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Abstract
Language plays an important role in human life as a medium of communication. The communication between sender and receiver is the activity of conveying ideas, messages, attitude, and mood of both speakers and hearers. This paper attempts to analyze cooperative principle (CP) and politeness principle (PP) in guest complaining at x hotel in Kuta-Bali through a series of conversation at the front desk. The data were gathered from guest’s conversation record book from one of the hotels in Kuta-Bali. The conversations have been transcribed into a written text. The intended data were identified, classified, and then separately analyzed based on cooperative and politeness principle. A qualitative descriptive analysis was employed to analyze CP and PP in the guest complaining as in line with the theories which are proposed by Grice and Leech. The results of analysis show that the receptionist carefully observed both CP and PP, but the guest’s responses might not necessarily comply with those principles for some reasons.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Communication plays an important role in this modern society. We, as the occupants of the global society, have our varying classes, statuses, and ages, grades, which we want others to recognize in our social and linguistic intercourse. People communicate with each other using language as medium of communication.

Pragmatics is a systematic way of explaining language use in context. It seeks to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures, as explained by semantics. As a field of language study, pragmatics is fairly new. Its origins lie in philosophy of language and the American philosophical school of pragmatism. As a discipline within language science, its roots lie in the work of (Herbert) Paul Grice on conversational implicature and the cooperative principle, and on the work of Stephen Levinson, Penelope Brown and Geoff Leech on politeness

Pragmatics deals with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and in-
interpreted by a listener. It has something to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves (Yule, 1996: 3). People communicate with each other using language as medium of communication. To achieve a successful conversation, participants should be cooperative with each other. They need to observe and comply with the cooperative principle as purposed by Grice. In cooperative principle, Grice proposed that participants in a communicative exchange are guided by a principle that determines the way in which language is used with maximum efficiency and effect to achieve rational communication what so-called the Cooperative Principle (CP). Grice comes up with a list of four rules of the maxims namely; quality, quantity, relevance, and manner that specify what participants have to do in order to satisfy this principle. They should speak sincerely, relevantly, clearly, and should provide sufficient information.

In the CP and PP, it is assumed that in communicative events a speaker tries to communicate his needs, feelings, and thoughts to his interlocutors and expects them to understand his talk as easily as possible. Hence, a speaker always tries to make his utterance easily comprehensible, relevant with the context, indicating that he does not spend and waste a lot of time during the conversation.

Grice’s theory of meaning gives account of how communication might be achieved in the absence of any conventional means for expressing the intended message. He develops the concept of implicature as an essential theory about how people use language (Levinson, 1983: 101). In social interaction, it is necessarily for both speakers and interlocutors to consider politeness principles. People are aware that such principles and norms exist in the society at large. Politeness in the interaction can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another’s face. In this sense, politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing the equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is considered as friendliness, camaraderie or solidarity (Yule, 1996: 60).

Language is always associated with the form, function and meaning. Therefore, the communication made by human beings through the medium of language is inseparable from the study of form, function and meaning of speech such as; expressive, directive, representative, commissive, and declarative in speeches. The cooperative and politeness principle are always relevant to study and becomes main concerns in pragmatics. In hotel situation, for instance, a receptionist should be cooperative and polite to every guest who stays at the hotel. It is necessary for the receptionist to know cooperative and politeness principle in order to serve their guests better. Politeness is interpreted as a genuine desire to be pleasant to others, or as the underlying motivation for an individual’s linguistic behaviour.
Cooperative principle is the key to have the communication run smoothly by observing the maxims. In addition, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, but they also perform actions via those utterances. Actions performed via utterances are called speech acts. On any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts namely locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts.

Bali Island as one of the international tourist destinations in Indonesia provides various facilities including hotel accommodations, restaurants, pubs, cafes, travel agents, souvenir shops and many others. A receptionist who is in charge at the front office of a hotel plays an important role in making guests comfortable and staying longer. This section will take care of guests’ needs and ensure them to have their best service during their stay. This paper attempts to analyze cooperative and politeness principle in guest complaining through a series of conversation between a hotel guest and a receptionist at the front desk of a hotel in Kuta, Bali.

In my point of view, the cooperative principle and polite principle are very interesting issues to be discussed and investigated. There are a number of reasons why this present research should be conducted, they are; Firstly, the result of the study of CP and PP will be a useful reference not only for those who work in the front office/desk, but also for those who work in the tourism or hospitality industry in general. Secondly, Bali is well known and owns rich of culture, provides complete accommodation facilities and places of interest which attract many visitors to come to Bali, therefore, it is very important to serve them better by observing those principles in order to make them stay longer; Thirdly, it is worthy conducting a special study on the CP and PP in guest complaining as the research on the similar issues are still a few in numbers.

This paper attempts to analyze cooperative and politeness principle in guest complaining through a series of conversation between a hotel guest and a receptionist at the front desk of a hotel in Kuta-Bali. In addition, this study has theoretical, practical and pedagogical contribution in education. With this considering in mind, the researcher conducted a research on Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle in Guest Complaining: A Case Study at an Accommodation in Kuta, Bali.

In this research there are three main problems. Those problems are discussed based on the concepts and theories used in this research. The problems formulated in this research are (1) do the hotel guest and receptionist observe the Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principle (PP) when addressing and handling complaining? (2) What factors make the receptionist and the guest to observe or not to observe (if any) towards the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principles? (3) What speech acts and maxims contain in the hotel guest and
receptionist’s utterances? Those problems are discussed in the discussion section.

In conducting this research there are several objective to be achieved. This objective of research will help the reader to understand the research overall. To make the discussion of the research clear, this research aims at (1) Examining whether the hotel guest and the receptionist observe the Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principles (PP) when addressing and handling complaining. (2) Knowing what factors make the receptionist and the guest observe or not observe (if any) both Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principles. (3) Finding out the speech acts and maxims contain in the utterances of hotel guest and receptionist.

This present research is qualitative design. It is in accordance with the descriptive qualitative for a number of reasons, they are; First, the characteristic of the descriptive qualitative research design is shown at the purpose of the study in describing the observance of the CP and PP. Second, the characteristic of the qualitative study is indicated by the principle methods and the results of the study, which focuses on the process rather than the product. Besides, it focuses on description or words rather than on numbers. And the last, the study focuses on data interpretation based on the research problems and concentrates on the transcribed conversation between the receptionist and the hotel guest. It is a descriptive analysis of cooperative and politeness principle of guest complaining through a series of conversation between a hotel guest and a receptionist at the front desk of a hotel in Kuta-Bali.

The data in this research are the utterances produced by the receptionist and the hotel guest in the form of English conversations which was transcribed into written form by the hotel management. The data was written in the guest complaining book that was administered by the hotel receptionist soon after the guest made the complaints. The researcher gathered the required data from the hotel management in his preliminary research.

A qualitative descriptive analysis is employed to analyze CP and PP in the guest complaining as in line with the theories which are proposed by Grice and Leech. The transcribed conversations in the guestbook then identified, classified, and separately analyzed based on cooperative and politeness principle. Data analysis consists of data transcription, data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusion. Data reduction aims at processing the raw data in order to be analyzed. Those processes will be conducted as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), the components of data analysis; interactive model. It might be in the form of selecting, focusing, simplifying, and abstracting.

The researcher expects that the results of this study will be beneficial and may contribute practically to those who work as receptionist and those of in hotel industry. For
hotel industry, the results may be useful for a guidance or code of conduct in handling and responding guests complaining. They will understand and have knowledge on cooperative principle and politeness principles to maintain a harmonius communication at all times. Theoretically and pedagogically, the research results hopefully will bring a great beneficial reference for the stakeholders in the education institution. For English instructors, it can be used for learning materials in relations to CP and PP, especially in the Pragmatics class. Moreover, the study of CP and PP might be used as a reference for many parties, including but not limited to; language teachers, linguists, language institutions, and further researchers who are interested in conducting the similar research on pragmatics-CP and PP issues.

2. CONCEPTS AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

CONCEPT

Speech Act

Making a statement may be the paradigmatic use of language, but there are all sorts of other things we can do with words. We can make requests, ask questions, give orders, make promises, give thanks, offer apologies, and so on. Moreover, almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once, distinguished by different aspects of the speaker's intention: there is the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, such as requesting or promising, and how one is trying to affect one's audience.

The theory of speech acts is partly taxonomic and partly explanatory. It must systematically classify types of speech acts and the ways in which they can succeed or fail. It must reckon with the fact that the relationship between the words being used and the force of their utterance is often oblique. For example, the sentence 'This is a pig sty' might be used nonliterally to state that a certain room is messy and filthy and, further, to demand indirectly that it be straightened out and cleaned up. Even when this sentence is used literally and directly, say to describe a certain area of a barnyard, the content of its utterance is not fully determined by its linguistic meaning--in particular, the meaning of the word 'this' does not determine which area is being referred to. A major task for the theory of speech acts is to account for how speakers can succeed in what they do despite the various ways in which linguistic meaning underdetermines use.

In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses a regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed. Some speech acts, however, are not primarily acts...
of communication and have the function not of communicating but of affecting institutional states of affairs. They can do so in either of two ways. Some officially judge something to be the case, and others actually make something the case. Those of the first kind include judges' rulings, referees' calls and assessors' appraisals, and the latter include sentencing, bequeathing and appointing. Acts of both kinds can be performed only in certain ways under certain circumstances by those in certain institutional or social positions.

**Levels of Speech Act**

How language represents the world has long been, and still is, a major concern of philosophers of language. Many thinkers, such as Leibniz, Frege, Russell, the early Wittgenstein, and Carnap (q.v.), have thought that understanding the structure of language could illuminate the nature of reality. However noble their concerns, such philosophers have implicitly assumed, as J. L. Austin complains at the beginning of How to Do Things with Words, that 'the business of a (sentence) can only be to "describe" some state of affairs, or to "state some fact", which it must do either truly or falsely'. Austin reminds us that we perform all sorts of 'speech acts' besides making statements, and that there are other ways for them to go wrong or be 'infelicitous' besides not being true. The later Wittgenstein also came to think of language not primarily as a system of representation but as a vehicle for all sorts of social activity. 'Don't ask for the meaning', he admonished, 'ask for the use'. But it was Austin who presented the first systematic account of the use of language. And whereas Wittgenstein could be charged with having conflating meaning and use, Austin was careful to separate the two. He distinguished the meaning (and reference) of the words used from the speech acts performed by the speaker using them.

Austin's attention was first attracted to what he called 'explicit performative utterances', in which one uses sentences like 'I nominate ...', 'You're fired', 'The meeting is adjourned', and 'You are hereby sentenced ...' to perform acts of the very sort named by the verb, such as nominating, firing, adjourning, or sentencing (see PERFORMATIVES). Austin held that performatives are neither true nor false, unlike what he called 'constatives'. However, he came to realize that constatives work just like performatives. Just as a suggestion or an apology can be made by uttering 'I suggest ...' or 'I apologize ...', so an assertion or a prediction can be made by uttering 'I assert ...' or 'I predict ...'. Accordingly, the distinction between constative and performative utterances is, in Austin's general theory of speech acts, superseded by that between saying something and what one does in saying it. This broader distinction applies to both statements and other sorts of speech acts, and takes into account the fact that one does not have to say 'I suggest ...' to make a suggestion, 'I apologize ...' to make an apol-
ogy, or 'I assert' to make an assertion.

The theory of speech acts aims to do justice to the fact that even though words (phrases, sentences) encode information, people do more things with words than convey information, and that when people do convey information, they often convey more than their words encode. Although the focus of speech act theory has been on utterances, especially those made in conversational and other face-to-face situations, the phrase 'speech act' should be taken as a generic term for any sort of language use, oral or otherwise. Speech acts, whatever the medium of their performance, fall under the broad category of intentional action, with which they share certain general features (see ACTION). An especially pertinent feature is that when one acts intentionally, generally one has a set of nested intentions. For instance, having arrived home without one's keys, one might push a button with the intention not just of pushing the button but of ringing a bell, arousing one's spouse and, ultimately, getting into one's house. The single bodily movement involved in pushing the button comprises a multiplicity of actions, each corresponding to a different one of the nested intentions. Similarly, speech acts are not just acts of producing certain sounds.

Austin identifies three distinct levels of action beyond the act of utterance itself. He distinguishes the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, and what one does by saying it, and dubs these the 'locutionary', the 'illocutionary' and the 'perlocutionary' act, respectively. Suppose, for example, that a bartender utters the words, 'The bar will be closed in five minutes,' reported by means of direct quotation. He is thereby performing the locutionary act of saying that the bar (i.e., the one he is tending) will be closed in five minutes (from the time of utterance), and what is said is reported by indirect quotation (notice that what the bartender is saying, the content of his locutionary act, is not fully determined by the words he is using, for they do not specify the bar in question or the time of the utterance). In saying this, the bartender is performing the illocutionary act of informing the patrons of the bar's imminent closing and perhaps also the act of urging them to order a last drink. Whereas the upshot of these illocutionary acts is understanding on the part of the audience, perlocutionary acts are performed with the intention of producing a further effect. The bartender intends to be performing the perlocutionary acts of causing the patrons to believe that the bar is about to close and of getting them to want and to order one last drink. He is performing all these speech acts, at all three levels, just by uttering certain words.

There seems to be a straightforward relationship in this example between the words uttered ('The bar will be closed in five minutes'), what is thereby said, and the act of informing the patrons that the bar will close in five minutes. Less direct is the con-
nection between the utterance and the act of urging the patrons to order one last drink. Clearly there is no linguistic connection here, for the words make no mention of drinks or of ordering. This indirect connection is inferential. The patrons must infer that the bartender intends to be urging them to leave and, indeed, it seems that the reason his utterance counts as an act of that sort is that he is speaking with this intention. There is a similarly indirect connection when an utterance of 'It's getting cold in here' is made not merely as a statement about the temperature but as a request to close the window or as a proposal to go some place warmer. Whether it is intended (and is taken) as a request or as a proposal depends on contextual information that the speaker relies on the audience to rely on. This is true even when the connection between word and deed is more direct than in the above example, for the form of the sentence uttered may fail to determine just which sort of illocutionary act is being performed. Consider, by analogy, the fact that in shaking hands we can, depending on the circumstances, do any one of several different things: introduce ourselves, greet each other, seal a deal, or bid farewell. Similarly, a given sentence can be used in a variety of ways, so that, for example, 'I will call a lawyer' could be used as a prediction, a promise, or a warning. How one intends it determines the sort of act it is.

Grice’s Conversational Maxim

Implicatures can be established by envisaging the four conversational rules or ‘Maxims’ comprised by the CP:

I. Maxim of Quantity
   1. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
   2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

II. Maxim of Quality
   1. Do not say what you believe to be false
   2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

III. Maxim of Relation: be relevant

IV. Maxim of MannerSupermaxim: be perspicuous
   1. Avoid obscurity of expression
   2. Avoid ambiguity
   3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
   4. Be orderly

Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principle is the main branch of Grice’s Conversational Implicature theory. To achieve a successful conversation, participants must be co-operative with each other. Grice (1975) states, speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation. In communication, participants are required to say the truth, be relevant and try to be as clear as possible (Yule, 1996). For this reason, Grice (1981) formulates a general “Cooperative Principle” which is elaborated in four sub-principles called maxims.
Within this principle, he suggests four maxims: quality, quantity, relevance and manner. Quality maxim deals with the truthfulness of the given information, quantity maxim with the definite amount of required information given by the speaker, and relevance maxim with the relevancy of information that the speaker contributes especially in relation to the ongoing context. In other words, the participants should be cooperative, and then their utterances can be relevant to each other. Manner maxim deals with the way how participants convey their message clearly and execute their performance with reasonable dispatch. In manner maxim, we need to be brief, orderly and avoid obscurity, and ambiguity. Grice’s maxims are the backbone of his pragmatic theory.

Violation of the Maxims

There are cases when a speaker fails to observe a maxim or several maxims in conversation in order to convey additional meaning. According to Grice, there are five ways of failing to observe a maxim, they are; flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending (Thomas, 1995: 64). In a conversation, the speaker may do one of four things with regards to the cooperative principle and the maxims:

1. The speaker may observe the maxims—this is the default assumption.
2. The speaker may opt out of a maxim by using a phrase that eliminates or mitigates the effect of the maxims and signals this to the addressee—this phrase is called a hedge.
3. The speaker may flout a maxim, to the full knowledge of the addressee
4. The speaker may violate a maxim, e.g., lie.

Grice’s theory of meaning gives account of how communication might be achieved in the absence of any conventional means for expressing the intended message. He develops the concept of implicature as an essential theory about how people use language (Levinson, 1983: 101). In social interaction, it is necessarily for both speakers and interlocutors to consider politeness principles. People are aware that such principles and norms exist in the society at large.

Theoretical Framework
Theories of Politeness

Politeness, as a pragmatic concept, has gained some scholarly attention especially within the last thirty years. It is often interpreted as a strategy (or series of strategies) exploited or employed by a speaker to achieve such goals as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations as evidenced by Leech (1980 and 1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987). Fraser (1978) and Walters (1979) focus on utterance level realizations vis-à-vis investigating “how much politeness could be squeezed out of speech act strategies alone” and examining the perception of politeness through cross- cultural pragmatics by comparing,
for instance, the politeness exhibited by native and non-native speakers of English and Spanish.

Pragmatics deals with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. It has something to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves (Yule, 1996: 3). Politeness in the interaction can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another’s face. In this sense, politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing the equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is considered as friendliness, camaraderie or solidarity (Yule, 1996: 60).

Politeness interpreted as a genuine desire to pleasant to others, or as the underlying motivation for an individual’s linguistic behaviour. Politeness refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age, etc (Thomas, 1995: 150). Politeness theory is the theory that accounts for the redressing of the affronts to face posed by face-threatening acts to addressees. First formulated in 1978 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia’s perception of politeness. Politeness is the expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003: 6). Another definition is "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction". Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another.

Politeness is one of the major social constraints on human interaction regulating participants’ communicative consideration the feelings of the others. It is usually regarded as manifestation of human civilization, and it is one of the most effective strategies modulating interpersonal relationship in human communication. The Politeness Principle may be formulated in a general way from two aspects: to minimize the expression of impolite beliefs and maximize the expression of polite beliefs. The term, self and other, are used in the maxims which make up the Politeness Principle, for politeness concerns the relationship between two participants. In a conversation, self will normally be identified with the speaker and other will typically be identified with the hearer, but other may also be applied to a third party, present or absent.

Maxim of Politeness

According to Leech, politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom we may call self and other (Leech, 1983: 131). There are a number of maxims dealing with polite behavior. In conversation, self will normally be identified with s, and other will typically be identified with h; but speakers also show politeness to third parties, who may or may not be present in the speech situation. The label other may
therefore apply not only to addresses, but to people designated by third person pronouns.

Leech stated that the maxim of politeness principle (PP) tends to go in pairs as follows:
1. Tact maxim (minimize cost to other and maximize benefit to other).
2. Generosity maxim (minimize benefit to self, and maximize cost to self).
3. Approbation maxim (minimize dispraise of other, and maximize praise of other).
5. Agreement maxim (minimize disagreement between self and other, and maximize agreement between self and other).
6. Sympathy maxim (minimize antipathy between self and other, and maximize sympathy between self and other).

In communication, both Politeness Principle and Cooperative Principle play important roles. While sometimes it is not difficult to find that someone usually observe the Politeness Principle, even at the cost of violating some maxims the Cooperative Principle. That is because Politeness Principle has a higher regulative role than the Cooperative Principle.

3. DISCUSSION

Receptionist: Good morning, Mrs Sandy. Is everything all right? (1)
Sandy: No. It’s not. Someone’s stolen some of my valuables—a tape recorder a digital cam-
era. (2)

Receptionist: I’m very sorry to hear to hear that, madam. Where were they? (3)
Sandy: In my room. And the door was locked. It can only be one of your staffs. I want my things back and fast. (4)

Receptionist: Well, I can certainly understand that you’re upset about losing them and we’ll do all we can to help. If they really are missing, it’s a matter for the police. (5)
Sandy: What do you mean, if they are missing? I told you they were. (6)

Receptionist: Yes, madam, but first I’ll have one of the housekeeping staff look through your room in case they’re still there. But I must say that we can’t be held responsible. You should have deposited the valuables with Reception. It says so on the Key Card. (7)

Sandy: That’s not enough. I want to see the manager immediately. (8)

Receptionist: I’ll be glad to call the duty manager for you, madam, but he will certainly say the same. We have very clear instructions about valuables and we must follow them. (9)
Context of situation

This conversation took place at the front office counter of a hotel in Kuta Bali between Mrs. Sandy (hotel guest) and receptionist on duty. Mrs. Sandy lost her personal belongings (a tape recorder and a digital camera) in her room while she was out.

The concept of there being an expected amount of information provided in conversation is just one aspect of the more general idea that people involve in a conversation will cooperate with each other. The Grice’s concept of cooperative principle (CP) may used to identify the following utterances between receptionist and Mrs. Sandy, a hotel guest who is approaching the front desk.

Consider these utterances (1 and 2):

Receptionist : Good morning, Mrs Sandy. Is everything all right? (1)
Sandy : No. It’s not. Someone’s stolen some of my valuables—a tape recorder and a digital camera. (2)

If we look at the conversation, the Receptionist seems to observe the maxim of quantity as his utterances are brief and clear, greetings and asking Mrs. Sandy’s purposes of approaching him. Mrs. Sandy, as his interlocutor also provided an appropriate amount of information to response Receptionist’s utterances. She went on to say that she was not happy as she lost her tape recorder and a digital camera. However, the utterances of Mrs. Sandy in (2) did not observe politeness maxim what so-called tact maxim as purposed in politeness principle (PP). In tact maxim, we need to minimize cost to other and maximize benefit to other. In fact, Mrs. Sandy maximized benefit to herself and maximize cost to the Receptionist by claiming someone (one of hotel staffs) has stolen her tape recorder and a digital camera. In fact, she was failed to prove who was really stolen them. In other parts of the conversation, Mrs. Sandy violated tact maxim as seen in the utterances (4) below:

Receptionist : I’m very sorry to hear to hear that, madam. Where were they? (3)
Sandy : In my room. And the door was locked. It can only be one of your staffs. I want my things back and fast. (4)

Mrs. Sandy’s responses to the question of Receptionist, again contradicts with the tact maxim because she has accused one of the hotel staffs stole her tape recorder and a digital camera. In fact, she neither has evidence nor shows the truth of the information. While the receptionist showed his sympathy to Mrs. Sandy’s problem. It can be seen from his utterances in (3), I’m very sorry to hear that, madam. Where were they? Receptionist in this case minimized antipathy and maximized his sympathy to Mrs. Sandy. His sympathy are also seen in his utterances (5) “Well, I can certainly understand that you’re upset about losing them and we’ll do all we can to help” and utterances (7) Yes, madam, but first I will have one of the housekeeping staff look
through your room in case they’re still there”.

The idea of receptionist in uttering (5) “If they really are missing, it’s a matter for the police” is one of the ways to solve the problem. He carefully taken care the case by reporting it to the police officer. Unfortunately, Mrs. Sandy assumed that the receptionist did not believe her report. It can be seen from her utterances (6) What do you mean, if they are missing? I told you they were. She keeps thinking that the Receptionist did not believe her at all. It is clearly seen that Mrs. Sandy has negative assumption on it. Therefore, she is very angry and disappointed and she wanted to address the issue to his manager, as seen in her utterances (8), That’s not enough. I want to see the manager immediately”. The Receptionist is necessarily show respect and polite to Mrs. Sandy regardless her impolite utterances. Thus, he kept cooperating and addressing Mrs. Sandy’s concern to the manager on duty as seen in his utterances (9) I’ll be glad to call the duty manager for you, madam, but he’ll certainly say the same. We have very clear instructions about valuables and we must follow them. The communication between the hotel Receptionist and Mrs. Sandy were face to face and in the form of verbal communication. Mrs. Sandy came directly to the front office to address her concerns.

People do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, but they perform actions via those utterances. Actions performed via utterances are called speech acts. They can be complaining, requesting, promising, offering, threaten, commanding and warning. We do not just use the language to say things or make statements, but to do things or perform actions.

If we look at the conversation between Receptionist and Mrs. Sandy, then we will identify some speech acts as we can see in utterance (1) Good morning, Mrs. Sandy. Is everything all right? And utterance (3) I’m very sorry to hear that, madam. Where were they? These utterances are said to have illocutionary acts because the meaning extends beyond the literal meaning. What is meant often goes beyond what is said and that this additional meaning is inferred and predictable. The utterances 1 and 3 are not just expression of greetings, but there was force or intention behind his utterances.

Searle (1976) in Levinson 1983: 240, states that there just five basic kinds of action that one can perform in speaking, they are; representatives, directives, commissive, expressive, and declaratives. The utterances (2) it’s not. “Someone’s stolen some of my valuables-a tape recorder and a digital camera” can be said as a representative or assertive because Mrs. Sandy expressed proposition that she has lost the valuable goods in her room. While utterance (4)…. I want my things back and fast” is considered as a directive illocution where Mrs. Sandy asks the Receptionist to give her valuable goods back as soon as possible.
The Receptionist’s response in utterance (3) “I’m very sorry to hear to hear that, madam. Where were they?” may contain an expressive illocutionary verb. While the utterance (7) “Yes, madam, but first I’ll have one of the housekeeping staff look through your room in case they’re still the” can be categorized as commissive verb because the Receptionist promised to solve her problem. The Receptionist’s response in the utterance (3) “I’m very sorry to hear to hear that, madam...” can function as an apologizing for any inconvenience caused. While Mrs. Sandy in her utterance (2) it’s not, someone’s stolen some of my valuables—a tape recorder and a digital camera” may function as a complaining.

4. CONCLUSIONS

People communicate with each other using language as medium of communication. To achieve a successful conversation, participants should be cooperative with each other. We need to observe and comply with the cooperative principle and politeness principle, including maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. Language is always associated with the form, function and meaning. Therefore, the communication made by human beings through the medium of language is inseparable from the study of form, function and meaning of speech such as; expressive, directive, representative, commissive, and declarative in speeches. The results of analysis show that the receptionist carefully observed both cooperative principle and politeness principle, but the guest’s responses might not necessarily comply with those principles for some reasons.
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