

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to provide information pertaining topic research, which is obtained from reviewing the related literature and studies. It begins with the language of hospitality, speech acts, speech acts of greetings and replies to greeting, politeness theory, politeness strategies and social factors. The last part is devoted to the past researches related to the present investigation.

2.1 The Language of Hospitality

Nowadays, the hotel and tourism industry, one of the biggest businesses, has grown up very quickly in all counties around the world in a short period of time. A differentiation in hosting activities has arisen between those that are extended as a social obligation and those involving payment. In both categories, participants normally observe the etiquette and proprieties that involve interpersonal and cross-cultural communication. Activities involving payment, that is commercial hospitality refers to the cluster of activities oriented towards satisfying guests. In the hospitality industry, it simply means that the hotel staff take good care of the guests so the need for language of interaction arises between them. The language used in the hospitality industry is known as "hospitality language". Blue and Harun (2003) define the term "hospitality language" as all linguistic expressions which relate to and represent hospitality concerns. It could be said that hospitality language simply means the expressions of care for guests and the generosity of the hosts providing the hospitality in the establishment. This establishment competes to provide the best quality of

hospitality throughout the arrival-departure cycle of the guest's stay which Kasavana (1993) names as the "guest cycle". Prachanant (2006) indicates that the cycle concerns the ideal-typical visit cycle of hospitality practices in private hotels, beginning with the arrival of the guest and ending with their departure, respectively. Viewed as a process, then hospitality language covers at least four discernible stages, including, arrival, familiarization, engagement and departure.

In conclusion, making hotel guests feel warm welcome is an art, and the key to success in the hospitality industry. In the context of a globalized world, there has been some standardization of hospitality language. The language of hotel encounters, for example, comprises functional aspects of hospitality language that are understood worldwide. These functional activities include dealing with checking in, checking out, information and queries, and miscellaneous requests.

2.2 Speech Acts

Successful speaking is not just a matter of using grammatically correct words and forms but also knowing when to use them and under what circumstances. However, it can be a sentence or a word or phrase as long as it follows the rules necessary to accomplish the intention. When one speaks, one performs an act. Speech is not just used to designate something, it actually does something. If we consider the ways that we communicate in daily life, we will see something more than just the language. For example, sometimes the speaker doesn't mean to ask the question to the listener but may request to the listener such as "Liew" says to her daughter "Kaimuk"; "Do you have a pen, Kaimuk?" In this sentence, Liew does not want to know that Kaimuk has a pen or not but also she wants to borrow the pen from her daughter, or "Nu" says to his friend, "Rose"; "The weather in this room is too hot".

Suddenly, “Rose” goes to open the air-conditioner. She knows well as “Nu” does not mean to tell her about the weather in the room but “Nu” would like to make a request to her. From the previous examples, it indicates that we can not focus on language function but also depends on the situation during communication and the speaker’s intention too as the cases of “Liew” and “Nu”. We call these cases as “Speech Act”.

Speech acts, one of the key areas of pragmatics, are utterances which contain information needed to assert and perform action. A speech act is created when a speaker/ writer makes an utterance to hearer/ reader in the context (Allan. 1994). Speech acts are a part of social interactive behavior and must be interpreted as an aspect of social interaction (Labor & Fanshel. 1997). The term speech act coins by the linguistic philosopher in terms of internationalist Austin, (1962) with “How to Do Thing with Words” and has developed by another philosopher, Searle (1969a).

The speech act plays a great role in effective communication. It is important for the hotel staff whose work is with tourists from all over the world to be understood by their guests when they greet and receive replies. Fluency in English does not always mean success in communication, knowledge of the speech act shows intention of the speaker. Hotel staff need to know the meaning of what is said in order to be explicit in a cross-cultural situation.

2.2.1 Speech Acts of Austin’s Theory

Austin (1962) has mentioned that people do not only use the language functions in communication but also use the language to appear in many acts of situations. He classifies the speaker’s utterance that is influenced on action into 3 kinds; locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. A locutionary act is the product of sounds and with meaning. The study of locutionary is the domain of descriptive linguistics, which include phonetics, syntax, phonology and semantics.

An illocutionary is the realization of a particular language function. Illocutionary acts include commanding, daring, nominating and resigning and can be effected through performative sentences, whether or not they contain performative verbs. For instance, “It is raining” is an implicit performance of “stating” even though the sentence contains no performative verbs. A perlocutionary act is an achievement of effects on the addressees. This act has no part of conventional meaning of an utterance, it is derived from the context and situation of the utterance.

2.2.2 Speech Acts of Searle’s Theory

Searle (1969b) is the person who applies and develops the concept of Austin by studying more about the utterance in communication and explain clearly the performative act from the speaker’s utterance which is speech act theory. In using utterance, the speaker may not only mean the words or messages but in each utterance of speaking has the performative act to show the speaker’s aim, too. Sometimes, the speaker’s meaning is direct to the listener but sometimes may not. The speaker may mean more than the word is saying as in indirect speech. He gives the example about indirect speech act as follows:

A: Let’s go to the movie tonight.

B: I have to study for an exam.

From the above conversation is why A knows that B’s utterance is refusing. From his conception the utterance of B is indirect speech act that includes two components; primary illocutionary act and secondary illocutionary act. A primary illocutionary act is that the speaker does not show the direct intention as B refuses to A as “I have to study for an exam”. A secondary illocutionary act is the utterance of direct speech act to the listener.

Searle (1976) has classified illocutionary into five major classes: 1) “representative”- which the speaker communicates to the listener focusing on message or the truth of the expressed proposition; 2) “assertives”- which the speaker would like to get the performative act back from the listener; 3) “commissives”- which the speaker communicates to the listener by attention to do something for the listener; 4) “expressives”- which the speaker shows about their emotions, their state of mind or their feeling; and 5) “declaratives”, which the speaker aims to declare or change of the personal status. The essential insight developed by these philosophers is that, when using language, we do not only make propositional statements about objects, entities, states of affairs, and so on, but we also fulfill functions such as requesting, denying, introducing, apologizing, etc. Identifying the speech act being performed by a particular utterance can only be done if we know the context in which the utterance takes place. What the speaker actually wants to achieve in functional, communicative terms is known as the illocutionary force of the utterance.

To sum up, we see that explicit, cohesive links between utterances are insufficient to account for the coherence of discourse that such coherence depends on the ability of the language users to recognize the functional role being played by different utterances within the discourse. The speech act is the connector of the utterance and intention to achieve communication. However, the hotel staff always greet the tourists for the first time met because they are the first person to welcome them so the speech act of greeting enables the hotel staff to achieve communication.

2.3 The Speech Acts of Greetings

Li Wei (2010) indicates that there are two perspectives of the pragmatic functions of greeting. The first one is greeting as illocutionary acts as Firth (1972) claims that greeting are a system of signs that convey other than over message. Mentioned to Austin's theory (1962) is "*to say something is to do something*" seems to understand that the utterance of the speaker cannot finish of themselves but means to ends, means to affecting listeners in certain ways. According to Austin's (1962) speech act classification, greeting is categorized in expressives which is used to express certain feelings toward the hearer, for example, when someone asks you "How are you?" or "How is your trip? He/ she does not really want your answer, but showing their politeness. On the other hand, Fieg and Mortlock (1989) agree that there are linguistic differences between American and Thais in three situations: work, passing on the street, and personal encounters. Li Wei (2010) also points out that giving another interesting example of the expressive aspect of such routines is the use of the Chinese expression "Have you eaten"? He/ she is seldom really concerned about whether you are full or hungry, but intends to make you feel that he/ she is being considerate to you. The conventional answer is "Yes", though often a white lie, for the negative answer would put the greeting person in an awkward situation. Actually, such a greeting expression is not an invitation but a means to show the speaker's warm attitude and consideration towards the hearer.

Second of pragmatic functions of greeting of Li Wei is that greeting as linguistic routines of politeness which focused on face. Face refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. There are two types of face: negative and positive. Negative face is that one's action be unimpeded by others and positive face is that one's wants be desirable to least some

other. If the strategic ends of speakers in conversational act are to be achieved, various politeness strategies must be used to maintain the participants' negative face or to enhance their positive face. In the process of greetings, such maintenance or enhancement of face has to be taken into consideration. For instance, in English, greetings such as "Hello", "How do you do?" and "I am pleased to meet you". have to be used to maintain or even enhance the hearer's positive face, depending on the status of the participants and the social setting. Moreover, greeting is defined as ritualistic expressions, such as, greeting while passing on the street, Americans are reported to say "what's happening? Or "what's new?" should have an effect on the listener, causing a non-formulaic. Different responses from Thais, the hearer is too ephemeral to discuss in casual greeting.

Speech act of greeting is the intention of the speaker when they greet someone to accomplish their purposes in communication. The speakers are said to perform intended actions while talking. We perform speech acts when we greet. A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. A speech act might contain just one word, as in "Hey!" to perform a greeting, or several words or sentences: "Hello, how are things? Speech act of greeting includes real-life interactions and requires not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture. Here are some examples of speech acts of greetings in Thai culture.

A: "Where are you going?"

B: "Where have you been?"

C: "What are you doing?"

All of these sentences above are Thai utterances. If we translate directly to words and the patterns with all of the sentences, it looks the common of the question sentences.

However, especially Thai people use these sentences to greet someone when they have met each other. In addition, the speaker does not want the answer from the listener. They can answer or may not depending on the listener. If we carefully consider the sentences, the speaker would like to show their intention other than the utterance. Thai people greetings to each other sometimes make the foreigners confused. The foreigners will understand why Thai people would like to know their business. If we use question such as “Where are you going?”, “Where have you been?” and “What are you doing?” to greet foreigners, they might answer “It’s not your business” because the listener understands and translates the meaning according to the function of the sentences or phases of the utterances since they do not understand the way Thai people greet. Speech act of greeting may be difficult to perform in a second language because learners may not know the idiomatic expressions or cultural norms in the second language or they may transfer their first language rules and conventions into the second language, assuming that such rules are universal. Because the natural tendency for language learners is to fall back on what they know to be appropriate in their first language, it is important that these learners understand exactly what they do in that first language in order to be able to recognize what is transferable to other languages. Something that works in English might not transfer in meaning when translating into the second language. Ebsworth, Bodaman and Carpenter (1996) claim that cross-cultural is crucial when greeting happens such as the case of many native speakers conclude that it is polite to give a quick, but friendly “greeting on the run” or a “speedy greeting” to a friend or acquaintance passing by when one or both greeters are in a hurry but this maybe considered to be extremely rude. This situation shows concern over function in language, cross-cultural speech act which result in misunderstanding between native and non- native speakers.

Wongkhomthong (1985) states that without readily available formulaic expressions, people meeting one another for the first time might suffer a gap of silence which leads to an uneasy feeling. Therefore, greetings might serve as a bridge of communication. She also indicates that when people meet each other, they start the conversation by greeting each other, for example, in Japanese culture, they greet the stranger as the weather but in Thai culture they ask where he or she is going. It is obvious that greeting exists in most societies even though usage, variety and the exact form of these expressions may vary from society to society. It is crucial that a greeting used by any culture but is understood by the recipient culture. Therefore, speech act is the bridge to make the speaker's intention through the listener.

Fujiwara (1980), mentions that greetings can be classified as formulaic expressions, in actual use, their own vitality, their own characteristic, and are flexible in any real situation. He emphasizes both the importance and the convenience of greeting in society. Van Ek and Alesander (1996) propose the language functions that use to interact with other people in society as the greeting functions below.

1. To greet people:
 - Hallo
 - Good morning/afternoon/evening
2. To meet people:
 - Hallo
 - How are you?
 - (I'm fine, thank you) how are you?
 - I'm very well, thank you, and how are you?
3. To introduce people and to be introduced:
 - This is.....
 - I'd like you to meet..
 - May I introduce you to....

- Respond: hallo, how do you do?
- How do you do?
- Hallo

Van Ek and Alesander also indicate that Hallo in number one and number two is similar but there is still a difference. Hallo in number one is used to greet people in the first conversation but in number two is used to respond when someone greet and number three is used to answer when someone is introduced.

Kenneth (2008) indicates that there are three perspectives of greeting: linguistics, sociology, and anthropology. Linguistics present the micro view, focusing on linguistic behaviour or also known as discourse analysis consisting of two basic manners: speech units and pragmatic meaning. Speech units have adjacency pairs, utterances, and turns. Schegloff (1972) and Schegloff and Sacks (1973 cited in Kenneth 2008), define adjacency pairs as 1) two utterance length, 2) adjacent positioning of component utterances 3) different speakers producing each utterance and 4) relative ordering of parts. Schegloff (1972) and Schegloff and Sacks (1973) see greeting as a speech event composed of two parts side by side, serial, and sequential, as following: Greeting-Greeting:

A: Hello

B: Hi. Or

A: Good morning.

B: Hello.

Another one is greeting request for information

A: Hello.

B: Did you just get home?

Goffman (1971 cited in Kenneth 2008) mentions that sociolinguistic perspective characterizes greeting exchanges as access rituals consisting of two types, passing greeting and engaging greeting. On the other hand, greetings have observable physical behaviour like open or close relations. In short, greetings are composed of several interlinking behaviours: salutation or the verbal linguistic form, term of address, body language and social context. Goffman (1971) also makes three perspectives of greeting in generalizations interpreting greeting behavior: 1) exchanges serve to re-establish social relations; 2) acknowledgement of a differential allocation of status; and 3) when greetings are performed between strangers, there is an element of guarantee for safe passage. Firth (1973) indicates that greeting phenomena is ritual with verbal and non-verbal forms. Verbal forms may be one of three linguistic units: question "How do you do?", interjection "Hello" or affirmation "Good morning, and non-verbal forms are composed of body language. Laver (1981) mentions that there are three components of greeting exchanges: formulaic phrases, address forms, and phatic communion or small talk as "Nice day for this time of year".

Fieg and Mortlock (1989), agree that anthropological linguistics are linguistic differences between Americans and Thais in three situations: work, passing on the street, and personal encounters. Greeting in perspective of Fieg and Mortlock (1989) is defined as ritualistic expressions, such as greeting while passing on the street as Americans reported to say "what's happening? Or "what's new? should have an effect on the listener, causing a non-formulaic response different from Thais the hearer are too ephemeral to discuss in casual greeting.

In conclusion, the speech act of greeting takes on a crucial role to help the hotel staff realize the tourist's intention. Greeting also varies culturally so the speech act of greeting is an interesting field.

2.4 Replies to Speech Acts of Greetings

Similar to greeting, replies to greetings is an illocutionary act of expressing friendly recognition or courteous respect to someone upon meeting them. Suzuki (1968 ; cited in Wongkhomthong, 1986) mentions that there are three types of responding to greeting. The first type covers the words that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts such as “*yaayaa*” (Hi), in Japanese, and “*hello*” in English. The second type is the identifiable subparts, or to put it another way those which have literal as well as pragmatic meanings and that greeting of this type have the characteristics or ritualized convention formulas. Suzuki has shown the second example in Japanese word “*ohayoo*” (good morning; literally, it is early) and English word “*good-bye*”. These types of words function as ritualized conventions and are removed from the literal meaning. He cites that, thus, an atheist would feel no compunction in saying good-bye though it derives from “God be with you”. His last type of greeting is a statement of congratulation or condolence for special occasions. Wongkhomthong (1986) also states that the last type is longer, more complex, and more varied. If grouped together the third type is sufficiently different from the other two so that the usual practice in English appears to be to refer to those utterances as speeches, or addresses.

2.5 Politeness Theory

Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another (Mills. 2003 : 6). Being polite, therefore, consists of attempting to save face for another. Politeness theory states that some speech acts threaten others' face needs. First formulated in 1987 by Brown and Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia's perception of politeness (Mills. 2003). This text has influenced almost all of the theoretical and analytical work in this field (Mills. 2003: 57). Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages in order to save the listener's face when the bad situation is inevitable or desired.

Presently, the famous philosophers, Brown and Levinson (1987), in terms of sociolinguistic theory, take a great role to show an interest in the politeness phenomenon because it is important to researchers in pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Brown and Levinson (1987) extent Goffman's dramaturgical approach concerning "face" that everyone in social rituals has self-esteem, the speaker and the listener both preserve their face in the same time attempting to protect the interlocutor not lose face, too. When engaged in social interaction, social factors are expected to save both the positive and negative face sof each other (Lim. 1988). Face will be the self image to do something acceptable socially. Face can be characterized into two types: positive and negative faces. Brown & Levinson (1987) defines face into two ways as "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others", or alternately, "the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of claimed by interactants. The explicit of positive face is that we feel more comfortable when we do something and others like, respect and approve of us. The second type of face is negative face

which is significant universally in human culture. Negative face is “the desire every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by other”, or “the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction. Lim (1988; p.22 cited in Prachanant. 2006) points out that “negative face is the desire for autonomy or self determination. When engaged in social interaction, social factors are expected to save both the positive and negative face of each other”. Negative face is the self-esteem condition to consider something and not need the interlocutor’s obstruction or negative face is threatened when we feel uncomfortable that others cannot constrain us in any way and freedom of choice and action are impeded when negative face is threatened. Prachanant (2006) also indicates that performing face-threatening acts (FTAs), participants have to calculate the potential face risks, i.e., how much they are risking in performing those acts. The three sociological factors taken into the consideration in determining the level of politeness which a speaker will use to a hearer are: 1) the social factor between speaker and hearer (D), 2) the relative power relationship between speaker and hearer (P), and 3) the ranking of the particular imposition (R). Brown and Levinson (1987) also mention that showing politeness strategies is the way to save the hearer’s face when face-threatening acts are not avoided.

Brown and Levinson (1987) classify politeness strategies into four main types: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record or indirect strategy. Bald on record strategies usually do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer’s face. It is often used by speakers who are familiar with their interlocutor. In addition, it is direct utterance that the hearer will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy but makes clearly to the listener. Next, to mitigate the FTAs, positive politeness strategies are addressed to hearer’s positive face wants, such as expressions

of solidarity, informality, and familiarity. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that employing positive politeness strategies, the speaker (S) recognizes and respects the addressee (A)'s positive face want. It seems to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face that make the listener feel good about themselves. It always uses the situation when speakers and listener know each other. In other word, the strategy attempts to avoid conflict between speakers and listener. Negative politeness strategies are addressed to the hearer's negative face and can be described as expressions of restraint, formality, and distancing. Brown and Levinson (1987) further indicates that when applying negative politeness strategies, the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee's territory and self-determination. Therefore, the speaker refrains from imposing on addressees. These strategies presume that the speaker will be imposing on the listener and there is a higher potential for awkwardness or embarrassment in bald strategies and positive politeness strategies. The last of Brown and Levinson theory about politeness strategies is that off-record or indirect strategy. This strategy applies indirect language and takes away the potential of imposing.

In addition, this strategy prevents the speaker making an explicit imposition on the listener. The four main types of politeness strategies developed by Brown and Levinson outline an avoidance strategy to avert conflict between speaker and interlocutor speaker and interlocutor smoothly and sensitively. However, greeting plays a crucial role in managing relations between people in their initial encounter. It is usually taught during the first day of beginning-level foreign language classes and serves as an introduction to the culture of the target language. Consequently, to make an impression with people we meet for the first time, we must use the greeting and recognize that politeness strategies are an inevitable choice to make contact with

people we do not know. Politeness strategies play a great part in the method of greeting demonstrating the politeness theory especially in terms of social factor and social status.

2.6 Factors Affecting the Speech Act Production

Social factor is one of the factors that determine politeness behaviours (Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987). The notion of social factor refers to the consideration of “the roles people are taking in relation to one another in a particular situation as well as how well they know each other” (p.126), which means the degree of intimacy between interlocutors. Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that politeness increases with social factor. On the other hand, Wolfson (1989) mentions that there is very little solidarity establishing speech behaviour among strangers and intimates because of the relative pre-existing familiarity of their relationship, whereas the negotiation of relationships is more likely to happen among friends.

The role of social status in communication involves the ability to recognize each other’s social position (Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987; & Holmes, 1990). They claim that people with high social status are prone to receive deferential behaviour, including linguistic deference and negative politeness. Thus, those with lower social status are inclined to avoid offending those with higher status and show more respect to them. Liao and Bresnahan (1996) argue that American and Chinese have to refuse with the listener who is higher, equal and lower in social status. Chinese have the specific to make an excuse in refusal higher than American when higher in social status appeared. Moreover, the degree of apology in Chinese rises when the speaker are lower in social status. The study shows that there are different between American and Chinese in refusal strategies that social status is a part of these

differences. In addition, the European zone rarely recognizes that social status differs in Asia, where people usually act up to the social status. Sairhun (1999) indicates that social status played an important role in refusals in Thai and in English used by the Thai students. When the refusals are lower in social status, they tend to give reasons and employ such strategies as hedging, apologizing and expressing positive remarks. Social status seems to influence the strategic choices made by the American students to a lesser extent than those made by Thai students.

In this study, it seems to be that the important social status plays a big role between the offers and refusals when the lower in social status appeared. In other words, the lower in social status explicitly choose the appropriate utterance when they speak to the listener so it seems to relate with my research to know the differences when hospitality industrial staff use to reply strategies to greeting if the social distance and the social status are related. Panpothong (1999) states that social status and informally between the speaker and the listener is the factor to effect in easy and difficult to refusal and strategies using by the interlocutors.

2.7 Previous Studies Related to the Present Investigation

Sullivan (1979) studied the conversation about saying hello and goodbye. The study used sampling of ESL textbooks and dialogues which did not match those collected from spontaneous speech. The study found that in the seven textbooks, the most common greeting was "How are you?" which was heard only once in 65 greetings. They also took a sample from speaker by gender and work place such as beauty parlor, elevators, office buildings, airports, stores, TV ages 18-45. Of 46 female greetings, 31 said "hi" (67%). Of 19 males, 7 said "hi" (37%).

Beebe and Takahashi (1989a) studied social status and pattern variation in second language acquisition between Americans and Japanese. They argued that Americans were not always more direct nor more explicit than Japanese. Japanese did not always avoid disagreement, nor critical remarks, especially, when talking to lower status person. They also found that both American and Japanese used style shifting in English according to the status of the interlocutor.

Beebe and Takahashi (1989b) investigated disagreement and chastisement in American and Japanese performance in both natural speech collected in notebooks and through a discourse completion test/written role-play questionnaire. The findings revealed that Americans are not always more direct or explicit than Japanese, Japanese do not always avoid disagreement or critical remarks (especially to lower status person) or apologizing more. Both groups used questions to function as a warning, in order to correct, or indicate disagreement, to chastise, and to convey embarrassing information, but questions by Americans and Japanese were seen to be significantly different in tone and content. Americans used positive remarks more frequently and in more places than did the Japanese.

Beebe and Takahashi (1990) investigated about pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. They collected the data by using a discourse completion test with 60 participants to investigate pragmatic transfer in refusals to requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions directed at higher-, equal-, and lower-status interlocutors. The evidence of pragmatic transfer was found at least on three levels: the sequence, frequency, and the intrinsic content (or tone) of the semantic formulas used in the refusals.

Garcia (1992) studied about refusing an invitation: A case study of Peruvian style, intended to compare the politeness strategies used by male and female speakers

in a role-play situation: refusing an invitation. The respondents were 10 male and 10 female Peruvians with an age range from the 20s to the 70s and with three different classes represented. Both groups went through distinctly marked stages: 1) invitation-response, and 2) insistence-response. In the first stage both genders used deference politeness strategies as the head act, while in the second stage they adopted solidarity politeness strategies for head acts. In the first stage both genders expressed their respect toward their interlocutor and their friendship with her. However, in the second stage, males tended to refuse, while females generally responded affirmatively, though vaguely.

Beebe and Takahashi (1993) also studied American and Japanese performance the speech act of correction in status unequal (professor-student: low to high, high to low) situations where one knows the other has made a factual error. They used 12 situations discourse completion tasks to collect the data. The results showed that in high to low (processor to student), the American group showed the most verbal indications of correction in English and Japanese responding in English and Japanese responding in Japanese in order. On the other hand, low to high (student to processor) was Japanese responding in Japanese, Japanese responding in English and American in order. The reason was that in Japanese paralinguistic means, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, signs, hesitating were that function. Japanese were more overt in their consciousness of status and in not covering it up in their use of language.

Tyler (1995) carried out the miscommunication which occurred in a videotaped tutoring session between a Korean tutor and an English student. The results indicated that mutual miscommunication occurred not only because of either participant's uncooperativeness, as both the tutor and student believed, but also

rather because differing cultural frameworks for discourse caused each participant to negotiate the higher status for themselves.

Beebe and Cumming (1996) studied natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance by using compared refusals in spontaneous speech and written discourse completion tests to collect the data. The findings revealed that discourse completion tests are an effective means of gathering a large amount of data quickly, creating an initial classification of semantic formulas, and ascertaining the structure of refusals. In only 5 out of 27 formulas, strategies, or subcategories was there a difference of three or more tokens between the oral and written data. However, the tests did not elicit natural speech with respect to actual wording, range of formulas and strategies, length of responses (4 times as many words and sentences over the phone) or number of turns necessary to fulfill a function. Nor did they adequately represent the depth of emotion and general psycho-social dynamics of naturally occurring speech.

Ebsworth, Bodman and Carpenter (1996) investigated the concerning handle greeting situation of non-native speakers in U.S., American English. They mentioned that non-native speakers show great importance to greet with a person or in cultures in which concerns of time are secondary of social interaction. They also described that it is not rude for native speakers who have the same cultures to greet quickly but friendly with a person or both are in a hurry different from non-native who always considered important to extent more effort with person who are impersonal. The findings indicated that greeting is very much language-specific, and that pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic failure often occurred when non-native speakers did not understand the assumptions make by native speakers for particular greeting situations.

Liao and Bresnahan (1996) studied a contrastive pragmatic on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. The subjects were asked to respond to one of the six request scenarios by filling in their responses. The responses were coded according to the number of strategies used in each response to examine ethnicity and gender differences. The results found that both groups refused requests from a teacher more easily than from either a friend or a family member, but Chinese gave more specific reasons than Americans. Women tended to use more strategies than men to refuse someone of higher status.

Placencia (1997) studied address forms in Ecuadorian Spanish. He found that in Ecuadorian Spanish a variety of address forms are used. These included first name, full name, title and surname, title and full name, name substitutes and address pronouns. Their use primarily occurred during openings and closing of conversations, during a preface of the reason for the call, or in situations of heightened emotion. The patterns of use depended primarily on age, distance, power relationships, sex, frequency of interaction, and goal of the interaction.

Bresnahan et al (1999) examined a comparison of response styles in Singapore and Taiwan. They collected the data by using discourse completion questionnaires, containing one of three scenarios, representing different levels of imposition. The results indicated that although independent self-construal was associated with more explicit refusal and more concern with clarity, interdependent self-construal was not associated with compliance and greater concern for others' feelings. Differences in the level of imposition in a request were related to the type of response. Responses to lower-imposition requests tended to comply; responses to higher-imposition requests tended to refuse the requests. Overall, men were more compliant than women. Singapore Chinese indicated a greater preference for complying with the request from

a friend than Chinese in Taiwan, but Taiwan Chinese used more indirect refusal strategies and embedded structures to soften the tone of voice. When Singapore participants used refusals, they were more direct and used fewer strategies to refuse than their Taiwanese counterparts. The study concluded that the response styles of Chinese in Singapore and Taiwan were distinctive.

Forbes and Cordella (1999) investigated the role of gender in Chilean argumentative discourse. They collected the data by using discourse analyzed. Three groups (G1--n= 3 males, 1 female, G2--n=3 females, 1 male; G3--n=2 females, 2 males) discussed discrimination that women experience in society. Results found that gender did not completely determine role in participant style. Gender preferences were noted, but most strategies were used by both genders. The most influential factor on gender variation was the balance ratio of gender. Females tended to favor overlap, latching, back channeling, supportive moves, and repetition of others, except when there was a balanced ratio of gender. When the group composition was balanced, females tended to accommodate to male strategy balance, demonstrating sensitivity to group dynamics and a need for harmony and cooperation. Male strategy choice varied more when they were the majority and seemed to be exercising power.

DuFon (2000) investigated the acquisition of negative responses to experience questions in Indonesian as a second language by sojourners in naturalistic interactions that a combination of linguistic, social and cognitive factors worked together to move the learners forward through the acquisition process. The findings explained that in response to experience questions, the learners progressed through stages from English 'no' to minimal responses and to overgeneralization of *tidak* and eventually at the intermediate level to a more automatic and appropriate use of *belum*. A combination

of linguistic, social and cognitive factors worked together to move the learners forward through this acquisition process.

Schumann and Ross (2000) studied why women apologize more than men: gender differences in thresholds for perceiving offensive behavior. They divided it into a two part study. In Study 1, participants reported in daily diaries all offences they committed or experienced and whether an apology had been offered. Women reported offering more apologies than men, but they also reported committing more offences. There was no gender difference in the proportion of offences that prompted apologies. This finding suggested that men apologize less frequently than women because they have a higher threshold for what constitutes offensive behaviour. In Study 2, they tested this threshold hypothesis by asking participants to evaluate both imaginary and recalled offenses. As predicted, men rated the offences as less severe than women did. They found that different ratings of severity predicted both judgments of whether an apology was deserved and actual apology behaviour.

Macaulay (2001) examined differences between male and female interviewers in topical and political interviews on radio and television. In interviewing, asking questions signifies power rather than powerlessness. Female interviewers had social status comparable to that of male interviewers. The male interviewers in this study employed direct requests greater frequency than do their female counterparts. In contrast, the female interviewers employed more indirect requests for information than did the male interviewers; however, since indirect requests for information can be provocative as well as polite, use of provocative forms constitutes an enabling strategy. While the male interviewers favored indirect forms that foster attunement, the female interviewers favoured indirect forms that engage their interviewees

analytically. The female interviewers employed indirect requests for information to ask “tough” questions, maintain a line of questioning.

Al-Issa (2003) examined the phenomenon of sociocultural transfer and its motivating factors within the realization patterns of the speech act of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners. He collected the data by using a discourse completion test (DCT), which was designed and further developed based on observational field note data. The results showed three areas in which sociocultural transfer appeared to influence the EFL learners' selection of semantic formulas, the length of their responses, and the content of the semantic formulas. The cases of transfer were seen to reflect cultural values transferred from Arabic to English.

Prachanant (2006) investigated the pragmatic transfer in responses to complaints by Thai learners in the hotel business. His participants were 120 hotel employees separated into 30 natives English speaking hotel employees, 30 native Thai speaking hotel employees, 30 Thai English learners of low proficiency and 30 Thai English learners of high proficiency. He used the discourse completion task (DCT) in 10 complaint situations to collect the data. He also emphasized the pragmatic transfer by Thai English learners of low proficiency and Thai English learners of high proficiency compared to the native English speaking hotel employees and native Thai speaking hotel employees. The results found that twelve semantic formulas in complaining in the hotel business were used in responding. The highest number that uses these strategies is native Thai speaking hotel employees, native Thai speaking hotel employees, Thai English learners of high proficiency and Thai English learners of low proficiency in order.

In conclusion, from the previous studies above, the researcher has more knowledge of the strategies used in greeting and replies to greeting, cross- culturally

and also the study that related to this research such as social factor (gender).

Importantly, they can assist the present investigation comprehensively.

2.8 Summary of the Chapter

To sum up, this chapter describes the language of hospitality, speech acts, speech acts of greetings and replies to greeting, politeness theory, factors affecting the speech acts production, and previous studies related to the present investigation. The next chapter will give details on research methodology.