

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background of the study, the research problems, the research objective, the significance of the study, the scope and limitations, and definition of key-terms.

A. Research Background

Understanding how language is used in social interactions influences how language teaching and learning of foreign languages is essential. Pragmatics and sociolinguistics seemed to be attracted to communication through language. Hymes (in Istifci, 2009) introduced the concept of communicative competence in 1960. Since then, foreign language teaching has emphasized the development of communication skills. Essentially, communicative competence entails more than language rules, but also abstract notions about language functions and norms. In Hymes' view, knowledge of linguistic rules is complemented by the capability to use the language appropriately in specific situations. Even so, it's a completely different situation when people learn a second or foreign language since speech acts have been identified as one of the most problematic aspects of learning a second or foreign language

Through communication, a person may develop good lexica-grammatical knowledge of the language (Abdolmalaki & Ghani, 2016). Unfortunately, communication can sometimes lead to infringement or offense between speakers; one may therefore offend another or do something that requires an apology to maintain communication (Anam, 2010). Apologies are included as one of the

speech acts in socio-pragmatic studies. As a language relationship, apology is important. This can help us understand how individuals communicate on a daily basis (Huwari, 2018). Al Fattah (in Jebahi, 2011) states that apology plays a crucial role in understanding each individual's everyday communication. There are connections between apologies and speaker needs, power relationships, and social distance (Wouk, 2006). A person is required to apologize by taking action to establish a connection between himself and the apology recipient as well as understand how the apology recipient will react. Then, adding a face reaction may also be helpful in showing support or threats when apologizing. Individuals may be motivated to apologize by this fact.

Weiner (in Lwin et al., 2017) argues that apologizing is arguably the highest form of accepting responsibility. However, the most effective crisis response is an apology. People, especially children and young adults, commit many offences in society, such as losing something precious, hurting a loved one's heart, misunderstandings in conversation, etc. Interactions in society often lead to those kinds of violations. As a result, when those situations arise, the offender will apologize and give the harmed person many compensation strategies to seek forgiveness for the offense. By taking such action, the victim and the offender will be able to re-establish their relationship. In addition to repairing a relationship, apology is intended to help improve the relationship between the offended person and apologizer (Pajri, 2018). It helps establish interpersonal relationships, as well as repair one's image, when one apologizes. By sincere apology, social harmony and stability can be preserved, rather than exacerbated; victims and netizens can

also be reassured; and the situation can be eased, not worsened (Abudin & Sundari, 2021). However, it is unclear which types of apologies are used and how persons react to them.

An apology is realized in a variety of patterns and carries a particular cultural significance, and this variety is a consequence of social organization in human societies being a dynamic one (Qorina, 2012; Wouk, 2006). Thus, the speech act of apologizing in different communities takes on different patterns depending on the specific culture and social values of that community. There are four assumptions that must be made when discussing apologies in a brief. Firstly, the speaker believes there has already been an act of performance. A second major concern is that the speaker believes that the act offended the listener in some way. Thirdly, the speaker believes that he is responsible for the offense committed against the listener. Lastly, the speaker regrets some aspect of his or her speech (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Qorina, 2012).

Over the past decade, a sample of research has been devoted to describing the varied manner. Apologies have been examined from two distinct perspectives by linguists and management specialists. Studies of apology tend to focus on the categories of pragmatic strategies used in apology composition (Holmes, 1990; Trosborg, 1995). In recent years, a great deal of attention has been focused on the comparison of apology strategies used by different speakers and in different contexts. Researchers have also conducted ethnographic research to examine apologies as a speech act in different cultures and dialects and identify some universal features of apologies (Al Masaeed et al., 2018; Tajeddin & Pirhoseinloo,

2012). Shariati and Chamani, (2010) found that Persian apology strategies are characterized mostly by explicit apologies accompanied by explicit requests for forgiveness. The above strategy was the most frequently combined one with acknowledging responsibility among Persian speakers. There were also series of apology strategies used by Persian speakers, but these strategies seemed to be culturally-based.

A descriptive-comparative study of apology strategies among Iranian and Malaysian ESL university students by Farashaiyan and Amirkhiz (2011) demonstrated that pragmatic performance is associated with better apology outcomes and relies on particular factors rather than language proficiency. It was discovered that speakers of approximately the same proficiency level dealt with identical circumstances quite differently in some cases, despite more or less the same level of proficiency. Malaysian students, for example, used fewer strategies when apologizing than their Iranian peers. Among the factors contributing to the difference might be the speakers' socioeconomic and sociocultural backgrounds, the speakers' L1 pragmatics and their status as EFL/ESL speakers. Based on types of differences, Iranians are primarily characterized by their priorities in learning styles, test-taking strategies, and personality traits, while Malays tend to be more dominant in this regard.

A number of studies have shown that gender (sex) has little impact on apology strategies. They reported that the gender did not significantly influence the use of apology strategies (Harb, 2016; Saleem et al., 2014). Moreover, Keshani & Heidari-Shahreza (2017) discovered that gender did not affect the

frequency of apology strategies by German and Iranian. However, Shahrokhi and Jan (2012) investigated the manner in which Persian male native speakers contextualized their apology strategies in various social contexts using a grouping and framing approach. In this study, a study of Persian men reveals several universal apology strategies as well as a culture-specific apology strategy relative to contextual variables.

Theoretically, males and females converse differently in public situations (Pajri, 2018). According to Holmes (1989), women and men use languages differently. Males and females use language differently because of their social position in society. Subsequently, the speech act that used by males and female will be different because speech act is one of the elements in language use model. The current study examines how male and female apology strategies differ. As these participants could represent the language use of the speakers in the real world, it is convenient to select them since they could represent the language use of the speakers in the real world, and how these speakers use the language to apologize and deliver their messages. Relying on the explanation above, the study entitled “A Study of Apology Strategy Performed by Male and Female of English Department Students of IAIN Kediri” is conducted to support and enrich the study about the use of apology in English Language.

B. Research Problem

Based on the research background, there are two research questions proposed in the study:

1. What are the types of apology strategies employed by English Department Students of IAIN Kediri?
2. How is the difference of gender on the use of apology strategy employed by the English Department Students of IAIN Kediri?

C. Research Objective

According to the research problems, the study is aimed at:

1. Investigating the types of apology strategies employed by English Department Students of IAIN Kediri.
2. Finding out whether there is any difference of gender on the use of apology strategy employed by the English Department Students of IAIN Kediri.

D. Significance of the Research

The finding of this research can be the information of Gender Differences in apology strategies between male and female students of English Department Students of IAIN Kediri. The study is conducted to support and enrich the study about the use of apology in English Language.

E. Scope and Limitations

To scope and limit the research, the research covered at the result of this research which would be related to the existing body of research in terms of the differences in apology strategy. The types of apologies were according to Trosborg (1995) who classified the types of the strategy into five main types, namely opting out, evasive strategies, indirect strategies, direct strategies, and remedial support. However, the data would be analyzed according to Trosborg's Theory which explored by Ruth & Kuntjara (2016). Next, the

discussion was explored to the roles of gender to the use of apology. Another variable such as age, personality and other psychological variables were not discussed.

F. Definition of Key-terms

1. Apology

Apologies are expressive illocutionary acts distinguished from complaints by their convivial nature, which are also expressive acts (Trosborg, 1995).

2. Apology Strategy

The act of asking forgiveness after one has done something wrong. The request can be interpreted as a rejection, minimization of the offense, apology, acknowledgement of guilt, explanation or account, offer of repair, promise and forbearance, and expressing concern for those involved (Trosborg, 1995).