's Cooperative Principles	18
2.2.4 Leech's Principles of Politeness	19
2.3 Speech Act	20
2.3.1 Speech Act of Complaining	22
2.3.2 The Complaint as an Abusive Act	22
2.3.3 The Complaint as a Face Threatening Act	23

2.3.4 The Complaint as Retrospective and Prospective Acts.....	23
2.3.5 The Non – Politeness of Complaints	24
2.4 Felicity Condition	25
2.5 Complaint Strategies	26
2.5.1 Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987	26
2.5.2 Rinnert and Nogami’s Taxonomy, 2006	29
2.6 Term of Direct and Indirect Complaining Act	30
2.7 Gender	32
2.8 Gender and Politeness.....	34
2.9 The Language of Men and Women	37
2.10 Men and Women in Indonesia	40
2.11 Previous Studies on Complaint	42
2.12 Concluding Remarks	44
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	45
3.2. Aims of the Present Study	45
3.3. Method of research	46
3.4. Respondents of the Study	47
3.5. Data Collection	48
3.5.1 Discourse Completion Test	49
3.5.2. Interview	51
3.6 Data Analysis	52
3.7 Concluding Remarks	54
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	
4.1 Introduction	55
4.2 Data Presentation	55
4.3 Realizations of Speech Act of Complaining	57
4.4 Men and Women’s Realizations of Speech Act of Complaining	60
4.4.1 Hints	65
4.4.2. Annoyances	68
4.4.3. Ill Consequences	70

4.4.4. Indirect Accusation	72
4.4.5. Direct Accusation	74
4.4.6. Modified Blame	76
4.4.7 Explicit Blame (Behavior)	78
4.4.8. Explicit Blame (Person)	80
4.5. Style Differences between Men and Women in Complaining Act	82
4.6 Concluding Remarks	88
5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	
5.1 Introduction	89
5.2 Major Findings of the Study	90
5.2.1 Realizations of Speech Act of Complaining between Men and Women	90
5.2.2 The Influence of Gender Differences	91
5.3 Conclusions	94
5.4 Suggestions for Future Research	94
References	96
Appendix A Informed Consent	
Appendix B Demographic Information	
Appendix C Discourse Completion Test	
Appendix D Respondents' Responses	
Appendix E Distribution of Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg.....	
Appendix F Distribution of Complaint Strategies based on Rinnert and Nogami.....	
Official Letter of the Research Paper Title	
Curriculum Vitae	

List of Tables

Table 2.1	The Comparison of Speech Act Categories	21
Table 3.1	Advantages and Disadvantages of Gathering Natural Data	49
Table 3.2	Advantages and Disadvantages of DCT	51
Table 3.3	Complaint Strategies	52
Table 4.1	A description of situation along the dimensions of Speaker, Hearer, Setting, Social Distance, Relative Power, and Ranking of Imposition	56
Table 4.2	Distribution of Men's Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	58
Table 4.3	Distribution of Women's Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	58
Table 4.4	Distribution of Men To Men (MM)'s Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	63
Table 4.5	Distribution of Men To Women (MW)'s Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	63
Table 4.6	Distribution of Women To Women (WW)'s Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	64
Table 4.7	Distribution of Women To Men (WM)Complaint Strategies based on Trosborg	64

List of Figures

Figure 1	Distribution Chart for each gender (%)	60
Figure 2	Hints Distribution Chart	65
Figure 3	Annoyances' Distribution Chart	68
Figure 4	Ill Consequences' Distribution Chart	70
Figure 5	Indirect Accusation's Distribution Chart	72
Figure 6	Direct Accusation's Distribution Chart	74
Figure 7	Modified Blame's Distribution Chart	76
Figure 8	Explicit Blame (behavior)'s Distribution Chart	78
Figure 9	Explicit Blame (Person)'s Distribution Chart	80
Figure 10	Distribution Chart between Men and Women	82
Figure 11	Distribution Chart of Each Group (Trosborg, 1994).....	85
Figure 12	Distribution Chart of Each Group (Rinnert and Nogami, 2006).....	86