



THE USE OF UN/MARKED CODE TO SHOW POLITENESS AMONG MULTILINGUAL CUSTOMERS

Putri Nur Hidayah*

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The use of un/marked codes in expressing dissatisfaction has become a typical case among Indonesian multilingual customers which show various ways to convey dissatisfaction. This study applies theories of politeness strategy, politeness principles, and three types of complaining responses. These theories are applied to analyse marked and unmarked complaints in Indonesian and English. It attempts to show how customers express their complaints by using specific codes implying im/politeness, finding the underlying reasons by choosing certain codes, and categorizing the complaints based on three types of complaining responses. The data is taken from observation in a Japanese restaurant in form of conversation, both in Indonesian and English. The results show that the unmarked complaints are attempted to get a response and the marked complaints to exclude the waitress. The unmarked and marked complaints apply underlying reasons as assertive and impositive uses, but the politeness principle here is used to decrease the impositive by using interrogative sentences and marked code. The unmarked code is an action of voice response to get a response from the restaurant parties. It also found that the younger multilingual customers tend to use a private response, whereas the adult customers use a voice response.

E-ISSN: 2621-9158
P-ISSN: 2356-0401

*Correspondence:
Putri.17020154062@mhs.unesa.ac.
id

Submitted: 29 Mei 2021
Approved: 20 November 2021
Published: 15 December 2021

Citation:
Hidayah, P.N. (2021). The Use of Un/Marked Code to show Politeness among Multilingual Customers. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 8(2), 177-189. Doi: 10.22219/celtic.v8i2.16692

Keywords: *Customer Complaints; Marked Code; Politeness Strategies, Politeness Principles*

ABSTRAK

Kegunaan kode *marked* dan unmarked dalam mengekspresikan ketidakpuasan telah menjadi kasus khas di antara pelanggan Indonesia multibahasa yang menunjukkan berbagai cara untuk mengutarakan ketidakpuasan. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori strategi kesopanan, prinsip kesopanan, dan tiga tipe perilaku keluhan. Teori-teori digunakan pada keluhan *un/marked* dalam Bahasa Indonesia dan Inggris. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menunjukkan bagaimana pelanggan menyampaikan keluhan mereka dengan menggunakan kode tertentu yang menunjukkan kesopanan atau tidak, mencari alasan dasar dengan memilih kode tertentu, dan mengelompokkan keluhan berdasarkan pada tiga tipe perilaku keluhan. Data diambil dari pengamatan di sebuah restoran Jepang dalam bentuk percakapan dalam Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa keluhan *unmarked* bertujuan untuk mendapat tanggapan dan keluhan *marked* yang bertujuan untuk mengeluarkan pelayan dari percakapan. Keluhan *unmarked* dan *marked* menggunakan alasan tertentu sebagai kegunaan yang tidak mengenakan (*impositive*) dan penegasan (*assertive*), tetapi prinsip politeness di sini digunakan untuk mengurangi kemungkinan menyakiti dengan menggunakan kalimat tanya dan kode *marked*. Kode *unmarked* adalah perilaku tanggapan bersuara untuk mendapatkan tanggapan balik dari pihak restoran. Penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa pelanggan multi

bahasa yang lebih muda cenderung menggunakan tanggapan pribadi, sedangkan pelanggan lebih tua cenderung menggunakan tanggapan bersuara.

Kata Kunci: *Keluhan Pelanggan; Kode Marked; Prinsip Kesopanan; Strategi Kesopanan*

INTRODUCTION

Societies use language to communicate and express their feeling to another individual or group of people (Fromkin et al., 2013). How people communicate is different because people's regional, race, and gestures influence their language use. This case causes varieties of people's codes, such as different dialect, language, gesture, etc. The geographical border causes every country to have a different language. To make people from different countries can communicate with each other, there is English as an international language (Widowati & Kurnianingsih, 2018). In the multilingual Indonesian's case, at least they master two languages, such as Indonesian, Javanese, and English. Therefore, in this world, most people are multilingual who have many variations of language usage that are interesting to be examined.

According to Yan-qiu and Feng-Juan (2015) the markedness is discovered by roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy. Unmarked is a feature that more common and straightforward to use by society. Whereas marked is a feature that refers to specific. The markedness in the code-switching term could be called a marked and unmarked code. This marked code deals with the use of variety that more specific and uncommon among the primary language and vice versa. For instance, code-switching happens in the international seminar, which is attended by people who use diverse varieties. The speaker would give a speech using Indonesian, but the interpreter would interpret it in English. Nevertheless, when the interpreter talks with the speaker, he would switch to Indonesian again. The English that the interpreter uses is called the marked code, and the Indonesian, which just a few listeners understand, is unmarked. Even though the speaker determines the language as an individual, but it conducts for a group that relates to the listener's understanding (Myers-Scotton, 2018). This marked code could be found in many environments, mainly in a public place that includes a restaurant. In the restaurant could be found many multilingual customers who would show the use of their marked code. In some cases, a group of customers would talk about a critique or a private matter in their marked conversation. They mix between Indonesian and English in their conversation, followed by some reasons for mixing code. Their behavior and speech in marked and unmarked conversation would be connected to the politeness theories in this study.

Politeness Strategy

According to Yule (1996), the definition of politeness is not, mainly because it is influenced by society's view about politeness in their culture. The participants who show politeness would act based on the social principle and norm. Therefore, to analyze politeness, the concept of the participant's face is an essential instrument to define politeness. Face deals with society's views about the person's self-image,

which one desires to be recognized. At the same time, politeness is the act of whether the participant realizes the person's face. It relates to the participant's closeness, and it could be defined as respect for others. The face is divided into three types: face wants, face-threatening act, and face-saving act. Face wants the social self-image of respect for each other. Face threatening act is an utterance that the speaker says is the opposite of an individual's self-image or threatening the receiver. Face saving act is the speaker's utterance that relieves the threat (Mansoor, 2018).

Brown and Levinson (1987) believe that politeness is defined by society and influence by their norms and culture (Tanto, 2018). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the face-wants are divided into negative face wants, and positive face wants. The speaker's negative face demands not to be interrupted, or he demands his freedom to take action. The speaker's positive face needs other help, connection, closeness, or reply from others (Oktama & Ariatmi, 2019). The face-saving act which used to negative face will show a formality, courtesy, and apology. This case is called negative politeness. In contrast, positive politeness is the face-saving act to face the person's positive face is more informal and friendly. The fundamental reason is that their closeness, and they already familiar with each other.

There are two options whether to say something or say nothing in expressing a request and complaint (Brown & Levinson, 1987). When people chose to say nothing, they use an intended sign. For instance, when a student forgot to bring a book in class rather than request the one beside the student directly, he gives a sign by looking at it countless times in the bag. Say something is divided into two-part off and on record. The off-record is an indirect utterance like a clue for the hearer. For instance, "where I put my book" talking by yourself. Whereas on-record or bald record is a directly asking the needs or the point to the addressee (Yule, 1996).

Politeness Principles

Leech (2014) defines politeness as an action or behavior to respect other people feeling. Leech introduces six politeness principles: tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim.

1. Tact Maxim

Tact maxim deals with how the speaker's expression can minimize the disadvantages and maximize the advantages to others (Leech, 2014). This strategy implies the impositive to recommend, advise, request, order, and commend. The second function is commissive to offer, vow, and offer.

2. Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim is the expression of minimizing the benefit for self and maximizes the cost to self (Leech, 2014). Same as tact maxim, this strategy is used to emphasize the impositive and commissive.

3. Approbation Maxim

Approbation maxim deals with maximizes the indignity to others and maximizes the praise for others (Watts, 2003). According to Leech this strategy is used to expressive. For instance, to congratulate, praise, thank, apologize,

blame, console, etc. It also has an assertive function to state, complaint, claim, report, boast, etc.

4. Modesty Maxim

Modesty maxim deals with the act that presents minimizing the praising for self and maximizing the insult for self (Watts, 2003). Same as the approbation maxim, this strategy has expressive and assertive functions.

5. Agreement Maxim

Agreement maxim is the action of minimizing the disagreement and maximizing the agreement to others (Lustyantie, 2019). It functioned as assertive, and it aims to state, complain, claim, boast, report, etc.

6. Sympathy Maxim

A sympathy maxim is an action to minimize antipathy and maximize sympathy to others (Lustyantie, 2019). Same as the agreement maxim, this strategy only accepted to show assertive. It aims to state, complain, claim, boast, report, etc.

Customer Complaint Behavior

Complaining is an action to express the dissatisfaction attitude about an object, person, or situation, while the statement is called a complaint. The motive of customers who deliver their complaints are varied. When a customer delivers their disappointment about the service or product, some are intended to get compensation, refund, or liability (Ashraf et al., 2013). Some of the customers deliver their dissatisfaction directly to the manager, but some of them remain silent. This study believes that a positive consumer is a consumer who expresses their dissatisfaction to get compensation. Whereas not all complaints are addressed as personal gain, goals can differ (Tronvoll, 2012). For example, a customer complains very politely, and his purpose is not compensation but criticism and suggestions for the good of the seller. Therefore, the attitude of consumers toward complaining has an underlying purpose when they complain. According to Singh in (Tronvoll, 2012), complaining demeanor is implicated in private response, voice response, and third-party response.

1. Private Response

The private response is the action not directly to state their complaint to the seller. However, the customers warning their relative or deciding not to use the seller service again. This case primarily uses the action of hostile word mouth.

2. Voice Response

Voice response is an act of showing the customer dissatisfaction directly to the seller. This action is purposed to looking for compensation.

3. Third-Party Response

The third-party response is the action to complain using the third party's involvement and take legal action.

With regards to recent research about customer complaint behavior, several studies have been noted in the literature. Masjedi and Paramasivam (2018) investigate politeness in complaint among Iranian speaker of English by using discursive pragmatic. It found that the negative politeness is mostly used to decrease the FTA. The use of politeness principle in complaint among guest in hotel have been

investigated by Karim (2016). He found that the receptionist has applied the cooperative principle and politeness principles, in contrast the guest not necessarily applied the principles. Politeness phenomena in text messages have been examined by Indonesian researcher Tanto (2018), which using a pragmatic approach. He believes that specific politeness strategies are used based on their goal. The study applies the politeness strategy theory by Brown and Levinson (1987), whereas the speech act classification applies Searle's theory. This study shows that negative politeness strategies are used by someone who has more power or dominant. Whereas, when the participant faces someone in the same status or lower, the participant tends to use mix negative and politeness strategy.

The differences between this study from the previous studies emphasize the use of marked and unmarked code to show politeness or impoliteness. The relation of two languages in the complains as the data. Those researches also did not use restaurant customers as the subject in their research. Restaurant customers complains which closely relate to the appliance of politeness strategy. This research examines politeness in complaining uttered by multilingual customers. Therefore, this study tries to reveal the codes used by multilingual customers according to politeness strategy, find the reasons underlying multilingual customers to choose certain codes in conveying criticism, and categorize complains based on three types complaining response.

METHOD

This study attempted to investigate the politeness strategy used by multilingual customers to convey their complaints, the underlying reasons why costumers chose marked code and unmarked code, and find out how an age differentiates their way to utter the complaints. Therefore, the research question brings the use of complaining or critique and comments spoken by the multilingual customer. The utterances spoken in the first language and the second language are needed to investigate the use of un/ marked code. To analyze the politeness principles and strategies, setting, third party, and context are needed. This method also gives a chronological event happened in the field which gives the term in context. Constantly, the qualitative data is chosen to support the purposes of this study.

The qualitative is used because this study needs to enlighten and explain the data rather than numerical data. The qualitative data is supporting the study to describe the situation and expression in social issues. This method makes the researcher focused on the data explanation and connects it with the theory. The advantages to use qualitative method is the flexibility of the data collection which naturally portrays the event (Miles et al., 2014).

The informants of this study are taken from customers who express their dissatisfaction in English and Indonesian when in a restaurant. The Indonesian customers who basically are multilingual choose certain code in utter their dissatisfaction. The informant's utterance could be in Indonesian as a whole, or using code switching, and code mixing. The observation has found 11 informants in 6 data regarding to complains, including marked and unmarked codes.

Constantly, the setting of this study is taken from a Japanese restaurant in a mall located in Surabaya. This restaurant has some multilingual customers, because many multilingual family and customers live nearby. Thus, there is a high chance to observe multilingual customers who utter their lamentation about the restaurant as the compatible informants and setting for this study.

FINDINGS

The observation has shown 6 data relate to this study. The data are spoken in English and Indonesian, including marked and unmarked code. The unmarked code complains are fully spoken in Indonesian, whereas the unmarked code complains are applied code switching and code mixing in Indonesian and English. The data number 1, 3, and 6 is use English and Indonesian, whereas the others use Indonesian. The chosen data are presented in the table below.

Table 1. Table of customer's age, category, and utterances.

| No | Age | Category | | | Utterance | Explanation |
|----|-------|----------|--------|-------------|--|---|
| | | P R | V R | T P R | | |
| 1 | 16-25 | √ | | | C1: <i>Tempat ini cantik*</i> . But this place is quite unlike the other. C2: Yup, it's okay. And this table is so small for such a big appetite. *this place is beautiful | The customers were commenting about the design and furniture of the restaurant in front of the waitress while she was serving the orders. Both of the customers were primarily using English in their speech. |
| 2 | 36-45 | | √ | | C: <i>Gimana sih mbk?! Kalo gini bisa-bisa gak lama bangkrut ini!*</i> * What the hell?! if it's keep going it will bankrupt soon. | After waiting for the orders for so long, the waitress informed to them that their orders were already sold old. The customer complained directly to the waitress. She raised her voice and showed an angry expression in her face while all the tables in the restaurant were full of customers. |
| 3 | 16-25 | √ | | | C1: Guys look at this! I have to pay Rp. 23.000,- for a plate of french fries. C2: What is it, is this a tax for government or what? | After giving the bill, the customers talked to other customers out loud. Laughing, standing, and showing their dissatisfaction in a rude action as mocking but not directly to the staffs. |
| 4 | 26-35 | | √ | | C: <i>Mbak, ini memang lauknya cuma segini kah? Ini tepung semua lho.</i> * Miss, is the meat only this much? It's just full of flour. | The customer directly delivered their dissatisfaction to the waitress in bahasa Indonesia. |
| 5 | 26-35 | | √ | | C: <i>Permisi Mbak, ini emang makanannya asin gini ya? Ini asin banget lho.*</i> | The customer called the waitress and uttered his problem to ask about redress. |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---|
| | | | *Excuse me, is this food salty like this? This is too salty. | |
| 6 | 36-45 | √ | <p>C1: dad, it's running around again.</p> <p>C2: <i>Haduh! Kecoak lagi!</i>*</p> <p>W: <i>Ada kecoa kah pak?</i>**</p> <p>C2: <i>Ini mbak, kecil-kecil segini. Dari tadi banyak yang lewat.</i>***</p> <p>W: <i>Mohon maaf atas ketidaknyamanannya.</i>****</p> <p>C3: <i>iya, tidak apa-apa kok mbk.</i>*****</p> | When the customers were waiting for their orders, they found cockroach in around the table. They uttered the dissatisfaction when the waitress were serving the dish. |
| | | | <p>* Ouw! Cockroach!</p> <p>** Is there any cockroach sir?"</p> <p>*** here's, miss. Tiny like this. It has been passing for a while ago.</p> <p>**** I'm so sorry for the inconvenience</p> <p>***** it's fine miss.</p> | |

VR: Voice Response

PR: Private Response

TPR: Third Party Response

The Codes Used by Multilingual Customers According to Politeness Strategy

There are several possibilities in expressing dissatisfaction according to the politeness strategy, whether directly say it or choose to say nothing. According to the data that have been taken, all the data vividly represent the action of say-something strategies, but the use of marked code in some data will become a new consideration in politeness strategy. All the spoken complains either directly and indirectly expressed to the waitress are included on the say something and say nothing. Here the say something action would be divided into off and on record which includes the hearer and speaker's action.

Data number 1, 3, and 6 are considered as off-record action because rather than directly deliver it to the waitress they choose to give a sign to the third party. Datum 6 is vividly depicted the off record action. It shown they give an indirect action to the third party by giving an action and utterance among the customers. It was a family of multilingual customers, the C1 in the data was the daughter, C2 is the father, and C3 is the mother. Their child primarily uses English the whole time and the parents use code-switching in their conversation. When C2 and C3 were talking they used Indonesian and when talking to C1 they switched to English. Before the order had arrived, they talked in English about the cockroach. After the waitress arrived C2 utter "*haduh kecoak lagi*" but not directly to the waitress. This utterance is an indirect reaction of dissatisfaction to get a response from the waitress. The waitress gave a response in form of a interrogative sentence. The C2's statement is an FTA, which makes the waitress made an apology. Whereas the C3 gave an FSA to reduce the FTA, she lowered her voice and make a humble smile.

In data 1 and 3, these cases could be called as say nothing and say something off record action depend on their intention. The marked code they used is a barrier

that they build to the waitress, whether they intend to get a reply from the waitress or not. In datum 1 they said, "This is a small table for a big appetite" this could be an off-record because it could be a sign for demand to unite two tables. But it also portrays the action of saying nothing because they use English to exclude the waitress. The case of datum 3 could be called as off record because the waitress could be aware of their dissatisfaction in their marked code. The basis of this theory is to get a response from the hearer, but the use of marked code, in this case, is to exclude the waitress. The code-mixing in datum 1 is an action to reduce the FTA, in other words they considered the third party's feeling. Hence she did not feel offended, whereas in datum 3 the code-switching is used to freely mock the restaurant.

Data number 2, 4, and 5 are included in the on-record action, they directly called the waitress. The entire data show their FTA to the waitress they demand redress or express their anger. The data number 4 and 5 have shown the action of lessening the FTA by using question form and use negative politeness (formality), whereas in datum 2 the customer did not lessen the FTA and express her dissatisfaction by insulting the restaurant.

The Reasons Underlying Multilingual Customers to Choose Certain Codes in Conveying Criticism

Among six maxims of politeness principles by Leech (2014), the data only indicate four maxims; approbation maxim, tact maxim, generosity maxim, and sympathy maxim. Data numbers 1 and 3 which use marked code indicate the approbation maxim. Data 1 has shown the code-mixing between praising in Indonesian and critic in English. This action is shown as a reason for the use of marked code as an action of approbation maxim, decreasing the indignity to the restaurant and increasing the praising for others (Watts, 2003). Customer in datum 1 chooses a certain code after considering the third party's feeling. While data 3 indicates the same reason as number 1, but data number 3 does not show the same politeness as number 1, because they did not give any praising and they critic the tax as a mockery to the restaurant. Their action did not consider the third party's feeling, the marked code was used to give freedom to mock. Unconsciously, the marked code is a barrier to hide their action followed by the assumption that the party did not understand the meaning of the conversation.

The second maxim is an action against generosity maxims which is depicted in data numbers 4 and 5. The generosity maxim is an action to decrease the benefit for self and increase the cost for self. The action in data 4 and 6 are purposed to look for a redress of their dish despite the result. In datum 4, the customer did not vividly ask for redress but began by asking questions or confirmation with the dish quality. Considering how they did not state for demanding redress or any compensation. It portrays the politeness in their action, which give the third party the freedom to take action. Though they against the maxims it does not include impoliteness because they complained politely and tried to not offend the waitress.

Data number 6 has been depicted as an action of tact maxim. Data number six has shown the action to advise to minimize the disadvantage and maximize the advantage to others, whereas in datum 6, the condition did not show the possibility

for seeking redress. These cases are purposed to relieve the dissatisfaction feeling. Their reasons neither seeking for redress nor blame, but giving report as polite as possible.

The last maxim that has been founded in the data is an action against sympathy maxim which is depicted in datum 2. The sympathy maxims are an action to emphasize sympathy and increase antipathy to others. Datum 2 is an action of out of anger when the customer was raising her voice and insulting the restaurant. The customer utters the words as an action to relieve the dissatisfaction. Basically, this case is the most dissatisfying service. Because they already wait for long enough and inform that what they had ordered was sold out. Therefore, this action is against the sympathy maxims, her action is not purposed to look for redress but express her dissatisfaction by insult and raise her voice.

Complaints Categorized Based on Three Types of Complaining Responses

According to the data number 1 and 3, both of the cases uses the marked code in their conversation. The code-mixing in the data 1 case is included in the private response. The fact that they uttered their dissatisfaction in front of the waitress should be called a voice response, but the use of marked code in their conversation to exclude the waitress make the complaint included in the private response. While in data 3 the marked code in the form of code-switching is included on the private response even though they uttered so loud. But the dissatisfaction is included in the private response because they use marked code and it was indirectly delivered to the waitress but in form of conversation among customers.

The data are taken from elderly in the range age of 26-35 and 36-45 years old have shown that they tend to vividly show their dissatisfaction through voice response. It is shown by data numbers 2, 4, 5, and 6 which use the first language directly to the waitress. Data number 6 has shown that the multilingual customers who talk in English among themselves, but switch to Indonesian when uttering their complaints as a voice response. Constantly, the youngster multilingual customers tend to use private response when face a dissatisfaction. The young customers use private response trough applies marked code to exclude the third party to understand their dissatisfaction utterances, while adult customers have a high tendency to apply the voice response. They directly complaint to the waitress about the dissatisfaction, to get a redress or give a critic and advice for the service.

DISCUSSION

The markedness in the code switching or code mixing called as marked code and unmarked code (Yan-qiu & Feng-juan, 2015). The unmarked code in this data refer to Indonesian as the first language used in complaints data, and the marked code refer to English as foreign language that more specific used in the complaints for certain reasons. According to Tanto (2018), the action of negative politeness is an action to lessen the FTA to the hearer. The findings indicate that the unmarked complaint shows an action to lessen the imposition to the hearer by asking as negative politeness. In order to avoid the FTA when the customers complaint to get redress, they tend to use indirect strategy by using interrogative sentences which belief could lessen the imposition (Nugroho, 2019). The marked complaint included

as an action to avoid the FTA to the waitress, but the differences are in the purpose. The unmarked complaints purpose to get a response or redress, in contrast, the marked complaint purposed to exclude the third party (Mabule, 2015). This study has shown that unmarked complaints have a higher FTA tendency rather than marked complaints. The customer who use unmarked complaints in data 4 and 5 tend to use indirect accusation to lessen the FTA by asking question (Masjedi & Paramasivam, 2018). Due to English as a foreign language if the waitress did not fluent in English, thus the FTA does not deliver to the waitress. In this study, the unmarked FTA is an action to mock the waitress directly, whereas the marked FTA gives the speaker the freedom to mock the third party which decreases the tendency of the third party to understand. Thus the marked FTA more likely polite than the unmarked FTA because the unmarked complaint has high tendency the hearer to understand.

There are several findings relate to the politeness principles, the data have shown either obey and violate the politeness principles. The marked code private response complaints depict the approbation maxim as an action of complaint and insulting. The second is against the generosity maxim as an act of seeking redress for the self-benefit. Tact maxim is defined as an action to minimize the restaurant's disadvantage by giving a polite critic for restaurant's improvement. The last is against the sympathy maxim, which indicates the action of insulting the restaurant because of anger, the impoliteness shown by the customer is influence by the emotion or psychological aspect relate to the fact that the customer felt huge disappointment with the service (Eshreteh & Badran, 2020). According to Leech's principle, politeness is an action to considering the hearer's feelings (Leech, 2014). In this case, when the customer felt dissatisfied with the restaurant's service, the customer had the right to ask for redress and complain for asking redress is an act of violating the principle. Thus the customer do not necessarily apply the politeness principles (Karim, 2016). But in this case, the politeness emphasizes how they ask as politely as possible when considering the hearer's feeling. The basic reason why the customers use an unmarked code to complain is to directly complain about redress and better service from the restaurant. A marked complaint has shown as an act of considering the hearer's feeling, the marked code indicate an act to show emotion (Myers-Scotton, 1993). Even though complaining, reporting, and claiming is an action that has a higher possibility to impose the hearer, here these principles could lessen the imposition as an action. When the customers who obey the principles more likely to minimize the cost for other than customers who violate them.

The data have indicated that the marked private responses and unmarked voice responses. The voice response is an action to directly complaint to the waiters to ask redress or advice. Nevertheless, there is unmarked voice response in datum 2 which could not be compensated which lead to negative word of mouth. The customer emotional frustration of dissatisfaction service lead them to express the rage with negative word of mouth or boycott (Chinedu et al., 2017). According to Nimako and Mensah (2012), it found that younger customers tend to complaint than older customers, which is shown that customers in range of 26-35 most likely to complaint. The findings of this study according to the three types complaining response have shown that only voice response and private response, whereas the

third-party response have not been found. The unmarked complaints include a voice response, whereas the marked complain are private responses. This study has shown that younger customers (range age 16-25) tend to apply marked private responses, whereas older customers (range age 26-35 and 36-45) tend to use voice responses. It indicates that age have influenced the complaining behavior. It relevant with Kaddour (2019) who discovers that younger people tend to use code switching and code mixing than older speakers.

CONCLUSION

The multilingual customers who used English as a marked complaint show the intention to make the restaurant parties take no action in their dissatisfaction issues. The marked complaints as private responses used for preventing the third party to understand what they spoke and take no action. Whereas the multilingual customers who purposed to get redress, giving advice, and expressing their dissatisfaction directly to the waitress would use the unmarked voice response or Indonesian. All the unmarked on-record complaints are giving the FTA which has a high tendency to violate the maxims, but the politeness in here is whether the customer considered the hearer's feeling. Such as decrease the FTA by using an interrogative sentence in their complaints, formality, or unmarked code, but not all unmarked complaints are polite because unmarked complaints are aimed to gain the freedom to mocking the third party. The finding has shown that older customers tend to use unmarked voice responses, in contrast, younger customers tend to use the marked private response. Furthermore, the third-party response has not been found in this study because the restaurant field does not show a problematic disadvantage for the customer to take legal action, such as sue and report to the security or any other third parties.

REFERENCES

- Ashraf, T., Sajjad, W., Rizwan, M., Ahmed, D., & Nazeer, H. (2013). Determinants of Consumer Complaining Behavior: A study of Pakistan. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 3(6), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v3i6.6209>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chinedu, A. H., Haron, S. A., & Osman, S. (2017). Predictors of Complain Behaviour among Mobile Telecommunication Network Consumers. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 9(1), 119-128. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v9n1p119>
- Eshreteh, M. K. M., & Badran, H. (2020). The Application of Leech's Politeness Maxims in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies (IJELS)*, 6(2), 60-76.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2013). *An introduction to language* (Tenth Edit). Cengage Learning.
- Kaddour, N. Al. (2019). The Use of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing by Speakers of Emirati Arabic (EA). *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 52(January), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jlll/52-08>

- Karim, S. A. (2016). Analysis On Cooperative Principle And Politeness Principle In Guest Complaining At X Hotel In Kuta-Bali. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 2(2), 394. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.2.2.68.394-408>
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001>
- Lustyantie, N. (2019). Leech ' s politeness principle in Lenong Betawi humorous dialogue entitled " Anak Durhaka ." *English review: Journal of English Education*, 7(2), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v7i2.1731>. Received
- Mabule, D. R. (2015). What is this? Is It Code Switching, Code Mixing or Language Alternating? *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(1), 339–350. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2015.v5n1p339>
- Mansoor, I. K. (2018). Politeness : Linguistic study. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 8(IV), 167–179.
- Masjedi, N., & Paramasivam, S. (2018). Complaint and Politeness Strategies used by Iranian Speakers of English. *IJALEL: International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(4), 38–49.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/524911>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2018). Frequency and intentionality in (un) marked choices in codeswitching : " This is a 24-hour country ." *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6(2), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069020060020401>
- Nimako, S. G., & Mensah, A. F. (2012). Motivation for Customer Complaining and Non-Complaining Behaviour Towards Mobile Telecommunication Services. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 4(3), 310–320.
- Nugroho, A. (2019). Request realizations of indonesian ESP lecturers. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistic*, 6(1), 1–13.
- Oktama, M. Y., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2019). Politeness Strategies in Criticisms Used By the Overseas Students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS). *The 2nd International Conference on Language, Literature and Teaching*, 225–233.
- Tanto, T. J. (2018). Request Strategies in Indonesian : An Analysis of Politeness Phenomena in Text Messages. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 18(2), 137–145.
- Tronvoll, B. (2012). A dynamic model of customer complaining behaviour from the perspective of service-dominant logic. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(1/2), 284–305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561211189338>
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615184>
- Widowati, D. R., & Kurnianingsih. (2018). Critical reading skill and its implication to speaking ability in multicultural classroom. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistic*, 5(2), 18–23.
- Yan-qiu, Z., & Feng-juan, T. (2015). Study on Markedness in Linguistics. *Sino-US*

English Teaching, 12(9), 667–671. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2015.09.004>

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (W. H.G. (ed.)). Oxford University Press.