



## Complaint Discourse Features in Modality Forms *A Comparative Analysis of Japanese and Indonesian Internet Review*

Andhini Pratami Putri Rustandi

*Kanazawa University, Japan  
andhiniputripr@gmail.com*

### ABSTRACT

This paper describes a comparative study of complaint discourse in Japanese and Indonesian focusing on modality expression. 500 items of each language were collected from TripAdvisor and usage of modality were quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. As a result, modality forms have often been reported to be used to show consideration for the other person, such as avoidance of judgments and euphemisms, roundabout expressions or consideration (*hairyo*) for the other person are expressed. It was confirmed in complaint discourse, that there are cases in which have no consideration (*hairyo*) for the other person at all, rather than in a direct way of speaking. Both Japanese and Indonesian modality functioned effectively for expressing complaint. It was found that in “obvious complaint” the modality emphasizes the hotel’s faults and forces them to work appropriately, and in “implicit complaint”, the modality can express complaint with slightly reducing the burden on the hotel side by emphasizing the self-pay. The subject is used to determine whether an utterance expressing Complaint is “explicit/direct” or “implicit/indirect” in terms of the discourse level. In other words, the degree of FTA (Face Threat Act) differs depending on whether the subject is the writer (the guest) or the reader (the hotel). When the subject of “an act” is the reader (hotel side), the modality form functions to emphasize the reader’s fault (wrongness) or to force the reader (hotel side) to act. On the other hand, when the subject of “an act” was the writer, the function was to emphasize self-imposed burden or to understate the fault/burden of the reader (the hotel side).

### KEYWORDS

Complaint discourse; Consideration; Explicit complaint; Event feasibility; Implicit complaint modality; Subject

### ARTICLE INFO

*First received: 07 November 2022*

*Revised: 01 December 2022*

*Final proof accepted: 06 December 2022*

*Available online: 25 December 2022*

## INTRODUCTION

Conventional research on expressing complaints has focused on the direct expression of complaints as one of the verbal behaviors in the fields of sociolinguistics and Japanese language education, and discourse studies have been conducted by comparing Japanese learners and Japanese discourse by learners (Hatsushikano, Kumatoridani,

& Fujimori, 1996; Lee, 2006, etc.).

Expressing Complaint is an act that threatens the other person’s position, and it is a difficult act that can have a large impact on human relationships depending on how people use the words and how they talk (Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993; Hatsushikano, Kumatoridani, & Fujimori, 1996, Yamaoka, 2004). Also, as pointed out by Wongsamin (2016),

according to the politeness theory, expressing complaint is an act that violates the negative face of not wanting to be disturbed by the interlocutor. Therefore, it is considered necessary to consider appropriate linguistic forms in order to reduce the infringement of the other party's face and maintain human relationships. Specifically, the method of expressing complaint changes depending on the language used.

Comparing the following (1), (2), and (3), we can see that the strength of the speaker's assertion and the degree of the speaker's FTA was differ depending on the end of sentence expression (*bunmatsushi*).

- (1) このホテルは全く掃除していません。  
([www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp))

*Kono hōteru wa mattaku sōji shite imasen.*  
This hotel is not cleaned at all.

- (2) このホテルは全く掃除していないでしょう。  
([www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp))

*Kono hōteru wa mattaku sōji shite inaideshou.*  
This hotel may not be cleaned at all.

- (3) このホテルは全く掃除していないかもしれ  
ない。  
([www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp))

*Kono hōteru wa mattaku sōji shite inai kamo shirenai.*  
This hotel maybe is not cleaned at all.

In (1), by stating the proposition itself in the categorical form, we can feel the nuances of judging the other party. It is thought that (2) and (3) avoid making a conclusion or obliquely point out the other party's actions that have caused a disadvantage by expressing conjecture and possibility judgment. Sometimes, "maybe" has the function of avoiding the risk of FTA (Face Threatening Act) in which one's own utterance threatens the negative face of the other party (Yamaoka, 2016).

From the above, it is considered that the mode of expression of Complaint is closely related to the final expression (modality). However, the research on complaint expressions so far has focused on pragmatic analysis based on discourse markers, and there has not been much analysis of speech function in relation to grammatical forms. In particular, the modality forms are important in expressing complaints such as used based on what kind of function, how the usage differs in different languages, and what intentions the speaker has in

using the modality form, are not sufficiently analyzed.

Therefore, in this study, while relying on the results of previous complaints research, we will conduct a comparative analysis of internet review data of complaints expressed by Japanese and Indonesian speakers, with a particular focus on the use of modalities. By doing so, we will clarify the characteristics of Complaint expressed by Japanese and Indonesian speakers that have not been clarified so far.

## RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

### Research on Expressing Complaints

Ishizuka (2014) conducted a survey analysis of complaint expressions of customer service among Japanese native speakers and Korean learners of Japanese. According to Ishizuka, among native Japanese speakers, strategies of 'proposition' and explicit 'request for improvement' were often seen. Specific examples include, 「確かにそのような指示があったんでしょうか」 (*Tashika ni sono you na keiji ga attandeshouka*) 'Is there really such a notice?' and 「セール品であっても人が不快を感じる商品なら売らすべきではないと思います」 (*Seeru-hin de attemo hito ga fukai o kanjiru shouhin nara urubeki dewa nai to omoimasu*) 'Even if it's a sale item, I don't think you should sell it if it makes people feel uncomfortable'.

Wongsamin (2016) examines expressions of Complaint and responses to them through role-plays targeting Japanese and Thai native speakers. As a result, it has been clarified that Japanese native speakers (JNS) use strategies that seek explanations of causes and reasons, and objectively emphasize the consequences of situations. Specific examples include requests for explanations of reasons and the provision of general information, such as 「え？何で辞めちゃうの？」 (*E? nande yamechau no?*) 'What? Why are you quitting?' or 「だけど明日もう始まっちゃうでしょ」 (*Dakedo ashita mou hajimachatta yo!*) 'But it's starting tomorrow isn't it?'. On the other hand, Thai native speakers (TNS) emphasized their own disadvantages, and in addition, it was found that sarcasm and jokes were used as a characteristic strategy of TNS. As a specific example, the expressions such as 「せっかく紹介してあげたのに、私の面目が潰れちゃうじゃない」 (*Sekkaku*

*shoukai shite ageta noni, watashi no memboku ga tsuburechau janai*) 'I've taken the trouble to introduce you, but you're going to ruin my face' were used.

The overall tendency of Complaint expression strategies among native Japanese speakers is 'do not express Complaint' or even if they express Complaint, 'request for reason/explanation', 'express Complaint in a roundabout way', and use 'euphemistic expressions' (Choi, 2009; Lee, 2006; Jeong, 2005).

Puksi (2017) studied complaint expressions using an approach closest to this study. Puksi (2017) analyzed complaint speech act on an accommodation reservation site in Indonesia, and focused on review postings. Puksi (2017) examined complaint strategies and found that review posting is also related to actions that infringe on the other person's face, and the most commonly used complaint strategy is 'direct accusation', and 'annoyance'. In other words, it can be said that Indonesians prefer to use explicit and direct strategies and directly complain without considering the face of the reader (hotel side).

However, Puksi (2017) leaves some limitations. First, 160 cases of data are considered insufficient to understand complaints overall. In Puksi's (2017) study, the most fundamental problem is that there is no clear standard for identifying which of the reviews posted is a sentence with 'complaint'. Since there are no clear criteria, the subject of analysis may be subjective and prejudiced. To fill in this gap, as mentioned in Method section in this paper, we will not observe 'sentence' but 'discourse' of complaint as the object of analysis.

Based on the research on complaints, it is found that there are two aspects to the way complaint is expressed, and the criteria of 'explicit/direct' or 'implicit/indirect' can be different depends on the country and language. However, it is not clear what kind of clues are used to determine whether complaints are 'explicit/direct' or 'implicit/indirect'. Therefore, in this paper, we are also examining the clues necessary for judging whether Complaint utterances are 'explicit/direct' or 'implicit/indirect' at the discourse level.

### **Relation Between Expression of Complaint and Expression of Consideration**

In recent years, complaint expression studies have pointed out the importance of focusing on

modality-type behavior (Yamaoka, Makihara, & Ono, 2010; Yamaoka, 2016). Modality represents the speaker's attitude toward the proposition and the listener, and is one of the ways to understand the utterance as an expression of complaint. Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) and Yamaoka (2016) conducted research on expressions of Complaint within the study of considerate expressions. He states that the mental attitude expressed and the communicative attitude expressed by the final particle include the consideration to maintain the interpersonal relationship as good as possible. Therefore, the modality format is used to avoid the risk of FTA (Face Threatening Act) by intimidating the negative face of the interlocutor, to convey one's expectations without blaming the interlocutor, and to convey empathy.

Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) point out that expressing Complaint constitutes an FTA (Face Threatening Act), which may damage human relations and is related to Leech's (1983) politeness principle. Leech (1983) has the following principles regarding evaluation of others.

- Approbation (a) Minimize blaming others  
Maxim (b) Maximize admiration for others

Since expressing complaint is 'blaming others', it should be avoided as much as possible or express it passively (Yamaoka, Makihara, & Ono, 2010, p. 183). In addition, Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono described that the mental attitudes expressed in modality including end sentence particles are important, and often include considerations which help to improve the interpersonal relationship. Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) and Yamaoka (2016) discuss that '*kamo shirenai*', '*temo ii*' and '*mono (end sentence particles)*' are often used to avoid the risk of FTA (Face Threatening Act) that threatens the negative face of the interlocutor, to convey one's expectations without blaming the other party, and to convey empathy.

According to Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) and Yamaoka (2016), it is possible that modalities are actively used in complaint discourse. To confirm this prediction, this study decided to analyze the relationship between complaint discourse and modality form deeper. By analyzing the modalities, this study expected to clarify the characteristics of complaint discourse, and the rule of pragmatic modalities usage in general.

## The Framework of The Analysis

There are representative studies on Japanese modality theory, including Nitta (1991), Miyazaki, Adachi, Noda, and Takanashi, (2002), and Japanese Descriptive Grammar Research Group (2003). On the other hand, Alwi (1992) is the only study representing Indonesian modality theory. However, the modality theory in Japanese and Indonesian have very different frameworks, and it is expected that it will be difficult to analyze if these modality theories are adopted.

Hence, this research used the framework of Palmer (2001), edited by Descriptive Grammar Research Group (2003), and focuses on cognitive Epistemic modalities, evidential modalities, binding modalities, and communicative modalities.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Data Collection

The data was collected from reviews posted on the Japanese version of TripAdvisor and the Indonesian version of TripAdvisor. A total of 1,000 reviews were collected, including 500 reviews in Indonesian and 500 reviews in Japanese. Data were collected by the following procedure. We extracted reviews written between 2015 and 2019. For Japanese data, the targeted reviews are those written between 100 to 1,000 characters, and for Indonesian, the targeted reviews are those written between 30 to 800 words. The target hotels are hotels in the metropolitan area in both Japan and Indonesia.

In addition, among the 5 levels of hotel evaluation (“very good,” “good,” “average,” “bad,” and “very bad”), only reviews with “very bad” and “bad” ratings were included in this study. We defined it as ‘Complaint discourse’, and analyzed the modality forms that appear in the whole complaint discourse. On the other hand, the reviews that evaluated the hotel as “very good” or “good” was analyzed as ‘satisfaction discourse’.

In this study, we compared ‘Complaint discourse’ and ‘satisfied discourse’ to investigate the emergence of modalities in Complaint discourse. The extraction procedure for satisfying discourse was the same as for Complaint discourse, and 250 data were collected. The total number of words in Complaint discourse in Japanese was 97,045 words, and the total number of words in

satisfied discourse was 35,030 words. In contrast, 63,539 Indonesian Complaint discourses and 23,448 satisfying discourses were collected.

### Data Analysis

This research consists of two stages: quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis. First, we clarify the usage trends of modalities appearing in word-of-mouth submissions by quantitative analysis. Based on the results of the quantitative analysis, we clarify the functions and usage context of the modality form through quantitative and qualitative analysis. For the quantitative analysis, we use the free software “KH Coder” for quantitative text analysis. KH Coder was developed by Koichi Higuchi (2014) of Ritsumeikan University, and is software that can extract words, search documents, perform morphological analysis, and set and aggregate search conditions (coding rules). Since KH Coder does not read the modality format, it is necessary to specify the vocabulary (modality format) to be extracted in advance using a function called “word selection”. Since most modality forms are compound forms, there are many exceptions to selection by part of speech.

Therefore, in this research, the modality form to be extracted is specified in advance using a function called “Forced Extraction Word Specification”, and forced extraction is performed. In addition, based on the results extracted by KH Coder, a function called KWIC concordance is used to confirm and consider the usage trends of modality format in posting reviews. Since most modality forms are compound forms, there are many exceptions to selection by part of speech. Therefore, in this study, we registered the modality complex form to be extracted in advance by using the function of ‘Forced Extraction Word Specification’ and forced extraction.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

According to Matsuki (1992), the point of gaze (the object seen) is mainly placed on the actor, while the person on whom the point of view (the place to see) is placed indicated by the verb of the sentence related to the point of view. In line with this point, this study focuses on the point of gaze and clarifies the function of modality forms in discourse of Complaint.

From this section onwards, the ‘gazing point’ is referred to as the ‘subject’ and refers to the actor.



Depending on the person who is the subject, the manner in which Complaint expressed is different. Another important factor in the characteristics of Complaint discourse in Japanese and Indonesian is the ‘feasibility of event’. This point will be explained through a case analysis.

### Complaint Discourse in Japanese

Table 1 shows the appearance frequency of modalities in Complaint discourse and satisfied discourse in Japanese. A chi-square test of independence was performed using a cross-tabulation table.

Table 1: Appearance frequency of modalities in Complaint and satisfied discourse in Japanese.

The Form of Modality	Complaint Discourse	Satisfied Discourse	pValue
	97,045 Words	35,030 Words	
Epistemic Modality	244	45	2.420522 e-05(<0.0001)**
Interactive Modality	239	93	0.5
Evidential Modality	166	33	0.001**
Deontic Modality	137	24	0.0008**
<b>Total</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>195</b>	

\* :p < 0.05, \*\* :p < 0.01

From Table 1, when the p-value level is <0.05 (significant difference), the Epistemic modality, evidentiary modality, and Deontic modality showed significant differences among the four modalities. Only the communicative modality was non-significant. From this, it can be said that the Epistemic modality, the evidentiary modality, and the binding modality are actively used in Complaint discourse.

This will focus only on the evidentiary modality and the binding modality in Complaint discourse in Japanese. For the list of modality forms, refer to Japanese Descriptive Grammar Research Group (2003) and discuss qualitatively in “Evidential modality” section.

### Evidential Modalities

Evidential modalities in Japanese are expressed in modality forms such as ‘(suru) sou/(shi) souda’, ‘mitaida’, ‘rashii’, and ‘youda’. In this section, we discuss only the modality type ‘(suru) sou/(shi) souda’. The combination of ‘(suru) sou/(shi) souda’ appears 68 times. That’s right” will be picked up and analyzed. Looking at them individually, only two modalities of ‘(suru) sou’ could be confirmed, so only ‘(shi) sou’ will be taken up for analysis.

According to Morita (1990) and Kekidze (2003), ‘(shi) sou’ is an expression that avoids assertion against things that can be affirmed, or an expression that is uttered out of consideration and consideration for the other party. However, the ‘(shi) sou’ in Complaint discourse has a nuance of actively negatively evaluating the reader (the hotel side), unlike the meaning that has been reported so far as showing consideration.

In Japanese Descriptive Grammar Study Group (2003, p.173), it is mentioned that ‘(shi) sou’ expresses the subject’s disposition and internal state being observed as an external appearance. and being involved in ‘already-realized events’, ‘(shi) sou’ came to have the function of ‘positive negative evaluation’. In the case of “positive negative evaluation”, the writer (guest) uses ‘(shi) sou’ to express a positive negative evaluation of the reader’s (hotel’s) response and facial expressions to emphasize the bad points.

This will be described below with specific examples.

- (1) 今回も○○○(ホテル名)の公式サイトより予約をさせて頂いて「KING PREMIUM DELUXE」を予約させて頂いたら、返信メールで「KING PREMIUM DELUXE, 禁煙確認済み」との事で禁煙部屋が確保されたかと思いきや、チェックインの際に「禁煙部屋は満室で喫煙部屋になります！！」と、当たり前の感じで言われた (後略)

「希望だけで、確約ではありませんので・・・以下意味不明な説明」と高圧的で当たり前の感じで説明があり、ヤニ臭い部屋はダメなので

再度お願いしたところ、明らかにめんどくさそうな感じで、「ツインの部屋なら禁煙部屋があります。」とのことで、明らかに格下げされたツインの部屋に宿泊する事になりました。

(www.tripadvisor.co.jp)

*Konkai mo rei rei ○(hoteru-mei) no kōshiki saito yori yoyaku o sa sete itadaite i 'kingu puremiamu DELUXE'*

*o yoyaku sa sete itadaitara, henshin mēru de 'kingu puremiamu DELUXE, kin'en kakunin-zumi' to no koto de kin'en heya ga kakuho sa reta ka to omoiki ya, chekkuin no sai ni 'kin'en heya wa manshitsu de kitsuen heya ni narimasu!!' To, atarimaena kanji de iwa reta (kōryaku)*

*'Kibō dake de, kakuyakude wa arimasen'node ika imi fumeina setsume' to kōatsu-tekide atarimaena kanji de setsume' ga ari, yani kusai heya wa damenanode saido onegai shita tokoro, akiraka ni mendokusa-sōna kanji de, 'tsuin no heyana kin'en heya ga arimasu.' To no koto de, akiraka ni kakusage sa reta tsuin no heya ni shukuhaku suru koto ni narimashita.*

This time as well, I made a reservation from the official website of ○○○ (hotel name), and when I made a reservation for “KING PREMIUM DELUXE,” I received a reply email saying, “KING PREMIUM DELUXE, non-smoking confirmed.” I thought it was secured, but when I checked in, I was told in a natural way, “The non-smoking room is full and it will be a smoking room!”

“It’s just a request, not a promise, so the explanation below doesn’t make sense.” When I asked again, they said, “There is a non-smoking room for twin rooms.”

In data (1), the subject of ‘mendōkusai (troublesome)’ is the reader (the hotel), and the state of ‘mendōkusai (troublesome)’ is the internal state of the reader (the hotel), which can be observed from the expression of the reader (the hotel). Here, the writer (guest) is thought to have emphasized the poor response and facial expression of the reader (the hotel) by adding “sō”. In other words, ‘(shi) sou’ fulfilled the function of ‘active negative evaluation’. From this, there is a possibility that the face of the reader (hotel side) is threatened, and it seems that Leech (1983)’s approval maxim was violated.

Another factor is the ‘feasibility of the event’, and ‘(shi) sou’ means ‘an event that has already happened’. In other words, there is a nuance that the writer (customer) focuses on the finished situation and strongly points out the other party. In fact, except for ‘(shi) sou’, it is possible to simply write “Akiraka ni mendokusai kanjide...(It’s obviously troublesome...)”, but the writer (customer) intends ‘(shi) sou’. It is thought that by using it in a generic way, it is easy to take on the nuance that emphasizes the undesirable situation, such as ‘mendokusasona kanjide...(it seems to be troublesome)’. Similar examples is as follows.

- (2) その後 28 階に上がり、レストランへ向かう。  
事前に話していた支払いについて確認する。

少々手間になる方法で処理を依頼していたが、いざ当日になると、こちら (ホテル) として間違ったらお客様に面倒がかかるため、できればその方法はさげたいとのこと。

でも事前にその方法を提案したのはその担当者本人。何故当日になってできないと言いつづけるのか？

支払いはそれぞれ割り勘だったが、違うタイミングで支払おうとしたところ、「まだ支払っていない方いらっしゃるんですか？」と気だるそうなトーンで言われた (苦笑) この時点でもう次は無いかと確信。(後略)

(www.tripadvisor.co.jp)

*Sonogo 28-kai ni agari, resutoran e mukau.*

*Jizen ni hanashite ita shiharai ni tsuite kakumin suru.*

*Shōshō tema ni naru hōhō de shori o irai shite itaga, iza tōjitsu ni naru to, kochira (hoteru) to shite machigattara okyakusama ni mendō ga kakaru tame, dekireba sono hōhō wa saketai to no koto.*

*Demo jizen ni sono hōhō o teian shita no wa sono tantōsha hon'nin. Naze tōjitsu ni natte dekinai to iidasu no ka?*

*Shiharai wa sozore warikandattaga, chigau taimingu de shiharaou to shita tokoro, 'mada shiharattenai kata irassharu ndesu ka?' To kedaru-sōna tōn de iwa reta (kushō) kono jiten de mō tsugi wa nai na to kakushin. (Kōryaku)*

After that, go up to the 28th floor and head to the restaurant.

Confirm the payment we were talking about earlier. They had asked for it to be handled in a way that was a little time-consuming, but when it came to the day, they would like to avoid that method if possible, as it would be troublesome for the customer if they (the hotel) made a mistake.

But it was the person in charge who proposed the method in advance. Why do you say you can't do it on the day of the day?

We split the bill, but when we tried to pay at different times, he said in a languid tone, “Is there anyone who hasn't paid yet?” (Omitted)

The state of (2) ‘kidarui (drowsiness)’ is the internal state of the reader (the hotel side) and can be observed from the reader’s (the hotel side) facial expression. Here, the writer (guest) is thought to use ‘(shi) sou’ to emphasize the bad point (mistake) of the reader (hotel side). In reality, except for ‘(shi) sou’, it is possible to simply write ‘kidarui toon de iwareta (said in a languid tone)’. It is thought that by using it in a generic way, it is easy to take on the nuance that emphasizes an undesirable situation, such as ‘kidarui toon de iwareta (said in a languid tone)’.

### *Deontic Modalities*

Binding modalities in Japanese are expressed in forms such as ‘*houga ii* (should)’, ‘*nakereba naranai* (must)’, ‘*bekida* (should)’, ‘*nai to ikenai* (should/have to)’, ‘*temo ii* (may)’, but we focus only on the modality form ‘*nakereba naranai* (must)’.

In Complaint discourse, ‘*nakereba naranai/naito ikenai* (must)’ expresses that it is unacceptable that the situation does not happen, that it is indispensable, but when the subject is the ‘writer’ and the ‘actual event’ already happened, this fulfill the function of “clarifying the responsibility of others”. “Clarification of the responsibility of others” means that the reader (hotel side) is not responsible for a situation where the writer (guest) is doing unnecessary acts. It was confirmed that 14 cases of ‘*nakereba naranai/naito ikenai* (must)’ fulfilled this function. A specific example is the following (3).

- (3) すべてが最悪の滞在でした。  
チェックインでは、フロントで散々待たされて、横で次々にチェックインしていく人々を横目に、フロントからは何の説明もないままに立ち続けていました。  
最後にはしびれを切らして、フロントの担当に何が問題かを聞いたところ、予約が見つからないとの事。私が確認番号を言って、やっとチェックインが進みました。  
あのまま私が何も尋ねなければ、あの後、どれくらい立っていなければならなかったのでしょうか？ (中略)  
何から何まで低レベルで、どこを直したらいいかわからない最悪のホテルです。

[www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp)

*Subete ga saiaku no taizaideshita.*

*Chekkuinde wa, furonto de sanzan matasa rete, yoko de tsugitsugini chekkuin shite iku hitobito o yokome ni, furonto kara wa nani no setsumei mo nai mama ni tachi tsudzukete imashita.*

*Saigo ni wa shibire o kirashite, furonto no tantō ni nani ga mondai ka o kiita tokoro, yoyaku ga mitsukaranai to no koto. Watashi ga kakunin bangō o itte, yatto chekkuin ga susumimashita.*

*Anomama watashi ga nani mo tazumenakereba, ano go, dorekurai tatte inakereba naranakatta nodeshou? (Chūryaku)*

*Nanikarananimade tei reberu de, doko o naoshitara i ka wakaranai saiaku no hoterudesu.*

All in all it was the worst stay ever.

At check-in, I was made to wait for a long time at the front desk, and while looking sideways at people checking in one after another, I kept standing without any explanation from the front desk.

Finally, when I got impatient and asked what the problem was with the person in charge at the front desk, they said they couldn’t find the reservation. I gave the confirmation number and finally check-in proceeded.

If I didn’t ask him anything, how long would he have to stand after that? (Omitted)

It is the worst hotel where it is low level and does not know where to fix anything.

In (3), the writer (guest) actually did the act of ‘*tatte iru* (standing)’, even though it was not necessary to do so. The writer (guest) is the actor of ‘*tatte inakereba naranai* (I must stand)’, and the writer (guest) gives the impression that he/she is a victim and that the reader (hotel side) made him/her wait for a long time and ask for the hotel responsibility.

If we exclude ‘*nakereba naranai* (must)’, the phrase ‘*ano ato, dorekurai tatteitanodeshou* (how long have I have been standing after that?)’ does not have the intention of questioning the reader (the hotel side), and is simply an utterance such as ‘self-confirmation’ or ‘internal speech’. In other words, it is thought that the writer (guest) of (3) chose a strategy of indirectly expressing Complaint using ‘*nakereba naranai* (must)’. In addition, (3) is related to ‘events that have already happened’, so the writer (guest) emphasized the bad points of the reader (hotel side). More direct terms also used as seen in example (4).

- (4) 施設は、以前全日空ホテルとして利用していた頃より、ゴージャスにはなりました。しかし、フロントの対応やレストランの対応には難があります。  
良かったのは、ベルさんだけです。特にチェックインしてもらった女性、眼鏡をかけた女性は最悪でした。  
長く待たせたのにお待たせいたしましたの一言もなく、わたしの姿は視野に入っているにもかかわらず、わたしがその女性の目の前に立つまで、反応もしません。  
その間ずっとわたしは待っていたのです。一言くらいお詫びを言うべきです。

[www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp)

*Shisetsu wa, izen Zen’nikkū hoteru to shite riyō shūte ita koro yori, gōjasu ni wa narimashita.*

*Shikashi, furonto no taiō ya resutoran no taiō ni wa nan ga arimasu.*

*Yokatta no wa, Beru-san dakedesu.  
Tokuni chekkuin shite moratta josei, megane o kaketa  
josei wa saiakudeshita.  
Nagaku mata seta no ni omataseitashimashita no  
hitokoto mo naku, watashi no sugata wa shiya ni haitte  
iru nimokakawarazu, watashi ga sono josei no me no  
mae ni tatsu made, han'nō mo shimasen.  
Sonoaida zutto watashi wa matte ita nodesu.  
Hitokoto kurai owabi o iubekidesu.*

The facility has become more gorgeous than when it was used as an All Nippon Airways hotel before. However, correspondence of the front desk and correspondence of restaurant have difficulty. The only good thing was Mr. Bell. Woman who had you check in in particular, woman who wore glasses were the worst. She made me wait a long time, but she didn't say a word, and even though she had me in her sight, she didn't react until I stood in front of her. All the while I was waiting. I should say a word of apology.

In (4), the writer (guest) is trying to clarify where the responsibility lies with the reader (hotel side), which is common to (3). However, in (4), the use of 'bekida (should)' allows the writer (guest) to point out the bad points (mistakes) of the reader (hotel side) in a straightforward manner, and the reader (hotel side) takes responsibility. The writer (guest) explicitly expressed his Complaint with the reader (the hotel) which made him/her waited. On the other hand, the subject of 'tatte iru (standing)' in (3) is the writer (guest), and it is thought that he expressed his Complaint more obliquely and indirectly than in (4). In the following (5), as in (3), the writer (guest) expresses his burden grandly.

- (5) ずっと宿泊したいと思っていた○○○(ホテル名)。○○○(ホテル名)のスタッフはこちらから声を掛けないといけないレベルで、ちょっと客を選んで対応している印象があり、チェックインからちょっと嫌な予感はしていました。その予感は時間の経過とともに的中。(中略) ルームサービスの提供時説明が不足していたり、レストランの予約時に再三の連絡の末にうまく希望が伝わっていないなど、スタッフの処理能力はビジネスホテルレベル。(中略) スタッフのサービスはまだまだ改善の余地があると思う。が、あまり期待はしていない。

([www.tripadvisor.co.jp](http://www.tripadvisor.co.jp))

*Zutto shukuhaku shitai to omotte ita ○○○(Hoteru-mei).  
○○○ (Hoteru-mei) no sutaffu wa kochira kara koe o  
kakenaito ikenai reberu de, chotto kyaku o erande taiō  
shite iru inshō ga ari, chekkuin kara chotto iyanayokan  
wa shite imashita.*

*Sono yokan wa jikan no keika to tomoni tekichū.  
(Chūryaku)  
Rūmusābisu no teikyō-ji setsumeiji ga fusoku shite i tari,  
resutoran no yoyaku-ji ni saisan no renraku no sue ni  
umaku kibō ga tsutawatte inai nado, sutaffu no shori  
nōryoku wa bijinesuhoterureberu. (Chūryaku)  
Sutaffu no sã bisu wa madamada kaizen no yochi ga aru  
to omou. Ga, amari kitai wa shite inai.*

I've always wanted to stay at ○○○ (hotel name). The staff at ○○○ (hotel name) was at a level where I had to call out to them, and I had the impression that they were picking out customers and responding to them, so I had a bad feeling from the time I checked in. The premonition is true with the passage of time. (Omitted) The staff's processing ability is at the level of a business hotel, such as lack of explanation when providing room service, and not being able to communicate well after repeated contact when reserving a restaurant. (Omitted) I think the staff's service still has room for improvement. But I don't expect much.

In data (5), since the act of 'koe o kakeru (calling out)' was not carried out by the hotel, the writer (guest) had to carry out the act of 'koe o kakeru (calling out)' to the hotel staff. In other words, the act of 'calling out' should be the responsibility of the reader (hotel side), but in reality this is not the case, and the writer (guest) must try to make the reader (the hotel side) who had to call him/her aware of where the responsibility lies, while using it to express his burden clearly. In (3) and (5) above, the writer (guest) expresses his own burden more than (4), so the risk of face infringement of the reader (hotel side) can be avoided.

## Complaint Discourse in Indonesian

This section examines the emergence of modality forms in Complaint discourse in Indonesian. Table 2 summarizes the appearance of modalities in Complaint discourse and satisfied discourse in Indonesian.

From the data presented in Table 2, the Epistemic modality showed a p-value of 0.0002, indicating a significant difference. Another significant difference was found in Deontic modalities. From this data, it can be said that the binding modality was actively used in Complaint discourse.



Table 2: Appearance frequency of Complaint discourse and satisfied discourse in Indonesian.

The Form of Modality	Complaint Discourse	Satisfied Discourse	pValue
	97,045 Words	35,030 Words	
Epistemic Modality	212	43	0.0002**
Interactive Modality	117	31	0.1
Evidential Modality	33	14	0.6
Deontic Modality	264	42	1.3959 26e-09 <0.0001* *
<b>Total</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>130</b>	

\* :p < 0.05, \*\* :p < 0.01

Next, the analysis will be focusing only on Epistemic modalities and binding modalities. As the Indonesian modality formats listed based on Alwi's (1992).

### *Epistemic Modalities*

The Epistemic modalities in Indonesian are 'Mungkin (maybe)', 'Pasti (must be)', 'Seharusnya (should be)', 'Kira (may be)', and 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan (I hope)'. From these expressions, we focus only on the modality "Semoga/Mudah-mudahan", which expresses prayers. This is because the modality of 'prayer' in 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan' appears in Complaint discourse, but not in satisfied discourse. Moreover, we could not confirm its use in Complaint discourse in Japanese.

According to Alwi (1992), 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan' is basically used as an adverb, and its basic meaning is to describe an uncontrolled situation. It is pointed out that it represents It is also said to express the speaker's wishes and expectations toward God. In Indonesia, which has a strong relationship with religion, 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan' is often used in daily conversation as a word that expresses 'prayer' or 'hope' to God.

In Complaint discourse, the writer (customer) can use expressions with a high degree of assertion, such as imperative and request, but by using 'wish/hope', they are passively making efforts to convey they means to the reader. Therefore, in this paper, we refer to this as a "passive demand for

action". From the data, there are 22 use of 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan' which found to perform this function. The characteristic of 'Semoga/Mudah-mudahan' use is shown in a specific example as (6) below.

- (6) Nama hotel dengan embel2 ○, tentunya bukan hanya sekedar nama, tapi juga gambaran kualitas mutu pelayanan.  
 Tp sayangnya untuk ○ yg satu ini jauh dari harapan.  
 Apalagi perjalanan dari ○hotel lanjut ke ○hotel yg berkualitas, ujungnya ○ yg levelnya jauh beda padahal harga yg hampir sama.  
 Mudah-mudahan bisa lebih ditingkatkan  
 (www.tripadvisor.co.id)

The hotel name with the appendage ○, of course, is not just a name, but also a description of the quality of service quality.

But unfortunately for ○ this one is far from expectations.

Moreover, the trip from ○hotel to ○ a quality hotel, in the end ○ with a much different level even though the price is almost the same.

Hopefully can be more be improved

The sentence (6), 'Mudah-mudahan bisa lebih ditingkatkan (I hope it can be improved)', is expressed as if the writer (guest) asked 'God', and hoped that the hotel would respond by God's power. However, 'Mudah-mudahan' in (6) no longer actually expressed a 'wish' to God. The subject of "Improve" is the reader (the hotel side), and they demand the realization of the act of "Improvement".

However, even if the subject of "Improve" is the reader (hotel side), by using "wish/hope", the reader reached passively and refrain from asserting. Therefore, it is thought that the risk of face infringement on the part of the reader (hotel side) can be avoided because the approach to the other party is not strong and the criticism of others is minimized. From the perspective of 'feasibility of events', 'Mudah-mudahan' means 'unrealized event'. In other words, the writer (guest) focused on the situation related to what the hotel had to do in the future.

From the above (6), 'mudah-mudahan' does not originally have the function of requesting action, but in Complaint discourse, it is thought that it acquired the function of requesting action from 'prayer'. Even though the writer (guest) uses the 'prayer/wish' to direct a certain action (improvement), it is up to the reader (the hotel side)

to accept or reject the action. The function of such a “passive action request” can be better understood by comparing it with (7) below, which makes an action request more explicitly.

- (7) *memilih hotel ini karna recomend temen tapi di sayangkan tidur terganggu dengan suara kereta yang lewat memang posisi hotel berdekatan dengan rel kereta jadi terganggu istirahatnya untuk resepsionis klo saya tlp angkat dong dan jgn judes klo menerima keluhan kesah tamu saya kira kemarin Bisa pindah Kamar tapi malah di cuekin gitu*

[www.tripadvisor.co.id](http://www.tripadvisor.co.id)

I chose this hotel because of a friend's recommendation but it's a shame that sleep is disturbed by the sound of passing trains, indeed the position of the hotel is close to the railroad tracks, so your rest is disturbed for the receptionist if I call pick up and don't get bitchy if the guests complaint I think yesterday we can change room but instead we were ignored, just like that

In (7), the writer (customer) made the reader perform the act of 'tlp/telpon (calling)' using the communicative modality 'dong'. According to Kridalaksana (2011), 'dong' has the function of pointing out the mistake on the part of the addressee (directly pointing out the reader's mistake) like in (7). In (7), the writer (guest) uses 'dong (yo)' to directly point out and criticize the reader's (hotel's) mistakes.

“dong” is more straight forward than a modality that expresses a wish/hope, such as “Semoga/mudah-mudahan”. In other words, there is a high possibility of infringing on the face of the reader (hotel side). On the other hand, 'Semoga/mudah-mudahan' has the function of indirectly making the reader (the hotel side) act, so the utterance was relaxed and the expression became a roundabout expression.

### **Deontic Modalities**

In Indonesian, binding modalities are expressed in forms such as 'Harus (must)', 'Wajib (must do)', 'Boleh (maybe)', and 'Baiknya (better)'. But in this paper, only 'Harus (must)' will be discussed.

Looking back, in the Complaint discourse in Japanese, there is not a single example of the type that compels the reader to act, and it is said that the reader (the hotel side) is made aware of where responsibility lies. However, in the Complaint

discourse in Indonesian, unlike Japanese, 'Harus' was found to force the reader to act.

In Complaint discourse in Indonesian, the writer (customer) strongly and positively appealed to the reader by using expressions with a high degree of assertion such as 'Harus (must)'. Accordingly, in this paper, we have referred to it as a “positive demand for action”. Twenty cases of 'Harus (must)' with the function of “positive action demands” were confirmed, as example (8) below.

- (8) *Ada salah satu teman saya yg dtng dr daerah dan menginap d hotel 000 tugu tani dekat kedubes USA, pada saat breakfast, salah satu staf restorannya melarang duduk meja breakfast ketika menginap di hotel 000, pelayanannya terhadap teman saya sangat buruk sekali, apakah pihak MANAGEMENT atau FO MANAGER nya tidak mengajarkan kesopanan dlm tutur bahasa terhadap tamu2 nya.. harusnya hotel berbintang itu pelayanannya lebih sopan dan tutur bahasanya lebih baik, bahkan Harus professional dlm bekerja. tetapi ini tidak sama sekali, malah membuat tamu kecewa..amat sangat disayangkan sekali..*

[www.tripadvisor.co.id](http://www.tripadvisor.co.id)

One of my friends came from the area and stayed at the 000 Tugu Tani hotel near the US Embassy, at breakfast, one of the restaurant staff forbade sitting at the breakfast table when staying at the hotel 000, the service to my friend was very bad, does the MANAGEMENT or FO MANAGER not teach politeness in speech to the guests.. the star-rated hotel should have more polite service and speak the language better, Must even be professional at work. but this is not at all, instead it makes guests disappointed..very very unfortunate.

In (8), “Harus (must)” is used. This created the impression that the writer (guest) was giving strong orders or pointing out to the reader (hotel). The writer (guest) used 'Harus (must)' to ask the reader (hotel side) to act in a straightforward manner, 'doing a job properly like a professional'. 'Harus' expresses 'an unrealized event', like 'Semoga/mudah-mudahan', which is good. In other words, it was found that the writers (guests) paid more attention to the improvement points on the hotel side.

“Harus” was used to indicate that the writer (guest) was in a higher position than the reader (the hotel). In terms of social status, the position of 'customer' is considered to be higher than the position of 'clerk', and has more power. The reason

why the function of ‘positive demand for action’ appears only in Indonesian is that Indonesian society is very conscious of the fact that ‘guest’ is a person of high social status and power.

## Discussion

The results and analysis results are described above. It has been reported that conventional modality forms are often used to show consideration for others, such as avoiding assertions and euphemistic expressions (Yamaoka, Makihara, & Ono, 2010; Yamaoka, 2016). It was also confirmed that the discourse does not simply express consideration for the other person in a roundabout way, but is rather direct and does not include consideration for the other person at all. Details are summarized in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7: Characteristics of expressions of Complaint seen from modalities.

	<b>Complaint Discourse Functions of Modality Forms</b>	<b>Japanese</b>	<b>Indonesian</b>
1.	Explicit Complaint A. I emphasized the bad point (mistake) of the reader (hotel side). B. The reader (the hotel side) was forced to act.	✓	✓
2.	Implicit Complaint A. Emphasized self-pay. B. It showed consideration for readers (hotel side) and relaxation of claims. C. The error/burden on the part of the reader (the hotel side) has been reduced.	✓	✓

From Table 7, the modalities of Complaint discourse in Japanese and Indonesian had two aspects: ‘explicit complaint’ and ‘implicit complaint’. In the case of ‘explicit complaint’, the modality format emphasizes the bad point (mistake) of the reader (hotel side) or forces the reader (hotel side) to act. On the other hand, in the case of ‘implicit complaint’, the modality format

emphasizes self-payment, cares for the reader (hotel side), relaxes the assertion, and moderates the fault/burden of the reader (hotel side).

In this regard, the results are somewhat different from those of previous complaint studies.

Japanese native speakers (JNS) use a strategy of objectively emphasizing the outcome of the situation when expressing their complaint (Wongsamin, 2016), not expressing complaint, or even expressing complaint, ‘indirect complaint’ and it is mentioned that there is a high tendency to use the ‘euphemistic expression’ strategy, but by observing the modalities of Complaint discourse, it has two aspects: ‘explicit complaint’ and ‘implicit complaint’.

This research is a further development of how modality forms other than ‘*kamoshirenai* (maybe)’, ‘*temo ii*’ and ‘end sentence particles (*mono*)’ are related to complaint as found by Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) and Yamaoka (2016). However, unlike the results reported by Yamaoka, Makihara, and Ono (2010) and Yamaoka (2016), the modality format in complaint discourse does not only include consideration for maintaining good interpersonal relationships with the other party. In complaint discourse, when the subject of “certain action” is the reader (hotel side), the modality format emphasizes the reader’s bad point (wrong) or forces the reader (hotel side) to act fulfilled its function. It may infringe on the reader’s face because it greatly expresses criticism to others. On the other hand, when the subject of ‘a certain act’ is the writer, it has the function of emphasizing self-burden and moderating the fault/burden of the reader (the hotel side). By doing so, it is thought that the risk of face infringement on the part of the reader (hotel side) can be avoided.

In this way, we observed characteristics that differed from dialogue situations that had been mainly dealt with in previous research on expressions of complaint. The approach of clarifying the characteristics of complaint expressions in Japanese and Indonesian by focusing on the modality form is also valid, and it is expected that new knowledge about linguistic differences in complaint expressions will be obtained.

Finally, the similarities and differences between Japanese and Indonesian are as summarized in Table 8.

Table 8: Necessary cues for judging complaint utterances.

		Japanese	Indone- sian
Subject	Reader (hotel side)	✓	✓
	writer (guest)	✓	✗
Feasi- bility of events	<b>already realized situation</b> Prefers to look back and pay more attention to the mistakes that the reader (hotel side) caused in the past	✓	✗
	<b>Unrealized</b> The writer (guest) prefers to focus on the situation related to what needs to be done to the reader (hotel side) by focusing on the improvement points.	✗	✓

As can be seen from Table 8, there are cases in which the subject of complaint discourse in Japanese is the reader (the hotel) and the writer (the guest) as the subject. On the other hand, complaint discourse in Indonesian is centered on the reader (hotel side) as the subject. From the point of view of 'feasibility of events', complaint discourse in Japanese mainly expresses 'already-realized' situations. From this, it can be said that native Japanese speakers prefer to pay more attention to and look back on mistakes that the reader (the hotel side) caused in the past. On the other hand, one characteristic of complaint discourse in Indonesian is that it prefers to express 'unrealized' situations. In other words, the writer (guest) can express to the reader (the hotel side) what needs to be done in the future by focusing on the points to be improved.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we clarified natural complaint expressions in both Japanese and Indonesian for the purpose of posting reviews, and we were able to observe characteristics that differed from

previous research results about discourse in conversations. In addition, by examining the function of modalities characteristic of Japanese and Indonesian complaint discourses, we confirmed the similarities and differences between Japanese and Indonesian in complaint discourses. Judging whether the complaint utterance is 'explicit/direct' or 'implicit/indirect' at the discourse level, it depends on the 'subject'. In other words, depending on whether the subject is the writer (guest) or the reader (hotel side), the degree of FTA (action that infringes on the face) will differ.

There are many issues that should be further studied in the future. A particularly important issue is to verify whether clues such as 'subject' and 'feasibility of an event' are effective outside of review posts. We only focused on analyzing evidential modality ('*suru souda/shi souda*'), binding modality '*nakereba naranai*', epistemic modality '*Semoga/mudah-mudahan*', and binding modality '*Harus*' (must), but other modality types need to be considered as well. Hence, the analysis to the structure of complaint discourse and the interaction between the writer (guest) and the reader (hotel side) also will be conducted in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Alwi, H. (1992). *Modality in Indonesian Language*. Jakarta: Kanius Press.
- Choi, D. W. (2009). Fuman hyōmei to sore ni taisuru ōtō - Chūgokugo-bogo washa to Nihongo-washa o hikaku shite [Complaints and responses - Comparison between Japanese native speakers and Japanese speaker]. *Tabunka Sesshoku Bamen no Gengo kōdō to Gengo Kanri*, 7, 43 - 63.
- Hatsushikano, K., Kumatoridani, T., & Fujimori, H. (1996). Fuman hyōmei sutorateji no shiyō keikō - Nihongobogowasha to Nihongogakushūsha no hikaku [Trends in using dissatisfaction strategies - Comparison between Japanese native speakers and Japanese learners]. *Nihongo Kyōiku*, 88, 128-139.
- Higuchi, K. (2014). *Shakai Chōsa no tame no Keiryō Tekisuto Bunseki Naiyō Bunseki no Keishō to Hatten o Mezashite* [Aiming at succession and development of lightweight text analysis for social research for social research]. Tokyo: Nakanishiya Shuppan.
- Ishizuka, Y. (2014). Sekkyaku-bamen ni okeru Nihongo no Fuman Hyōmei ni kansuru Kōsatsu - Bogowasha to Hi-bogowasha no Hikaku kara [A Study on Expressions of Dissatisfaction in Japanese in Special Situations - From a comparison of native and non-



- native speakers]. *Aomoridaigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, 35, 41-57.
- Japanese Descriptive Grammar Research Group. (2003). *Gendainihongo Bunpō 4 dai 8-bu Modariti [Modern Japanese Grammar 4 Part 8 Modality]*. Tokyo: Kuroshi o Izuru-ban.
- Jeong, H. (2005). Nikkan ryōgengo ni okeru “fuman hyōmei” ni kansuru ichikōsatsu - Ibunka ni yoru “momegoto” de no ōdō oyobi gengo hyōgen o chūshin toshite [A Study on "Expression of Dissatisfaction" in Japanese and Korean Languages - Focusing on the royal road and linguistic expressions in "disputes" due to different cultures]. *Nigatadaigaku Kokusai Sentā Kiyō*, 1, 63 - 71.
- Kekidze, T. (2003). Gendai nihongo ni okeru hyōgen no “yawarage~”~sōda”, “~ge”, “~ppoi” nado no baai ["Softening " of Expressions in Modern Japanese: Cases such as "~Souda", "~Ge", and "~Ppoi"]. *Kotoba to Bunka*, 4, 293-306.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2011). Introduction to Word Formation and Word Classes in Indonesia. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Lee, S. (2006). Nikkan no ‘fuman hyōmei’ ni kansuru ichikōsatsu : Nihonjin Gakusei to Kangokujin Gakusei no Hikaku o Tōshite [A Study on "Dissatisfaction" in Japan and Korea : Comparing Japanese Students and Individual Students]. *Shakai Gengo Kagaku-kai*, 8(2), 53-64.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Matsuki, M. (1992). “Miru koto” to Bunpō Kenkyū ["Seeing" and Grammar Studies]. *Nihongo-gaku*, 11(9), 57-71.
- Miyazaki, K., Adachi, T., Noda, H., & Takanashi, S. (2002). *Modariti Shin Nihongo Bunpō Sensho 4 [Modality Modality New Japanese Grammar Selection]*. Tokyo: Kuroshioshuppan.
- Morita, F. (1990). Iwayuru yōtainojodōshi “soda” ni tsuite: Yōhō no bunrui o chūshin ni [On the so-called state auxiliary Verb "Sou": Focusing on the classification of usage]. *Tōkaidaigaku Kiyō Ryūgakusei Kyōiku Sentā*, 10, 55 - 70.
- Nitta, Y. (1991). *Nihongo no Modariti to Ninshō [Japanese modalities and certifications]*. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Olshtain, E., & Weinbach, L. (1993). *Interlanguage Features of the Speech Act of Complaining*. In G. Kasper, & S. Blum-Kulka, *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (108-137). New York: Oxford.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Puksi, F.F. (2016). *Tindak Tutur Mengeluh pada Empat Laman Penyedia Review Hotel [Interlanguage Features of the Speech Act of Complaining]* (Master Thesis). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Wongsamin, S. (2016). Study on complaint expressions and responses: Comparing Japanese and Thai native speakers. *Linguistic Culture and Japanese Language Education*, 51, 11-20.
- Yamaoka, M. (2004). Nihongo ni okeru hairyo hyōgen kenkyū no genjō [Current status of considerate expression research in Japanese]. *Nihongo Nihon bungaku*, 14, 17 - 39.
- Yamaoka, M., Makihara, I., & Ono, M. (2010). *Komyunikēshon no hairyo hyōgen - Nihongo Goyōron Nyūmon [Considerate Expression Communication - Introduction to Japanese Pragmatics]*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Yamaoka, M. (2016). “Kamoshirenai” ni okeru Kanōsei Handan to Taijin Hairyo. In O. Masaki, *Ri ki Kusunoki (hen) “Gengo no Shukansei: Ninchi to poraitonesu no setten”* (133 – 150). Tokyo: Kuroshioshuppan.

## WEB REFERENCES

- Tripadvisor Japan <https://www.tripadvisor.jp/> (Accessed December 1, 2019)
- Tripadvisor Indonesia <https://www.tripadvisor.co.id/> (Accessed December 1, 2019)