IDEAS

Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Volume 14, Number 2, December 2026
pp. 9614 – 9626

Copyright © 2026 The Author
IDEAS is licensed under CC-BY-SA 4.0 License



Issued by English study program of UIN Palopo

# Complaint Speech Acts in Indonesian Translations of Franklin Storybooks: Pragmatic Quality and Child-Oriented Acceptability

**Aisya Zuraida[1], Dyah Ayu Nila Khrisna[2], Miftah Nugroho[3]**

[1,2,3] Universitas Sebelas Maret

**Article Info**

**Received:** 2026-10-25
**Revised:** 2026-11-06
**Accepted:** 2026-11-11

**Keywords:**
*complaint speech acts;*
*politeness strategies;*
*translation quality;*
*children's literature;*
*child-oriented acceptability*

**DOI:**
10.24256/ideas. v14i2.13145

**Corresponding Author:**
**Aisya Zuraida**
aisyazrd@student.uns.ac.id
Universitas Sebelas Maret

**Abstract**

*Translated children's literature must preserve not only propositional meaning but also pragmatic force and language suitable for child readers. This study examined how complaint speech acts and politeness strategies are realized in 13 Franklin storybooks and their Indonesian translations, and evaluated the translations for accuracy, readability, and psychological-educational acceptability. A descriptive qualitative, document-based case study analyzed 76 purposively selected source-target complaint pairs. Complaint strategies were classified using Trosborg's framework and politeness strategies using Brown and Levinson's framework. The researcher examined pragmatic realization and accuracy; five child readers contributed readability judgments; and three child psychologists assessed psychological-educational acceptability using a three-point instrument adapted from Nababan et al. The results comprised 63 accurate (82.89%), 12 less accurate (15.79%), and 1 inaccurate translation (1.32%); 54 high-readability (71.05%), 19 moderate-readability (25.00%), and 3 low-readability translations (3.95%); and 45 acceptable (59.21%), 25 less acceptable (32.89%), and 6 unacceptable translations (7.89%). Qualitative analysis showed that a translation could preserve propositional content while weakening or strengthening complaint force, changing interpersonal meaning, or introducing vocabulary that was less familiar to child readers. The three quality dimensions therefore did not always align. Translating complaints in children's literature requires the preservation of pragmatic meaning together with comprehensible and developmentally appropriate language.*

## 1. Introduction

Children's literature contributes to literacy, social learning, and emotional understanding because young readers encounter linguistic choices and interpersonal behavior through narrative and dialogue (Rawin et al., 2023; Shavit, 1986; Oittinen, 2000). When such literature is translated, the translator addresses two connected demands: preserving the source message and producing target-language expressions that children can understand and interpret appropriately. This challenge becomes especially visible in dialogue that conveys anger, disappointment, frustration, or disagreement. A rendering may be semantically close to the source yet still be too intense, too vague, or unfamiliar for its intended readers.

Complaining is an expressive speech act through which a speaker communicates dissatisfaction with an action, event, or state of affairs (Trosborg, 1995). Because a complaint can threaten the addressee's positive face, its form is closely related to politeness. Speakers may complain directly through explicit blame, mitigate the complaint through reasons or indirect hints, or use relational markers that soften the interaction (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In translation, lexical addition, omission, explicitation, or modulation can therefore affect more than propositional meaning: it can alter complaint intensity, interpersonal alignment, and the degree of face threat. For children's books, those pragmatic shifts also matter educationally because the dialogue offers models of how characters negotiate conflict.

Translation quality is commonly evaluated through accuracy, acceptability, and readability (Nababan et al., 2012). Accuracy concerns the equivalence of meaning, including pragmatic force; readability concerns whether the target expression can be readily understood; and acceptability concerns conformity with target-language norms. In child-oriented translation, acceptability also requires attention to the reader's developmental and educational context (Oittinen, 2000; Khrisna, 2025). The present study therefore uses the term psychological-educational acceptability for expert judgments about the intensity of a complaint, its social or educational value in context, and its potential to provide an unsuitable model for imitation. These judgments indicate perceived suitability; they are not evidence of measured psychological effects.

Previous pragmatic studies have described complaint realization, expressive speech acts, and politeness across languages and media (El-Dakhs & Ahmed, 2021; Muliawati et al., 2020; Syarif et al., 2020; Putri, 2025). Other research on children's literature has emphasized fidelity, readability, cultural adaptation, and child-friendly wording (Herianto et al., 2025; Mahbub et al., 2025; Amalia et al., 2025; Nurhalizah & Nasution, 2026). Together, these studies show that pragmatic equivalence and child orientation are both important, but they have usually been examined separately. As a result, limited attention has been given to the chain linking complaint strategy, politeness, translation shift, translation quality, and suitability for child readers within the same corpus.

This study addresses that gap by integrating pragmatic classification with three dimensions of translation quality and a child-oriented psychological-educational perspective. It asks: (1) How are complaint speech acts and politeness strategies realized in Franklin storybooks and their Indonesian translations? and (2) How is the translation quality of those complaint utterances assessed in terms of accuracy, readability, and psychological-educational acceptability? The objectives are to identify pragmatic realization and shifts, to evaluate each quality dimension, and to explain where those

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

dimensions align or diverge. The study's novelty lies in treating child suitability as a distinct expert-assessed dimension while retaining the connection among semantic meaning, pragmatic force, interpersonal relationship, and emotional intensity.

## 2. Method

### *2.1 Research design and corpus*

This study used a descriptive qualitative, product-oriented case-study design. The documentary data consisted of English complaint utterances and their Indonesian translations in 13 Franklin storybooks written by Paulette Bourgeois and illustrated by Brenda Clark. The Indonesian versions were translated by C. Erni Setiyowati and published by Kanisius. The 13 paired books were selected because they constituted the available bilingual Franklin corpus used in the research, shared the same recurring characters and child-oriented narrative setting, and offered comparable interpersonal conflicts across the series. This bounded corpus supported consistent analysis of complaint realization while avoiding differences in authorial style and target readership that would arise from combining unrelated series.

Table 1. Franklin storybooks included in the corpus

| No. | English source (year) | Indonesian translation (year) | Complaint pairs (n) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Franklin Is Bossy (1995) | Franklin Mau Menang Sendiri (2019) | 12 |
| 2 | Franklin's Bad Day (1996) | Hari Buruk Franklin (2007) | 6 |
| 3 | Franklin's Blanket (1995) | Selimut Franklin (2019) | 9 |
| 4 | Franklin's Canoe Trip (1999) | Franklin Naik Kano (2024) | 7 |
| 5 | Franklin Fibs (1999) | Franklin Berbohong (2019) | 3 |
| 6 | Franklin Forgets (2000) | Franklin Lupa Tugasnya (2024) | 6 |
| 7 | Franklin's Halloween (1996) | Franklin dan Pesta Helowin (2007) | 2 |
| 8 | Franklin Is Messy (1994) | Franklin dan Kamarnya (2022) | 4 |
| 9 | Franklin's New Friend (1997) | Teman Baru Franklin (2019) | 3 |
| 10 | Franklin Plays the Game (1995) | Franklin Bermain Sepak Bola (n.d.) | 5 |
| 11 | Franklin Runs Away (2001) | Franklin Pergi dari Rumah (2007) | 7 |
| 12 | Franklin Says Sorry (1999) | Franklin Minta Maaf (2024) | 6 |
| 13 | Franklin Wants a Pet (1995) | Hewan Piaraan Franklin (2019) | 6 |

*2.2 Unit of analysis and sampling*

The unit of analysis was a source-language complaint utterance together with its corresponding Indonesian translation; the unit was not the character who produced the utterance. Purposive sampling identified 76 paired utterances. An utterance was included when it expressed dissatisfaction, disapproval, annoyance, blame, or a negative consequence directed at an action, event, or interlocutor and when a corresponding target-text segment could be identified. Narrative descriptions without an expressive complaint and dialogue lacking sufficient context for pragmatic interpretation were excluded. The surrounding turn, speaker-addressee relationship, narrative situation, and illustration were consulted when the force of an utterance was ambiguous.

*2.3 Data sources, assessors, and instruments*

The researcher served as the principal instrument by identifying the data, classifying complaint and politeness strategies, tracing translation shifts, and conducting the initial accuracy analysis. The supporting instruments were a coding sheet, a three-point translation-quality questionnaire adapted from Nababan et al. (2012), and a semi-structured interview guide. Five child readers provided readability judgments about words, phrases, and sentences in the 76 target-text items. Three child psychologists provided expert judgments of psychological-educational acceptability. The dimensions were kept separate because a sentence can be accurate but difficult for children to understand, or readable but pragmatically or educationally unsuitable.

The psychological-educational assessors were Oktarian Nisa Wulandari, M.Psi., Psikolog; Anastasia Tiara Putri, M.Psi., Psikolog; and Theodora Putri Antonius P., S.Psi., M.Psi., Psikolog, all licensed clinical psychologists specializing in child and adolescent psychology, with expertise in developmental, emotional, and behavioral assessment of children. They were selected because they were already practising child psychologists, and all three completed a professional master's program in child clinical psychology at Universitas Katolik Soegijapranata. Each psychologist received the assessment document separately and completed it independently, without consulting the other assessors, within a two-week period; the completed questionnaires were then returned to the researcher.

All three psychologists assessed all 76 items. For each item, they scored psychological-educational acceptability on a three-point scale (3 = acceptable, 2 = less acceptable, 1 = unacceptable) for child readers aged 8–11 years and wrote the reasons for the score. Five guiding questions structured the judgment: (1) whether the complaint utterance portrays the character's emotion in a way that fits the emotional development of children aged 8–11; (2) whether the way the complaint is delivered fits their social and communication skills; (3) whether any word choice may negatively affect their psychological, emotional, or behavioral development; (4) whether the dialogue has educational value for managing emotions, resolving conflict, and interacting with others; and (5) whether the dialogue as a whole is suitable for children, with suggestions for improvement.

The researcher examined the three returned questionnaires and then reassessed each of the 76 items against the acceptability criteria of Nababan et al. (2012) and the theoretical principles of psychological-educational suitability for child readers drawn from Oittinen (2000), Bandura (1977), and Shavit (1986). The psychologists' scores and

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

written reasons served as expert input, and the final score of each item was determined by the researcher alone. Differences among the three psychologists' scores were therefore resolved by the researcher's decision, without consensus discussion or a statistical aggregate such as a mean score or majority category. No inter-rater agreement statistic was calculated, because the psychologists' judgments served as expert input for the researcher's final determination.

Table 2. Operational criteria for the three quality dimensions

| Dimension | Score 3 | Score 2 | Score 1 | Primary assessor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accuracy | Meaning and pragmatic force are conveyed without consequential distortion. | Most meaning is conveyed, but an addition, omission, or shift affects part of the message or force. | Meaning or pragmatic force is substantially different or not conveyed. | Researcher / bilingual analysis |
| Readability | Words, phrases, and sentences are readily understood by the child reader. | One or more elements require rereading or explanation. | The expression is difficult to understand or is misunderstood. | Five child readers |
| Psychological-educational acceptability | Intensity, wording, and social-educational value are judged suitable in context. | The item raises a limited concern about intensity, value, or possible imitation. | The item raises a substantial suitability concern in context. | Three child psychologists |

*2.4 Data collection and analysis*

Data collection proceeded in four stages. First, the English and Indonesian texts were read in parallel and candidate complaint pairs were entered into the coding sheet with their book, page, speaker, addressee, and narrative context. Second, each complaint was classified using Trosborg's (1995) complaint categories, while the associated politeness strategy was classified using Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework. Third, the source and target realizations were compared to identify preservation or shifts in semantic content, complaint force, politeness, interpersonal meaning, and emotional intensity. Fourth, quality judgments and interview responses were organized by item and dimension. Ambiguous classifications were revisited against the operational definitions and the full narrative context to maintain coding consistency.

Spradley's analytic sequence was used to organize the qualitative interpretation rather than to replace the quality assessment (Spradley, 1980, as cited in Santosa, 2021). Domain analysis delimited complaint pairs; taxonomic analysis grouped complaint and politeness strategies; componential analysis compared source-target shifts and the three quality dimensions; and cultural-theme analysis interpreted recurring relationships among pragmatic force, child-oriented wording, and perceived suitability. Classification answered the first research question, whereas the rubric-based assessments answered the second. Frequencies and percentages summarized the distribution, while representative cases explained why particular translations received their classifications.

*2.5 Ethical considerations*

The documentary analysis did not involve intervention with the storybook characters or authors. Five child readers aged 9–11 years participated in the readability assessment. They were neighbors of the researcher who were invited to take part, and the inclusion criterion was that they were early readers. The sessions took place at the researcher's home over three meetings of two to three hours each.

At the first stage, each child read the 13 Franklin storybooks individually to become familiar with the content, plot, and characters. The researcher then interviewed each child about every complaint utterance in the 76 items, and the children wrote the words, phrases, or sentences they still found difficult to understand on a questionnaire answer sheet. Before participation, the researcher explained the study to each child in an age-appropriate manner, and obtained their verbal assent alongside written permission from a parent or legal guardian. The children were given an appreciation after completing the sessions. Child-reader responses are reported only in aggregate and without identifying information. The three child psychologists were asked for their willingness to participate as informants in this study, and they agreed to serve as expert assessors.

The researcher gave each of them a token of appreciation for their assistance, and their comments are reported as expert judgments on the acceptability of the texts rather than as clinical findings about individual children. The assessments with the child psychologists and the child readers were conducted with the permission of the researcher's supervisors, although no formal ethics-committee approval or exemption number was issued for this study.

## 3. Results

*3.1 Overall translation-quality profile*

All 76 complaint pairs were evaluated separately for accuracy, readability, and psychological-educational acceptability. Table 3 presents the totals. No composite score was calculated because the dimensions represent different constructs and may diverge within the same item.

Table 3. Translation-quality assessment of 76 complaint pairs

| Dimension | Category | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Accuracy | Accurate | 63 | 82.89 |
| | Less accurate | 12 | 15.79 |
| | Inaccurate | 1 | 1.32 |
| | Total | 76 | 100.00 |
| Readability | High | 54 | 71.05 |
| | Moderate | 19 | 25.00 |
| | Low | 3 | 3.95 |
| | Total | 76 | 100.00 |

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Psychological-educational acceptability | Acceptable | 45 | 59.21 |
| | Less acceptable | 25 | 32.89 |
| | Unacceptable | 6 | 7.89 |
| | Total | 76 | 100.00 |

Accuracy was the strongest dimension: 63 items conveyed the source meaning and pragmatic force without a consequential shift. Twelve items retained most of the message but altered an element such as intensity, evaluation, or interpersonal stance, and one item substantially changed the complaint meaning. Child-reader judgments classified 54 items as highly readable, 19 as moderately readable, and 3 as having low readability. The expert assessors classified 45 items as psychologically and educationally acceptable, 25 as less acceptable, and 6 as unacceptable. Thus, high accuracy did not guarantee either effortless comprehension or expert-perceived child suitability.

*3.2 Complaint strategies, politeness, and translation shifts*

The pragmatic analysis treated complaint type and politeness as connected but distinct layers. Complaint classification (Trosborg, 1995) identified what kind of dissatisfaction was expressed, whereas politeness classification (Brown & Levinson, 1987) identified how directly the face-threatening act was performed. Comparison of the source and target texts then showed whether a translation preserved both layers or changed one while retaining the other. The frequencies reported below were taken from the original coding sheet covering all 76 verified complaint pairs, not estimated from the representative examples discussed in the text.

In the source texts, expressions of annoyance or disapproval were the most frequent complaint category (39; 51.32%), followed by implicit complaints (18; 23.68%), blaming (14; 18.42%), and accusation (5; 6.58%). In terms of politeness, bald on record was the most frequent strategy (31; 40.79%), followed by off record (21; 27.63%), negative politeness (16; 21.05%), and positive politeness (8; 10.53%). At the aggregate level, the target texts showed a slightly different distribution: blaming increased to 18 items (23.68%) while accusation decreased to 3 items (3.95%), and positive politeness increased to 13 items (17.11%) while bald on record decreased to 29 items (38.16%).

Table 4. Distribution of Complaint Strategies

| Complaint Strategies | Frequency (ST) | Source Text (%) | Frequency (TT) | Target Text (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implicit Complaint | 18 | 23.68 | 16 | 21.05 |
| Annoyance or disapproval | 39 | 51.32 | 39 | 51.32 |
| Accusation | 5 | 6.58 | 3 | 3.95 |
| Blaming | 14 | 18.42 | 18 | 23.68 |
| Total | 76 | 100.00 | 76 | 100.00 |

Table 5. Distribution of Politeness Strategies

| Politeness Strategy | Frequency (ST) | Source Text (%) | Frequency (TT) | Target Text (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bald on Record | 31 | 40.79 | 29 | 38.16 |
| Off Record | 21 | 27.63 | 19 | 25.00 |
| Negative Politeness | 16 | 21.05 | 15 | 19.74 |
| Positive Politeness | 8 | 10.53 | 13 | 17.11 |
| Total | 76 | 100.00 | 76 | 100.00 |

Table 6. Representative patterns in the analyzed complaint pairs

| Case | Source → target excerpt | Main analytical pattern | Quality implication |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | “I don’t want to play with you either!” → “Aku juga tidak mau bermain denganmu!” | Explicit blame and bald-on-record delivery are preserved. | Semantic and pragmatic alignment supports accuracy. |
| 3 | “That’s not fair.” → “Apa? Tidak ada juara paling belakang!” | A judgment of unfairness becomes an objection to the game outcome; directness remains. | Politeness can remain stable while complaint meaning shifts. |
| 6 | “It’s not.” → “Tidak panas!” | Direct contradiction is made more explicit in Indonesian. | Expert assessors considered intensity and possible imitation in context. |
| 7 | “No way!” → “Tidak mau!” | Short, familiar wording preserves direct refusal/complaint. | Familiar vocabulary supports high readability. |

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | "I never score a goal." → "Aku belum pernah mencetak gol," ... "dengan sedih." | Absolute 'never' is softened to 'not yet,' while an emotional cue is added. | Addition and modulation require separate accuracy and readability judgments. |
| 9 | "I'm tired." → "Aku capai." | The complaint is retained, but capai may be lexically ambiguous for children. | Meaning can be broadly accurate while readability is reduced. |

*3.3 Accuracy: propositional meaning and pragmatic force*

Case 1 illustrates close alignment. Franklin's English utterance 'I don't want to play with you either!' is rendered as 'Aku juga tidak mau bermain denganmu!' The marker either/also, the refusal, and the reciprocal blame are retained, as is the bald-on-record delivery between peers in an ongoing conflict. The translation therefore preserves both propositional content and pragmatic force. This type of correspondence explains the high number of accurate items in the corpus.

Case 3 demonstrates why semantic and pragmatic analysis must be combined. Bear's 'That's not fair' evaluates Franklin's behavior against a norm of fairness. The target expression 'Apa? Tidak ada juara paling belakang!' instead disputes the existence of a last-place winner. Both utterances are direct and can be classified as bald-on-record, yet they do not communicate the same complaint. The shift removes the moral evaluation embedded in fair and replaces it with a factual objection. Stable politeness therefore does not by itself establish translation accuracy.

*3.4 Readability: reported child-reader comprehension*

The readability results reflect judgments provided by the five child readers, not assumptions based solely on sentence length. Familiar and direct forms such as 'Tidak mau!' in Case 7 supported immediate comprehension. By contrast, the less common or potentially ambiguous form 'Aku capai' in Case 9 can be interpreted as 'I reach' rather than 'I am tired' without sufficient context. The translation retains the broad complaint but places a greater lexical burden on the child reader. This distinction accounts for cases in which accuracy and readability received different categories.

Case 8 also shows that an apparently simple translation can contain more than one shift. 'I never score a goal' becomes 'Aku belum pernah mencetak gol,' changing an absolute negative into an experience that has not happened yet. The reporting clause adds 'dengan sedih,' making the emotional state explicit. Such adjustments may help some readers follow the scene, but they also alter temporal meaning and emotional explicitness. They must therefore be evaluated as translation choices rather than treated automatically as either improvements or errors.

*3.5 Psychological-educational acceptability: expert judgments*

The three psychologists' ratings concerned perceived contextual suitability. In Case 6, the direct contradiction 'Tidak panas!' was evaluated in relation to the conflict, the relative power of the child characters, complaint intensity, and the possibility that the wording could model an overly abrupt response. The classification does not establish that children will imitate the expression or experience a particular psychological effect. It

records an expert concern about potential modeling and educational value within the narrative context.

Across the corpus, 45 items were judged acceptable, while 31 raised some degree of concern (25 less acceptable and 6 unacceptable). These figures show why acceptability should not be collapsed into linguistic naturalness. A target expression may be grammatical and idiomatic while still being judged too intense or insufficiently constructive for the intended educational context. Conversely, the presence of conflict or a direct complaint does not make an item unsuitable by itself; the judgment depends on narrative purpose, consequence, and how the story frames the behavior.

## 4. Discussion

### *4.1 Pragmatic equivalence extends beyond propositional meaning*

The results support a layered account of equivalence. Complaint meaning includes the state of affairs being evaluated, the speaker's stance toward it, the interpersonal relation enacted by the utterance, and the emotional intensity with which dissatisfaction is expressed. Trosborg's (1995) framework identifies the complaint strategy, while Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework locates that strategy within face management. The Franklin cases show that translation can preserve one layer and change another. Case 3 retains directness but changes the evaluative basis of the complaint; Case 8 retains the general topic but modifies temporal scope and makes sadness explicit. Accordingly, accuracy analysis should examine pragmatic force rather than rely only on lexical correspondence.

This finding clarifies the relationship between translation shifts and quality. Addition, omission, modulation, or explicitation is not automatically an error. A shift may be a purposeful child-oriented adaptation when it clarifies a referent, reduces unnecessary ambiguity, or makes an implicit emotion accessible without distorting the interaction. It becomes problematic when it changes who is blamed, weakens or intensifies the complaint without contextual motivation, or removes a socially meaningful evaluation. The analytical question is therefore not whether a formal shift occurred, but what the shift did to meaning, relationship, and readability.

### *4.2 The three quality dimensions may align or diverge*

The distribution confirms the value of separate quality dimensions. Accuracy was high for 82.89% of the data, whereas only 59.21% were judged psychologically and educationally acceptable. These percentages should not be read as if they evaluate the same property. An accurate direct complaint can remain intense or educationally sensitive; a highly readable sentence can simplify the source to the point of pragmatic loss; and a culturally softened rendering can be suitable for children while being only partly accurate. Nababan et al.'s (2012) model therefore becomes more informative in this context when its dimensions are interpreted independently and then related at the item level.

The readability cases further demonstrate that child orientation cannot be inferred from grammaticality alone. A form such as 'capai' is standard Indonesian, but its relative frequency and lexical ambiguity may make it less accessible to a child than 'lelah.' Conversely, direct, short wording such as 'Tidak mau!' is easy to understand even when its interpersonal force is strong. Child-reader judgments provide evidence about

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

comprehension, while expert judgments address perceived suitability; neither should substitute for the other.

*4.3 Child-oriented adaptation and perceived suitability*

Children's literature permits adaptation because translators write for readers whose linguistic experience and interpretive resources differ from those of adults (Shavit, 1986; Oittinen, 2000). However, adaptation should not erase conflict or sanitize every direct complaint. Complaints perform narrative and educational functions: they show frustration, establish consequences, and create opportunities for apology, negotiation, and repair. The relevant standard is developmentally appropriate representation, not the absence of negative emotion. Expert concerns in this study should thus be understood as perceptions of potential modeling and contextual fit, not as demonstrated effects on children. Bandura's (1977) social-learning perspective helps explain why models of speech may deserve attention, but the present design did not test imitation or behavior.

*4.4 Practical and theoretical implications*

For translators and editors, the findings suggest a four-step check: identify the complaint's target and evaluative basis; compare its degree of directness and face threat; test the target wording with child readers; and review emotional intensity and educational framing with appropriate experts when necessary. Publishers can use this sequence during editorial review, while teachers and parents can discuss direct complaints as part of conflict resolution rather than treating them as isolated phrases. The cases also show that editorial decisions should document why an addition or softening is introduced so that child orientation does not obscure source-text meaning.

The theoretical contribution is an integrated analytical chain: complaint strategy identifies the expressive act; politeness locates its interpersonal force; source-target comparison identifies pragmatic shifts; separate quality judgments evaluate meaning and comprehension; and psychological-educational review considers contextual suitability. This chain connects pragmatic translation analysis with child-oriented translation without treating expert suitability judgments as evidence of psychological outcomes.

## 5. Conclusion

This study analyzed 76 complaint utterances and their Indonesian translations in 13 Franklin storybooks. The analysis shows that translation quality depends on more than semantic correspondence. Complaint strategy and politeness can be preserved together, or one can remain stable while the other shifts. Additions, omissions, and modulations should therefore be evaluated according to their effect on propositional meaning, pragmatic force, interpersonal relationship, emotional intensity, and child-reader accessibility.

The quality results were 63 accurate (82.89%), 12 less accurate (15.79%), and 1 inaccurate translation (1.32%); 54 high-readability (71.05%), 19 moderate-readability (25.00%), and 3 low-readability translations (3.95%); and 45 psychologically and educationally acceptable (59.21%), 25 less acceptable (32.89%), and 6 unacceptable translations (7.89%). The gap among these distributions demonstrates that accuracy, readability, and perceived child suitability do not necessarily coincide. A defensible child-

oriented translation must preserve pragmatic meaning while using language that is comprehensible and developmentally appropriate.

The study is limited to one storybook series, a small child-reader group, and expert perceptions of potential suitability rather than measured behavioral effects. Future research should compare multiple series and age groups, report inter-rater reliability, and test how children interpret complaint intensity and conflict repair in context. In addition, the final acceptability score of each item was determined by the researcher on the basis of the three psychologists' input, and no inter-rater agreement statistic was calculated.

**6. References**

Amalia, S. N., Rohali, & Setiawan, T. (2025). Keterbacaan dan kesepadanan makna dalam terjemahan buku cerita anak: Studi penerapan metode literal dan word-for-word. Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, 10(2), 196–214. https://doi.org/10.23917/kls.v10i2.11017

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Prentice-Hall.

Bourgeois, P. (1995). Franklin is bossy (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1996). Franklin's Bad Day (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1995). Franklin's blanket (B. Clark, Illus.) Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1999). Franklin's canoe trip (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1999). Franklin fibs (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (2000). Franklin Forgets. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1996). Franklin's Halloween. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1994). Franklin Is Messy. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1997). Franklin's new friend. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1995). Franklin Plays the Game. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (2001). Franklin runs away. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1999). Franklin says sorry. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P. (1995). Franklin wants a pet. (B. Clark, Illus.). Kids Can Press.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2019). Franklin berbohong (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2019). Teman baru Franklin. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2007). Franklin dan pesta helowin (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2022). Franklin dan kamarnya. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2024). Franklin lupa tugasnya. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2019). Franklin mau menang sendiri (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2024). Franklin minta maaf. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2024). Franklin naik kano. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2019). Hewan piaraan Franklin. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2007). Hari buruk Franklin. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2007). Franklin pergi dari rumah. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (2019). Selimut Franklin. (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

Bourgeois, P., & Clark, B. (n.d.). Franklin bermain sepak bola (C. E. Setiyowati, Trans.). Kanisius.

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

El-Dakhs, D. A. S., & Ahmed, M. M. (2021). A variational pragmatic analysis of the speech act of complaint focusing on Alexandrian and Najdi Arabic. Journal of Pragmatics, 181, 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.05.023

Herianto, H., Khrisna, D. A. N., Dewi, I. K., Budiharjo, B., Kusumastuti, F., & Nababan, M. (2025). Balancing fidelity, acceptability, and readability in children's story translation. LITE: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya, 21(1), 168–179. https://doi.org/10.33633/lite.v21i1.12471

Khrisna, D. A. N. (2025). Seni Menerjemahkan Cerita Anak: Tantangan dan Strateginya. DapurKata.

Mahbub, M. T., Nababan, M. R., & Anis, M. Y. (2025). Analisis kualitas keterbacaan pada terjemahan cerita anak Inggris-Indonesia di website Penjaring. Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra.

Muliawati, N. W. P., Sedeng, I. N., & Puspani, I. A. M. (2020). The expressive illocutionary acts found in Webtoon True Beauty and their translation into Indonesian. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 6(2), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.6.2.1802.148-155

Nababan, M. R., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, 24(1), 39–57.

Nurhalizah, S., & Nasution, F. (2026). Teknik penerjemahan kalimat naratif dalam buku cerita rakyat anak The Turtle Stone karya Ida Ohoiwutun. Jurnal ISO: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora, 6(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.53697/iso.v6i2.3987

Oittinen, R. (2000). Translating for children. Garland Publishing.

Putri, A. A. (2025). Cracking the code of speech acts and translation quality in A Space for the Unbound. Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (JREaLL), 6(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v6i1.23178

Rawin, S. C., Sudiana, I. N., & Astawan, I. G. (2023). Peran Budaya Literasi dalam Menumbuhkan Minat Baca Siswa. Pendasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Indonesia, 7(1), 1–12.

Santosa, R. (2021). Metode penelitian linguistik. UNS Press.

Shavit, Z. (1986). Poetics of children's literature. University of Georgia Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Syarif, H. E., Nababan, M. R., & Santosa, R. (2020). Translation technique of women anger speech act in television series 13 Reasons Why season 1. International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 3(10), 164–173.

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