

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is written for presenting some theories from the research variables that are going to apply to do the research. It describes the theories and explanations on speech acts, speech act of apology, apology strategy, and some relevant previous studies.

A. Speech Acts

According to Austin (1975), speech acts are psychological symptoms that are determined by the speaker's language abilities in dealing with certain situations. Searle (1969) states that speech acts are the basic unit of linguistic communication. When people are trying to express themselves, they typically utter utterances in order to communicate their messages, and these utterances are generally referred to as speech acts. The term speech act is used to cover verbal actions such as requesting, asking, and performing (Yule, 1996). This implies that speech acts are the productions of the acts they are designed to produce.

Speech plays a variety of roles at various times. For example, you may hear people shifting furniture say “to you ... now a bit, ... to right”. Speech acts of this sort control people's physical actions. During a lecture, the speaker's role is to influence the listener's thoughts more than his actions. Di-pietro (in Baktir, 2014) states that speech plays another role in establishing or reinforcing a social relationship by recognizing the presence of the other. Therefore, speech can be used to request something, to get information, to express emotion, or simply for its own sake.

The Speech act theory views language as a form of action (Renkema, 1993). There are three kinds of action within each utterance (Austin, 1975; Renkema, 1993). In the same direction, Searle (1969) also divides the speech act into three different names; utterance act or locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. The locutionary speech act is the physical act of creating an utterance. The locutionary act is a selection of words, phrases, and sentences, depending on their meaning. This speech act may be considered as a form of expression. Locutionary acts do not question the intention or purpose of the speech. For instance, the statement my hands itch is solely intended to convey to the partner that the speaker stated that at the date and time mentioned, the speech was itching.

The second is illocution. It is an act which is committed by producing the message (Renkema, 1993). An illocutionary act is an action performed for a specific purpose. Speech acts can be considered as the act of doing something. A speaker who is speaking about his hands itching is only attempting to inform his partner that itching was lodged in his hands, and that he wants the listening partner to perform certain actions that are associated with that itching (Searle, 1969). The third is perlocution. It is a process of producing an effect through both locution and illocution (Austin, 1975). The perlocutionary act has following influence (effect). In this case, it is about affecting someone. In the example my hands itch, one can use the speech to regenerate the effect (effect) of the fear of the listener. As an example, fear arises from the fact that the speech uttered that they were bouncers, which is in their daily activities hit and injure

others very closely (Searle, 1969).

B. Speech Acts of Apology

A great deal of literature discusses apology, beginning with Goffman's (1971) (in Kim, 2012) definition of apology as a social function of speech act theory (Austin, 1975) and politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987). An apology, according to Goffman (in Kim, 2012), can be defined as a gesture that delineates the two parts of a person: the part responsible for the offense and the part that rejects its guilt and affirms faith in the rule violated. Goffman, in turn, defined apology in terms of transgressors and victims. According to Darby & Schlenker (1982), apology consists of admission of blameworthiness" and "regret for the undesirable event. By admitting responsibility for mistakes, the transgressor acknowledges the social norms that were broken, and by doing so will prevent committing the same transgression in the future.

Applied by Brown & Levinson (1987), apologies are defined as redress for face-threatening acts. Trosborg (1994) views out that apologies are expressive illocutionary acts that can be distinguished from complaints, which are also expressive acts, through their convivial nature Prior to considering the apology strategies, establishing what kind of apology is appropriate. An apology is also part of politeness strategies. In Hornby's view, apology refers to a noun expressing regret over something that has been done wrong or that causes a problem (Hornby, 2000)

According to Jebahi (2011), apology is an expression of illocutionary act, and that it is a speech act addressed to the face of the victim to remedy an offense

for which they take responsibility and to restore equilibrium between the transgressor and victim. From Goffman's work, an apology is conceptualized as a form of acknowledging the positive value of face. This is an important element of self-respect for someone to express (Kim, 2012). However, Mills (2003) identified apology as a "complex negotiation within interpersonal relationships over status and who is considered to be right," and refused to interpret them simply as restitution for face-threats.

It is important that the person who has made some mistake or misbehaved with the other person asks for forgiveness and apologizes to that person. Apologies are part of good manners and an expression of a desire to be normal with the other party. Apologies are important across all cultures, even when they don't use exactly the same strategies to remedy an offense (Werbicka in Abbas et al., 2018). According to Schumann (2018), seeking an apology is a major decision. One cannot destroy a relationship by seeking an apology. According to (Martinez-Vaquero et al., 2015), an apology will not destroy the relationship between people.

C. Apology Strategy

Apology strategies are the key to receiving forgiveness. There is a need for an apology to restore a harmonious relationship between transgressors and victims. According to Trosborg (1995), an apology can be defined as an act or utterance performed by an apologizer to repair his or her own social reputation. According to Trosborg (in Ruth & Kuntjara, 2016), a number of apology strategies can be used to express an apology. In the simple form of types of

apology strategies, Trosborg (1995) classified the types of the strategy into five main types, namely opting out, evasive strategies, indirect strategies, direct strategies, and remedial support.

In the complete form, an apology strategy consists of nine components, which are rejection or avoiding responsibility (the apologizer claims no responsibility and avoids apologizing), minimizing the degree of offense (the apologizer accepts responsibility but minimizes degree of offense), implicit or explicit acknowledgement of responsibility (the apologizer takes responsibility and blames himself), explanation (the apologizer gives explanation to soften his shame), direct apology (the apologizer shows his regret directly), In addition, the apologizer should offer repair (he offers to repair the damage he has done), promise of forbearance (to never repeat his mistake again), be concerned for the complainer (to show concern for the complainer's situation), and follow up on his apology.

1. Rejection

Basically, rejection entails the apologizer trying to reject or oppose being blamed, but also blaming to avoid responsibility. Four categories of rejection are identified. The first is explicit denial of responsibility, in which the apologizer explicitly denies that he should be held responsible. As an example, "You know I would never do such a thing". The second is implicit denial of responsibility occurs when the apologizer argues that he is not responsible for the inconvenient situation. This type of message might be stated as something like "I've promised you that I'll try to come to your home, but I haven't promised anything, did I?"

Other types of apologizers include blaming someone else, which indicates the apologizer is seeking a third-party blame to avoid being held accountable. A good example of this strategy is that "It was your brother's fault he did not inform me of the message." Last, attacking the complainer is possible when the apologizer does not have a solid defense to address the complaint. When the apologizer feels that a complainer cannot defend himself, the apologizer will attack the complainer. For example, "Yesterday, you said that I is okay if I use your room."

2. Minimizing the Degree of Offence

As in this case, the apologizer does not deny any responsibility. Apologizers prevent offenses from becoming too severe. Generally speaking, this strategy can be divided into three categories. The first is minimizing. Minimizing occurs where the apologizer tries to minimize the gravity of the offense, for example, "Take it easy, it's not the end of the world." The second is questioning in which the precondition is an apology that excuses the offense. For example, "Who told you that I would marry you." The last is blaming someone else is the condition in which the apologizer tries to convince regard that another party also contributed to the error, for example, "I have tried to tell you, but you were always busy with your job."

3. Acknowledgment of Responsibility

A strategy of this type consists of taking responsibility by varying degrees of self-blame, from low intensity to high intensity. This category contains six subcategories. The first is implicit acknowledgment. This happens where the apologizer seems to blame himself for something that has happened, for example “Perhaps, I shouldn’t have done it. The second is explicit acknowledgement which means that the Apologizer says his mistake clearly, for example “I will admit I forgot it. The next sub-category is lacking of intention means that the apologizer says that he did not intend to harm the other party, for example “I didn't Mean It.”

The next is expression of self-deficiency, in which the apologizer admits his own shortcomings, for example, “I was so confused.” The fifth is expression of embarrassment is the apologizer feels embarrassment for the offense, for example, “I feel so bad about it.” The last is explicit admission of guilt, when the apologizer believes the complainer has every right to blame him, for example, “You are right to blame me.”

4. Explanation of Account

According to this type, the apologizer might try to minimize the guilty party's fault by explaining the circumstance. There are two sub categories in this strategy. The first is implicit explanations, in which the apologizer explains the situation without providing an explicit explanation, for example, “Wait a minute, I’ll check the program.” The second is explicit explanation, in which the apologizer explains the problem precisely, for example, “Sorry I can’t finish it on-time because the program broke down.”

5. Expression of Apology

An apology is expressed in this way by the apologizer in a direct or formal manner. There are three main sub-categories of expression of apology. They are expression of regret in which the apologizer uses a common expression to demonstrate his regret, such as, "I'm truly sorry for everything I said", offer of apology when saying sorry is not enough to demonstrate regret. Also, the apologizer apologizes for the offense. "I apologize" is an example of this category, and request for forgiveness which shows that the apologizer is asking for forgiveness, for example, "Please forgive me and pardon me."

6. Offer of Repair

The apology may include an offer to "repair" the damage that has been caused. The offer of repair may be literal or it may be accompanied by an offer to pay for the damage. A sub type of this category is repair, which can be defined as when an apology promises to pay for the damage caused, for example, "I'll pay for the damage glass." Another way to apologize is by offering compensation, which occurs when the repair cannot be achieved, so the apologizer might offer a compensation action to the complainant, for example, "You can borrow my dress instead."

7. Promise and Forbearance

Promises are made by an apologizer not to repeat past mistakes. As a result, the person promises to be better in the future, for example, "I promise to do much better."

8. Expressing Concern for Hearer

During this type of apology, the apologizer expresses sympathy. Usually, the person feels bad for the complainer's condition, e.g., "I don't want this to happen to you."

D. Previous Study

The use of apology strategies in different contexts and by different speakers has been examined in many studies. In a descriptive-comparative study of apology strategies among Iranian EFL and Malaysian ESL university students, Farashaiyan and Amirkhiz (2011) found that pragmatic performance is determined by specific factors rather than language proficiency. The findings suggested that speakers of similar proficiency levels, however, handled identical apology situations quite differently in certain cases. Compared to Iranian students, Malaysian students used fewer strategies to apologize. The differences would be explained by such factors as speakers' socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, negative transfer of pragmatic norms from their L1 and speakers' EFL / ESL status. According to a theoretical perspective, the differences between Iranians and Malays are mostly determined by the attributes of the given speakers, such as their learning style preferences, test-taking strategies, and personalities

Dadkhah Tehrani et al., (2012) studied the different primary and secondary strategies Iranian EFL students used in different situations and also the role of gender in these strategies. Male and female participants both reported using the statement of remorse most often, and female participants used it more often than male participants. Additionally, female respondents used compensation, showing

lack of intent to harm, accounts, and reparation as their primary strategies, while male respondents used accounts, compensation, reparation and negative assessment of responsibility. Males were more likely than females to use negative assessment of responsibility. Among females, 10 percent of the situations were resolved by promising not to repeat offense, while no such promise was made by males

Next, Fitriani (2012) conducted a study on apology strategies to examine the differences between men and women in apologizing. People often assume that utterances used by women differ from those used by men, especially in concerns of politeness. Due to their social roles, women are often considered more polite than men. It is generally believed that women are responsible for transmitting culture and politeness in communities. According to her study, most female respondents tended to not apologize for mistakes, whereas male respondents tended to apologize explicitly for errors. Her study does not attribute that to women being innately more polite than men as a social thought and label.

The next is a study conducted by Prachanant (2016) attempted to understand the norms and patterns of apologies used by native English speakers (NE) and the way EFL learners in Thailand produce them. The study employed a descriptive quantitative method. The participants were 64 participants which consisted 32 Thai EFL learners and 32 native English speakers. To obtain the data the study used a written completion discourse. The findings revealed that most of the students used expression of apology type and offering and repair type of apology. Interestingly, the results of this study suggested that Thai EFL learners

used apology strategies similar to those of native speakers in some situations. In some instances, however, there were differences in the use of apologies. Thai EFL groups are likely to use apology in a similar manner to L1 (Thai). As noted in the scope and limitations of the study, since the data were collected from 32 students from the Northeast and 32 students from Thailand, it is difficult to generalize the findings. However, the findings of this study suggest that cross-cultural communications can be enabled across continents. Results of the study have implications for English as a second language (L2) instruction in crosscultural contexts.

The fifth is a study conducted by Dozie and Otagburuagu (2020) aimed at examining the ways in which Igbo learners of English in Nigeria employ conversational English apology politeness strategies. There were 3000 respondents filling out the discourse completion task. This task simulated the conceived role-play between possible interactants through a variety of scenario-based simulations. The results of this study show that politeness strategies were used significantly in apology discourse. In addition, it was evident from the study that Igbo bilinguals seem to make excuses as part of their native conversation regardless of social differences and contexts, as specific nuances inherent in their mother tongue could be detected in their target language productions. In the study, apology realization was found to be difficult in an interlinguistic context, i.e., students who speak Igbo and learn English necessarily bear the burden of native language transfer into the foreign language. This study concluded that because Igbos perceive affronts and outrage as possibilities in human interactions, they

have adopted both positive and negative forms of politeness strategies in apology discourse as needed to accomplish the conversational request.