Table 4.15

Frequency and Percentage of Replies to Greeting Strategies Used in Pattern MHG -

MHS

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts.	8	57.14
2. The identifiable subparts:	5	35.71
3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.	1	7.14
Total	**14**	**100.00**

According to Table 4.15, pattern MHG – MHS illustrates the total number of the strategies used in replies to greetings in 5 situations, which the male hotel guest greets, the male hotel staff replies. It indicated that "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts" was most found (f=8, 57.14%), followed by "The identifiable subparts" (f=5, 35.71%), and "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence" (f=1, 7.14%), respectively.

Table 4.16

Frequency and Percentage of Replies to Greeting Strategies Used in Pattern MHG - FHS

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts.	9	56.25
2. The identifiable subparts;	2	12.50
3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.	5	31.25
Total	**16**	**100.00**

As shown in Table 4.16, pattern MHG - FHS depicts the overall frequency of strategies used in replies to greetings of the male hotel guest greets, the female hotel staff replies. The instance of strategies most frequently used was "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts" (f=9, 56.25%), followed by "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence" (f=5, 31.25%), and "The identifiable subparts" (f=2, 12.50%), respectively.

Table 4.17

Frequency and Percentage of Replies to Greeting Strategies Used in Pattern FHG - MHS

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts.	12	66.66
2. The identifiable subparts:	3	16.67
3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.	3	16.67
Total	**18**	**100.00**

As shown in Table 4.17, pattern FHG - MHS shows the 5 situations in the aspect of the female hotel guest greets, the male hotel staff replies. It was found that the most frequently used strategy in replies to greetings was "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts" (f=12, 66.66%), followed by "The identifiable subparts" and "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence" (f=3, 16.67%), respectively.

Table 4.18

Frequency and Percentage of Replies to Greeting Strategies Used in Pattern FHG - FHS

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts.	13	59.09
2. The identifiable subparts:	5	22.73
3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.	4	18.18
Total	**22**	**100.00**

As shown in Table 4.18, pattern FHG - FHS illustrates the 5 situations in the aspect of the female hotel guest greets, the female hotel staff replies. It was found that the most frequently strategy used in replies to greetings was "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts" (f=13, 59.09%), followed by "The identifiable subparts" (f=5, 22.73%), and "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence" (=4, 18.18%), respectively.

As presented above, three replies to greeting strategies were found in the hotel business. The most used strategy was "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts", followed by "The identifiable subparts", and "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence", respectively. To illustrate the utterances of each strategy used, the following are the instances of each strategy.

1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts

Suzuki (1968; cited in Wongkhomthong. 1986) mentions that the word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts such as "yaayaa" (Hi) in Japanese, and "Hello" in English. This strategy was observed to be the first most frequently used strategy for the two different groups (hotel staff and hotel guests) in replies to greetings people. It reveals that both groups used Thai and English language. "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts" found can be divided into three subcategories: "Expression of greeting", "Acknowledgment of greeting", and "Gratitude" The evidence found that "Expression of greeting" was used 6 times, "Acknowledgement of greeting" was used 52 times while "Gratitude" was employed 5 times to replies to greetings. The respondents employed "Expression of greeting" when they want to reply to the short talking with their interlocutors and show their politeness when someone greets them such as in the instances (1) - (4) below:

(1) Hello. (MHS8).

(2) Hi. (MHS10)

(3) Sawatdee ka. (FHS16)

(4) Sawatdee krap. (MHG25)

In addition, "Acknowledgement of greeting" is the strategy used to draw the interlocutor's attention to ignore of long conversation. The utterances used to replies to greetings are:

(5) O.K./ Okays (MHS2/FHS16)

(6) Yes. (MHS2)

(7) Sure. (FHS20)

(8) Krap/ Kha. (MHG21)

(9) Fine. (MHG26)

(10) Great. (FHG31)

More interestingly, "Gratitude" strategy is used when they would like to thank their interlocutors for having informed him or her of the unfavoulable circumstance. Also, an expression of gratitude is employed when the conversation is ended such as in the instance (11) below:

(11) Thanks/ Thank you. (MHS2)

From the instances, both the hotel staff and hotel guests always used this strategy in replies to greetings to make direct utterances. In addition, the words that they used in conversation were always short and precise.

2. The identifiable subparts, or to put it another way those which have literal as well as pragmatic meanings other than greeting of this type have the characteristics or ritualized convention formulas

Suzuki (1968; cited in Wongkhomthong 1986) mentions that this strategy was used in Japanese word "ohayoo" (good morning) and English word "good-bye". These types of words are functions 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". "The identifiable subparts, or to put it another way those which have literal as well as pragmatic meanings and the greeting of this type have the characteristics or ritualized convention formulas" found can be divided into seven subcategories: "Expression of greeting", "Acknowledgment of greeting", "Gratitude", "To clarify", "To ask for help", "To introduce" and "Giving the time frame for action". The results found that "Expression of greeting" was used 7

times, "Acknowledgement of greeting" was used 12 times, "Gratitude" was used 20 times, "To clarify" was used twice, "To ask for help" was used once, "To introduce" and "Giving the time frame for action" were used 1 time to replies to greetings people.

The respondents employed "Expression of greeting" when they replied to greetings with the interlocutor and also intended to show their politeness when someone greeted them, such as in the instances (12) - (14) below:

(12)   Good morning. (MHS3)

(13)   Good evening. (FHS18)

(14)   Morning Miss. (FHG40)

In addition, "Acknowledgement of greeting" strategy was used to confirm that utterances of their interlocutors are, such as in the instances (15) - (20) below:

(15)   Yes, no problem. (MHS2)

(16)   Yes, you can. (MHS2)

(17)   Yes, thank you. (MHS7)

(18)   Yes, here you are. (MHS9)

(19)   Sure, please. (MHS10)

(20)   Of course.(MHG24)

On other hand, "Gratitude" is used to underline the sincerity of their interlocutors, such as in the instances (21) - (23) below:

(21)   Thank you. (MHS1)

(22)   Thank you, I will. (MHS3)

(23)   Thank you very much. (FHS14)

In addition, "To clarify" is the strategy used to repeat the information spoken before, such as in the instances (24) - (25) below:

(24)   O.K., we can check? (MHS6)

(25)   Yes, we have a reservation. (MHS7)

Moreover, "To ask for help" is the strategy used in replies to greetings when asking their interlocutors to help them to do something such as in the instance (26) below:

(26)   I want you help me. (FHS13)

However "To introduce" is the strategy used in replies to greetings in order to repeat their name correctly, such as in the instances (27) below:

(27)   My name is Odd Moller. (MHG2)

Also, "Giving the time frame for action" strategy used to inform the length of time needed to compensate about their question which is not responded immediately.

(28)   Just a moment.(FHS29)

From the instances, the hotel staff and hotel guests always used this strategy in replies to greetings when they would like to reply to greetings, to confirm, to make sincerity, to repeat, to ask for help, to introduce, to inform, and to request for waiting.

3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.

Wongkhomthong (1986) states that this type is longer, more complex, and more varied than others. If grouped together, the third type is sufficiently different from the other two and the usual practice in English appears to be to refer to those utterances as speeches, or addresses. This strategy was employed when the hotel staff

and hotel guests would like to state the important things at special occasions for their speakers such as birthday, special festival, special day, etc. "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence" found can be divided into six subcategories: "Expression of greeting", "Acknowledgment of greeting", "Gratitude", "Blessing", and "To offer help". The investigation found that "Expression of greeting" was used twice, "Acknowledgement of greeting" was used twice, "Gratitude" was used 3 times, "Blessing" was used 5 times, and "To offer help" was used 4 times in replies to greetings people.

The respondents employed "Expression of greeting" made formal in replies to greetings with interlocutors and also intented to show their politeness when someone greeted them such as in the instances (29) - (30) below:

(29) And you? (MHG26)

(30) Nice to meet you. (FHG40)

In addition, "Acknowledgement of greeting" strategy is used to confirm that utterances of interlocutors were already known such as in the instances (31) - (32) below:

(31) I am okay. (FHS16)

(32) I am good. (FHS17)

On the other hand, "Gratitude" strategy shows sincerity of their interlocutors helping such as in the instances (33) - (34) below:

(33) You're welcome. (MHG27)

(34) My pleasure if you need something call the number 0. (FHG38)

However, "Blessing" is a strategy that they would like to say something to create good feeling with their interlocutors such as in the instances (35) - (40) below:

     (35)   Have a nice stay. (MHS4)

     (36)   Happy new year, too. (FHS14)

     (37)   Have a nice staying. (FHG33)

     (38)   Enjoy your stay. (FHG35)

     (39)   Welcome to Surin, have a good permanence. (FHG40)

     (40)   Hope you will have a pleasant stay, Sir. (MHG22)

"To offer help" is used to provide the interlocutor with help and the unfavourable circumstances were taken care of sincerelity such as in the instances (41) - (42) below:

     (41)   Can I help you, sir? (MHG26)

     (42)   May I help you? (MHG30)

From the instances, it was found that both the hotel staff and hotel guests always used this strategy in replies to greetings to show their politeness, to confirm utterance of their interlocutors, to be sincere, and to take care of their interlocutors.

4.2 Differences of Strategies Used in Greetings

The section below shows the frequency of the strategies used for greetings by hotel staff and hotel guests when gender is involved. There are four groups, namely MHS (Male Hotel Staff), FHS (Female Hotel Staff), MHG (Male Hotel Guest) and FHG (Female Hotel Guest). The 40 situations of greetings were used to classify in each demand of gender employed in greeting strategies. The table below shows the differences of strategies used in greetings of hotel staff and hotel guests classified by gender.

Table 4.19

Differences of Strategies Used in Greetings of Hotel Staff and Hotel Guests Classified

by Gender

Strategies	MHS	FHS	MHG	FHG	F	Pattern of Variation
1. To greet people	11	10	8	10	2.28	N.S.
2. To meet people	7	8	18	27	15.44**	p<.000; MHS<MHG, MHS<FHG, FHS<MHG, FHS<FHG
3. To introduce people and to be introduced	4	2	9	3	2.13	N.S.
4. To request for information	10	4	11	18	12.28**	p<.000; MHS<FHG, FHS<MHS, FHS<MHG, FHS<FHG, MHG<FHG
All strategies combined	**32**	**24**	**46**	**58**	-	-

Note: ***significant different at 0.00, N.S. = No significant difference

Table 4.19 depicts the overall frequency of strategies used in greetings of hotel

staff and hotel guests classified by gender of four different groups: MHS, FHS, MHG

and FHG. The highest number of strategies used in greetings was used by the FHG

group (f=58), followed by the MHG group (f=46), the MHS group (f=32) and the

FHS group (f=24), respectively. This means that female hotel guest (FHG) employed

the strategies used in greetings in all strategies more than three groups: MHG, MHS

and FHS, respectively.

In addition, when considering each strategy , it was found that "To greet people" was most frequently employed by MHS (f=11), followed by FHS and FHG used the same in rank (f=10) and MHS (f=8) respectively.

To sum up, male hotel staff employed the strategies in greetings to make the utterance with their interlocutors more than female hotel staff, female hotel guest and male hotel staff. "To meet people" was most frequently employed by FHG (f=27), followed by MHG (f=18), FHS (f=8) and MHS (f=7) respectively. That is, female hotel guest employed the strategies used in greetings to meet people more than male hotel guest, female hotel staff and male hotel staff respectively. "To introduce people and to be introduced" was most frequently employed by MHG (f=9), followed by MHS (f=4), FHG (f=3) and FHS (f=2) respectively. In addition, male hotel guests employed the strategies used in greetings to introduce people and to be introduced more than male hotel staff, female hotel guest and female hotel staff. "To request for information" was most frequently employed by FHG (f=18), followed by MHG (f=11), MHS (f=10) FHS (f=4) respectively. Moreover, male hotel guest employed the strategies used in greetings to request for information more than male hotel guest, male hotel staff and female hotel staff.

The results of ANOVA indicate that two strategies showed significant differences of four social factors i.e. "To meet people" (F=15.44; p<.000) and "To request for information" (F=12.28; p<.000). Analysis of variance by the post hoc test of "To meet people" indicates that there were four pairs of significant differences: MHS-MHG, MHS-FHG, FHS-MHG and FHS-FHG. In addition, "To request for information" analysis of variance by the post hoc test indicates that there were five pairs of significant differences: MHS-FHG, FHS-MHS, FHS-MHG, FHS-FHG and MHG-FHG.

4.3 Differences of Strategies Used in Replies to Greeting

The section shows the frequency of the strategies used in replies to greetings by hotel staff and hotel guest when gender is involved. There are four groups, namely MHS (Male Hotel Staff), FHS (Female Hotel Staff), MHG (Male Hotel Guest) and FHG (Female Hotel Guest). The 40 situations in replies to greetings were used to classify the use of replies to greeting strategies. The table below shows the differences of strategies used in replies to greetings of hotel staff and hotel guests classified by gender.

Table 4.20

Differences of Strategies Used in Replies to Greetings of Hotel Staff and Hotel Guests Classified by Gender

Strategies	MHS	FHS	MHG	FHG	F	Pattern of Variation
1. The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts.	11	10	17	25	2.21	N.S.
2. The identifiable subparts;	19	11	7	8	2.12	N.S.
3. The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence.	1	3	6	7	2.08	N.S.
All strategies combined	**31**	**24**	**30**	**40**	-	-

Note: N.S. = no significant difference

Table 4.20 depicts the overall frequency of strategies used in replies to greetings of the hotel staff and hotel guests classified by gender of four different

groups: MHS, FHS, MHG and MHS. The highest number of strategies used in reply to greeting was the FHG group (f=40), followed by the MHS group (f=31), the MHG group (f=30), and the FHS group (f=24), respectively. This means that female hotel guest (FHG) employed the strategies in replies to greetings in all strategies more than the three groups; MHS, MHG and FHS respectively.

When considering each strategy, it was found that "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts." was most frequently employed by FHG (f=25), followed by MHG (f=17), MHS (f=11) and FHS (f=10), respectively. To sum up, female hotel staff employed the strategies in replies to greetings to make the utterance with their interlocutors more than male hotel guest, male hotel staff and female hotel staff. "The word that cannot be analyzed into meaningful subparts followed by the identifiable subparts, or to put it another way those which have literal as well as pragmatic meanings other than greeting of this type have the characteristics or ritualized convention formulas" were most frequently employed by MHS (f=19), followed by FHS (f=11), MHG (f=8) and MHG (f=7) respectively. That is, male hotel staff employed the strategies in replies to greetings more than female hotel guest, male hotel guest and male hotel staff. "The utterance at special occasions such as words of congratulation or condolence." was most frequently employed by FHG (f=7), followed by MHG (f=6), FHS (f=3) and MHS (f=1) respectively. In addition, female hotel staff employed the strategies in replies to greetings more than male hotel guest, female hotel staff and male hotel staff.

The results of ANOVA indicate that four strategies showed no significant differences among the four different groups. This means that the four groups employed all four strategies equally.

4. 4 Summary of the Chapter

In conclusion, this chapter presented the findings from the analyses of the strategies used in greetings and replies to greetings employed by the hotel staff and hotel guests, and the differences in strategies used when the hotel staff and hotel guests greet and replies to greetings when gender is involved. In the next chapter, the findings presented in Chapter Four will be concluded and discussed.