CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to the problems of study, it consists of three sections. The first is pragmatics, in pragmatics will explain about the understanding of pragmatics and the goal of pragmatics theory, the second is speech act, here will be explained about the definition of speech act and types of speech act, the third is apologize, in apologize will explain the definition of apologize and types of apologize.

1. Pragmatics

In every culture, people have their own ways to deliver the meaning through language, it is important to understand the variations in communication patterns and meanings related to the context. To be able to communicate in target context, a learner should be able to understand the pragmatics of the target language, because pragmatic competence is an important aspect of language learning.

1.1 Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics as a branch of linguistic is the study of meaning which relates to the context of the external meaning of language unit. Yule states that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.[1] Peccei states that pragmatics concentrates on those aspects of meaning that cannot be predicted

---

[1]Yule, 1996 as quoted in Universitas Sumatera Utara

by linguistics knowledge alone and takes into account knowledge about the physical and social world.[2]

Rizk defines pragmatic transfer as the influence of learners' pragmatic knowledge of language and culture other than the target language on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information.[3] Means that pragmatics is very important to make the learners understand each other, they will understand more about culture around them, it is not always same, but can be one unit. But pragmatics error or failure occurs where speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2.

From the definition above it can be conclude that pragmatics is a branch of linguistic which concerns with language use in context and the study of meaning related to the context or situation. Means that pragmatics is focused on a person's ability to derive meaning from the specific kind of speech situation to understand what the speaker means.

1.2 The Goal of Pragmatics Theory

In discussing pragmatics, Akmajian put some minimal requirements on an adequate pragmatics theory, they are as follows:[4]

a) A pragmatics theory must contain a classification of speech acts.

b) A pragmatics theory must contain analysis and definitions of various speech acts.

---

[2]Peccei, 1999 as quoted in Universitas Sumatera Utara

[3]Rizk, 2003 as quoted in, Dwi Qorina, Realization Of Apology Strategies By English Department Students Of Pekalongan University, LANGUAGE *CIRCLE Journal of Language and Literature Vol. VII/*1 October 2012. 95

[4]Akmajian, 1797, as quoted in Universitas Sumatera Utara

c) A pragmatics theory must contain a specification of various uses of expression, they must be as follows:

1) Expression e is standard (literally and directly) used to do in X (in context C)

2) Expression e has n different users.

3) Expression e and $è$ have the same use or uses.

d) A pragmatics theory must relate to literal and direct language use for such phenomena as:

1) Linguistic structure (semantic, syntax, phonology)

2) The structures of the communication situations, the course of conversations, and social institutions.

3) The speaker's meaning, implication, presupposition and understanding.

According to Akmajian, some of the philosophers have been mainly concerned with categorizing the type of speech acts and defining each category. They have pursued goals (a) and (b). Linguists have been concerned mainly in specifying the expressions in language (goal c) which are the pragmatic analogues of meaning specification, such as ambiguity, and synonymy

To improve the understanding and usage of language, many researchers have investigated different area of pragmatics, among these areas, speech act have been investigated.

2. Speech Acts

In express feeling, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structure and words. The people show it by those utterances. Actions which are showed by utterances are generally called speech acts.[5] As we know that people use language to express the activities, convey information, request information, give orders, make request, make threats, etc.

2.1 Definition of Speech Act

In general, speech acts are the 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 regret. As an act of communication, a speech acts will be success if the audience identifies the communication, in accordance with the speaker's intention which the attitude is being expressed.[6]

When people speak, they use language to achieve a variety of functions like expressing different emotions, start an argument or even insult someone. Das explains that in the framework of Speech act theory there have to be two or more participants speaking the language and making their intentions known.[7] One is the addressor and the other is the addressee. 'Addressor' is the source of the message of the addressor and 'addressee' is

[5]Universitas Sumatera Utara. 10
[6]Ibid. 11
[7] Das, 2005 as quoted in Saanallyas, Facebook Status Updates: A Speech Act Analysis, *Academic Research International*, 2012

the receiver of the message. They would interpret the message and perform actions accordingly.

Brown and Levinson discussed that speech acts are somehow threatening to either speaker or hearer and continue that speakers should consider some elements such as social distance, degree of power, ranking of imposition in a special culture and then choose some strategies to perform the act.[8] Means that when we want to talk or make conversation with other people we have to pay attention in some substances, like how close we are, the character of the hearer, the intonation and so on. This is very important because if we talk in a wrong way it can be dangerous, the hearer can be feel insulted by you. Actually it is not easy to make a good relation with other people, but it will be easy when you have already understood the character of every people and how to speak to them.

For Austin using an utterance is both saying something and doing that thing; therefore, it is observed that an utterance may reveal three types of acts; a locutionary act which is saying of something, an illocution that stands for the use of an utterance to perform a function and a perlocution which is the results and effects of the produced utterance.[9] This view leads to a more integrated theory of speech acts in the larger frame of communication theory. Wierzbicka claimed that most of the early definitions of speech acts are

---

[8] Brown and Levinson, 1978 as quoted in Reza Pishghadam and Maryam Sharafadini, A Contrastive Study into the Realization of Suggestion Speech Act: Persain vs English, *Canadian Social Science Vol. 7, No. 4,* 2011. 231

[9] Austin, 1962 as quoted in A. Eslami-Rasekh& Mehdi Mardani, Investigating the Effects of Teaching Apology Speech Act, with a Focus on intensifying strategies, on Pragmatic Development of EFL Learners: The Iranian Context, *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture.*

ethnocentric, and that thus they fail to take into consideration what she believed is one of the most important characteristics of speech acts, namely cultural specificity. She says that, cultural values and characteristics such as indirectness, objectivism, courtesy, and cordiality are reflected in the way speakers produce speech acts.[10] It can be conclude that speech act theory is still a much disputed field, and there is no commonly accepted definition of what a speech act is.

2.2 Types of Speech Act

According to Allan there are two ways of classifying speech acts. One is what he calls a lexical classification, which distinguishes among speech acts according to the illocutionary verbs they express. The second approach classifies them according to the act they express, such as requesting, apologizing, promising, and so on.[11]

Communicative approaches to speech act theory mostly categorize speech acts according to what they communicate to the hearer. Austin distinguishes three kinds of acts an utterance simultaneously performs:

a. *Locutionary act*: The utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference. (e.g. I will come back.)

b. *Illocutionary act*: the making of a statement, offer, promise etc. in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it. (e.g. a promise, or a threat etc.)

---

[10] Wierzbicka, 1991 as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University.* 2000. 8
[11] Allan, 1998 as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University.* 2000. 9

c. *Perlocutionary act*: bringing about effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterances. (e.g. making hearer happy, angry, or scared etc.)

Searle had a systematic approach and classified speech acts under five main categories: assertives, directives, commisives, expressives, and declarations. [12]

a. **Assertives** Expressing a belief, committing the speaker to truth of what is asserted.

E.g. (statements) we watched a movie yesterday.

b. **Directives** Expressing a wish, making an attempt to get to hearer to do something.

E.g. (requests) bring me some hot water.

c. **Commisives** Expressing an intention, commitment for the speaker to engage in a future action.

E.g. (promises, offers) I promise, I will complete the work by tomorrow.

d. **Expressives** Expressing a variety of psychological states.

E.g. apologies I am sorry for my disrespectful behavior.

e. **Declarations** Bring about a change via words.

E.g. (baptizing, declaring war, abdicating) Hereby I pronounce you husband and wife.

---

[12] Searle, 1969, as quoted in Mehmet Aydin, Cross Cultural Pragmatics: A Study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey, *Minnesota State University, Mankato*, 2013. 8

Under the category of expressives, apology speech acts hold an important place in human communication as a face saving act of speech. Thus it is crucial for people to understand what an apology is and how it functions. An act of apology can be considered a remedial act of speech, which means that the speaker is trying to save his or her face because of an action. However, the researcher believe that such a differences is important, because it is the only way one can account for the use of certain apology strategies that apparently might seem inappropriate, but which are used to actually suggest something different from their literal meaning.

2.3 Women's and Men's Language Theories

Gender manifest behavioral differences constructed within society experienced by each person. A common reason that is given as to why apologies are difficult is because an apology causes loss of status. One could argue that the reason women apologize more than men is because evolutionary pressure has made status more important for men, because men need status to compete for mates. Thus, since status matters relatively less for women, they can apologize more. According to Connell (2002) being a man or woman is not a fixed state. They have different behavioral in dealing with things they face. It is because men and women are socialized different (Eckert, 1998). It also occurs in term of their conversational strategies including the speech act of apology. Holmes (1995) identifies several differences between men and women in using apology as follows:

1. Women use significantly more apologies than men do.

2. Women use most apologies for the hearers of equal power, while men apologize to women of different status.

3. Women use most apologies for female friends whereas men use most for socially distance

4. Women's apologies are more often than men's in the case of space and talk offences.

Further he says that women and men differently may use apology since they have different perceptions of when they are appropriate. Women do an apology as being polite while men avoid apologies where it is possible. They will apologize if it will cause offence. The differences between men and women also are explained by Bonvillan (1986) stating that females typically use more polite speech act than males do. According to Fishman (1978) formal features that characterize woman's speech such as asking question aims to ensure reaction. In contrast, men's speech is marked by features (e.g. statement) than do little insure to further talk.

3. Apologizing

One of the speech acts that have long attracted the attention of scholars dealing with social and cultural patterns in language is apologizing. Speech act theory defines and classifies prototypical apology based on the felicity conditions for its realization that includes an apologetic performative verb and an expression

of regret.[13] As a type of speech act, the apology has also been the object of numerous studies that attempted to clarify what exactly an apology is and how the different ways of apologizing can be classified.

3.1 Definition of Apologies

Bergman and Kasper defined an apology as a "compensatory action to an offense in the doing of which S was casually involved and which is costly to H".[14] Ellis also said that an apology is a speech act that is required when the speaker has committed some behavior that has proved 'costly' to the hearer.[15] The cost can be in terms of losing face or even a severe misunderstanding. It is clear that different cultures have different degrees in perceiving how costly such an offense is, and therefore how necessary an apology is. It is considered very serious in one culture, may not require an apology at all in another culture. Also, the severity of such a face threatening act seems to be in a direct relationship with the type of apology chosen to defend face. According to Trosborg these factors are determined by one's social and cultural patterns, and by the behavioral norms of one's culture.[16] This leads to the assumption that not only do speakers of different languages perceive the necessity of an apology differently, but also use different ways of apologizing.

---

[13] Suszczyn´ ska, 1999, as quoted in Mohammad Shariati, Fariba Chamani, Apology strategies in Persian, *Journal of Pragmatics*.2010. 1690

[14] Bergman and Kasper, 1993, as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University*.2000. 16

[15] Ellis, 2012, as quoted in Tamimi Sa'd, S. H., & Mohammadi, M. (2014). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 10*(1), 2014. 119.

[16] Trosborg,1987 as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University*.2000. 17

Linguists classify the apology act according to various criteria. Divisions are primarily based on external factors such as the situation or object of regret. Sometimes the speaker explicitly apologizes to the other person for his/her offence whereas sometime he/she admits his/her responsible for the mishap. Sometime speaker regret and explains the reason of the mishap and sometime he/she show his/her offer to pay for loss. Moreover sometime he/she shows his/her determination to be careful in future.

Differences in apology strategy use have been demonstrated to be correlated with cross-cultural differences by both inter language studies and studies that looked at the way speakers of different languages apologize in their own language. The choice of apology strategies is also determined by social differences such as sex, age, and social status. Holmes has shown in a study on New Zealanders that there are significant differences in the distribution of apologies between men and women, and also that women apologize more than men.[17] However Leech viewed apologies as an attempt to recreate an imbalance between the speaker and the hearer created by the fact that the speaker committed an offence against the hearer.[18] It can be conclude that it is not enough to apologize, this apology needs to be successful in order for the hearer to pardon the speaker, and thus reestablish the balance.

---

[17] Holmes, 1993 as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University.* 2000. 17
[18] Leech, 1983 as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University.* 2000. 18

However, no matter what features one includes in a definition, the fact that an apology is given not only when there is a behavior that violates the social norms of the respective culture, but also as an anticipation in case a future or proposed behavior may violate such norms.

3.2 Types of Apologies

The way apologies are classified depends very much on the way they are defined. There are certain types of apologies that are common across different categorizations.

Bergman and Kasper distinguished seven different apology categories. According to them, the most commonly used seems to be the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) such as in "I'm sorry." The other strategies are intensified IFID ("I'm terribly sorry"), taking responsibility ("I haven't graded it yet"), giving an account of the reasons that led to the action that requires an apology ("I was suddenly called to a meeting"), minimizing the effects and severity of the action ("I'm only 10 minutes late"), offering repair or compensation ("I'll pay for the damage"), and verbal redress ("It won't happen again"). The last one seems to be very close to the minimization category, if we take into account the example used by the authors, "I hope you didn't wait long".[19]

Though all such apology strategies affect the speaker's positive face want but some are considered more dangerous than the others. IFIDs and EXPL moves are labeled as less dangerous while the other three moves

---

[19] Bergman & Kasper, 1993, as quoted in Guztav Demeter, A Pragmatic Study Of Apology Strategies In Romanian, *Bachelor of Arts North University.*2000. 19

(RESP, REPR, FORB) are taken as more dangerous for speaker's positive face want. Moreover IFIDs are the formulaic form of apology and rest of four are non-formulaic forms of apology. There are different measures to measure these apology strategies. These measures mostly depend upon the speaker, the addressee or both. The social distance, sex, power, social status, age and situation also play their respective part in this regard. Apologies speech act carry out by people when they did any mistake or nonsense to others who may have different kinds of relations with the speaker revolve from most formal to most informal. They may also have different social character and power.

A categorization of apology strategies that would constantly revised by many scholars was made by Olshtain and Cohen.[20] They proposed seven categories, as well, but divided into two parts. The first part contains five main categories of apologies in cases where the offender feels the need to apologize, namely an expression of apology, an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility, an offer of repair, and a promise of forbearance. Each of these categories has several sub-categories in order to make a further delimitation of strategies. The second part contains two strategies for the case when the speaker does not feel the need to apologize. These are a denial of the need to apologize and a denial of responsibility. This categorization is a very important one and useful for the

---

[20]Olshtain and Cohen, 1983, as quoted in ibid. 23

present studies because it takes into account situation when even though the hearer believes the speaker should apologize, the latter does not.

Finally, categories such as avoiding and postphoning apologies should also be part of the taxonomy, as choosing not apologize or apologize later is also a strategy used when an apology in required. As a conclusion, there are many different categorizations of apologies. However, as already mentioned in the section on Definitions of Apologies, this speech act is culture specific, so not all the categories in these taxonomies would work for all the cultures. Thus, when creating the taxonomy for a study one should choose those categories that are used in the respective culture. Also, one should account both for explicit and implicit.

4. Previous studies

Many researchers have performed similar researches on invertigating speech act strategies in apologizing. The first research is from Juhana by the title "The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female Students".[21] The aim of this study is to investigate the act of apologizing used by males and females students in order to find out whether there are similarities and differences between them. The data are gathered by a Discourse Completion Test having 6 apology situations by using questionnaires. To analyze the data from all responses, they were categorized according to Cohen and Olshtain's and Tuncel apology speech acts set. The respondents of the study were post-graduate

---

[21]Juhana, The Use of Apologizing Speech Acts Realization by Male and Female Students (A Case Study in Postgraduate Program of English Education Departement), *JurnalPengembanganHumaniora Vol. 11 No. 1,* April 2011. 2

students of English education consisting of 10 males and 10 females. The study reveals that in general, there is no significant difference between males and females of postgraduate students of English education in using apologizing strategy. Gender does not become a strong factor that influences the realization of apologizing speech act. It is proven by the facts that both genders employed many similar categories and there was no highly different tendency between them to express their apologizing speech acts.

The second previous study is "The Use of Apologies by EFL Learners" by Ilknur Istifci.[22] The aim of this study is to investigate the act of apologizing with subjects from two different levels of English proficiency to find out whether there are similarities and differences between these groups and whether they approach native speaker apology norms. 20 subjects in intermediate level, 20 subjects in advanced level and 5 native speakers of English participate in the study. The data are gathered by a Discourse Completion Test that had 8 apology situations. In the analysis of the data, all responses are categorized according to Cohen and Olshtain's apology speech act set. The results of the study reveal some similarities and differences between the two groups. Their L1 can be said to have an influence on their use of apologies, especially intermediate level subjects transfer native Turkish speaker norms into English.

The third previous study is "Across-Cultural Study of the Speech Act of Apology by Saudi and Australian Females" by Shatha Ahmed S Al Ali.[23] The main focus of this study is investigates the speech act of apology made by female

[22] IlknurIstifci, The Use of Apologies by EFL Learners, _www.ccsenet.org/journal.html_. 2009.1

[23] Shatha Ahmed S Al Ali, Across-Cultural Study Of The Speech Act Of Apology By Saudi And Australian Females, _The University Of Melbourne Faculty Of Arts_, 2012

Saudi native Arabic speakers and female Australian native English speakers. The study recruited 40 participants of university students and a few staff members. All 40 participants were asked to complete eight different Discourse Completion Test (DCT) situations, which varied in terms of power between the interlocutors and level of imposition. The aim of my research was to investigate whether Saudi native Arabic speakers and Australian native English speakers differed from each other in terms of apology strategies. In addition, I investigated the role of culture in influencing the ways in which each group realized their apologies.

Based on the explanation above, we know that every research has different result, and here the researcher conduct a research entitled **"THE REALIZATION OF SPEECH ACT STRATEGIES IN APOLOGIZING BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF STAIN KEDIRI".** It is to know how their act among teacher or students itself. And here are Cohen and Olshtain apology speech Act set which categorized in 5 main categories which are used by the researcher:

1) An expression of apology (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device IFID)

   a) an expression of regret (e.g. I'm sorry)

   b) an offer of apology (e.g. I apologize)

   c) a request for forgiveness (e.g. Excuse me, Forgive me)

2) An offer of repair/redress (REPR) (e.g. I'll pay for your damage)

3) An explanation of an account (EXPL) (e.g. My daughter was ill, I took her to hospital)

4) Acknowledging responsibility for the offense (RESP) (e.g. It's my fault)

5) A promise of forbearance (FORB) (e.g. I'll never forget it again). Tuncel (cited in Istifci) added some other categories in to the list because he states that the lists do not cover all the responses of his subjects in his research such as:

6) Deny (denial of fault or offense) (e.g. I did not cause the accident. You parked your car on my way)

7) Blame (putting blame on the hearer) (e.g. Why didn't you remind me?)

8) Health (asking the state of health) (e.g. Are you all right? I can take you to hospital)

9) Exclamation (EXL!) (expressing surprise) (e.g. Oh!, Oops!)

10) Request (e.g. can I use it for two days?)

The responses of 20 subjects were counted and categorized according to the above criteria in the coding tables for each situation. The frequency and percentage of the situation were calculated. In some situation, there were some combinations such as IFID+EXPL, REPR+EXPL.