CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 PRAGMATICS

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics study which focuses on the meaning of utterances. Pragmatics concerns with the meaning of utterance, in which the meaning depends on the situation where the utterance occurs (Leech in Trosborg, 1994:6). Meanwhile, Yule (1996:4) states that the speaker or the writer must be able to depend on a lot of shared assumptions and expectations. Pragmatics concerns to people's assumptions, people purposes or goals, and the types of actions (such as request, offer, apologize, etc) that they are performing when they speak.

Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of language or utterance meaning in which the meaning is influenced by the context. In the context of pragmatic the communication that occurs between speaker and hearer should involve and require good interpretation based on context and situation before and after doing communication.

Pragmatics study involved apology as one of the focus of its study as a type of action in communication and apology's utterance has various meaning depend on the context and situation. Therefore, to analyze apology strategies is required to understand pragmatic as part of its study.

2.2 Speech Acts

2.2.1 Definition of Speech Act

Speech act is a term that related to two basic things, they are speech and act/ action. Speech is a way of affecting actions or a way of doing things with words. Speech act is action that can be seen or depicted by saying something the speaker. According to Searle's opinion, the speech acts performed in the utterances of a sentence are in general a function of the meaning of the sentence. Yule states the term of speech act covers 'actions' such as 'requesting', 'commanding', 'questioning', and 'informing' (Yule, 1996:132). Recognizing the speech act that is being performed in the production of an utterance is important because speech act that in particular extent tells us what the speaker intends us to do with the propositional content of what was said.

Based on the opinions above, speech act can be defined as the action of a person that actually do through the language or in other sentence speech act is a unit of speaking and performs different functions in communication. It involves social acts such as to promise, to request, to offer, and the like. In communication, the speaker commonly expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized and be understood by the hearer.

There are two important things that need to be considered in studying speech act, they are situation and context. According to Yule

context refers to the relevant elements of the surrounding linguistic or nonlinguistic structure in relation to an uttered expression. (Yule, 1996:129)

2. 2. 2 Speech Act Classifications

A speech act can be performed either directly or indirectly. A direct speech act occurs when there is a direct relationship between a structure and function. Meanwhile, an indirect speech act is performed when there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function.

In relation of speech act , a linguist, Austin states that there are three subdivision of acts that can be shown / performed by utterances (Austin, 1983). The three kind of acts that depicted by utterances are:

1. A Locutionary act

   It is the act of saying something or producing a series of sounds which has a meaning or it means something.

2. An Illocutionary act

   It is the act performed in saying something and includes acts such as betting, promising, denying, and ordering. is concerned with force

3. A Perlocutionary act

   It is the act performed as a result of saying or speaking. This act produces some effects toward thoughts, feeling, or actions of audiences.

Another subdivision of speech acts is stated by Searle that classifies five types of general functions of speech acts (Searle in Yule 1996), they are:

a. Representatives

This type is such kinds of speech acts that refer what the speaker believes to be the case or not and the speaker express a belief that the proportional content is true. This type involves acts such as describing, hypothesizing, claiming, insisting, and predicting. In using a representative act, the speaker makes the words fit the world (of what is belief).

Example: The earth is flat

b. Expressive

This type is such kinds of speech acts that describe and show what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be in form of statements such as: pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow in term apologizing, praising, congratulating, deploring, and regretting.

Example: I'm really sorry!

In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world (consider of feeling).

c. Directives

This type is kinds of speech acts that the speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants and needs. They are such as commands, orders, requests, suggestions, inviting,

forbidding. In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words (via the hearer).

Example: " Could you lend me a pen, please?"

d. Commissives

This type is kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends to do. They are such as promises, threats, refusals, pledges, offering, threatening, vowing, and volunteering. They can be performed by the speaker herself/ himself, or by the speaker as a member of a group.

Example : "I'll be back."

In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (via the speaker).

e. Declaratives are speech acts in which the words and expression change the world by their utterances and it declares something.

Example: I bet, I declare, I resign.

Apology in speech act is called also as the act of apologizing. Apology is included in the type of expressive speech act.

2.3 Politeness

Politeness is a way to maintain a good relationship by doing right manner, showing respect and keeping the hearer face. Holmes (1992) states that generally speaking politeness involves taking account of the feelings of others. Polite person makes others feel comfortable. Polite behavior measures

social relationships along the dimensions of social distance or solidarity and relative power or status of the participants. We need to understand the social values of a certain community in order to speak politely and maintain the good relationship and avoid an offense.

Politeness strategies are used to save and keep the hearer's face. In communication or interaction, the speakers will represent feeling or respond themselves by their body language and face. It is because not all of the feeling and self representation is easily expressed to keep the good image and maintain relation. Face is one of part in our body which can shows feeling and expression. Politeness refers to 'face'. Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself. Brown and Levinson (1987:61-63) define 'face' as the public self-image that every number wants to chain for himself.

There are two types of face in this case, such as:

1. Positive Face.

   It is the desire/ wants / needs by a person or people to get the approval and to be appreciated by others.

   It is such as achievements, ideas, goals, and the like. In this case, positive face tries to get and find solidarity or in communication the speaker and the hearer cooperate together in keeping or maintain respond or face by showing empathy or sympathy.

2. Negative Face

   It is the desire / wants not to be imposed by others' actions. In this case, negative face is rather difficult to understand because it needs interlocutors to recognize each other's negative face and be more focus to interpret each other's face.

   We can understand in this example such as when the speaker says "Go to bed!" to the hearer, it seems that the speaker limits the hearer's freedom of doing what the hearer's doing at that time. The hearer must go to bed soon, he is not allowed to do anything else except goes to bed.

   When we communicate or talk to others, we must be aware of both kinds of face. Therefore, Brown and Levinson (1987:70) divided two kinds of politeness, they are positive and negative politeness.

   Types of Politeness:

a. Positive Politeness

   It is type of politeness that set as an approach based on treating member as solidarity through offers, friendship, and the use of compliments and informal language use. Positive politeness is appropriate between those who know each other well. It tries to minimize the distance by expressing friendliness and making solid interest to the interlocutor's need. For example, speaking conversation with slang as a membership

identity, "Come to my party, will you buddy?" that example symbolizes solidarity and friendliness of the interlocutors.

b. Negative Politeness

It is type of politeness which related toward satisfying the hearer's face and it leads to deference, apologizing, indirectness, and formality in language use. Negative politeness suggests distance by accentuating the hearer's right of territorial chains and freedom from imposition. For example, when the speaker expresses the acts indirectly "Would you be able to throw that garbage?", It means that the speaker asks the hearer to throw the garbage indirectly because of the social distance of the interlocutors. The speaker actually does not know the hearer well so he uses polite expression and he hopes that the hearer will comply with his request.

The relation between apology and politeness can be seen by Brown and Levinson that ever consider apology as a face threatening act, which damages to some degree the speaker's positive face, it is because in doing it the speaker admits that he or she has done a transgression (Brown levinson, 1987: 68). Face threatening itself means some acts that threat someone feeling and another individual face wants or the act that can infringe on the hearer need.

Apology can be a negative politeness strategy when the speaker indicates his or her reluctance to impinge on the hearer's negative face and thereby partially redresses that impingement (1987: 187). Apology can be a positive politeness when the speaker concerns for the addressee's wellbeing, needs, interests, feelings, and so on.

2.4 Apology

Apology is an action of asking forgiveness. Apology is used to express regret for having offended and making inconvenient thing to someone which can damage a relationship. Apology is used to maintain relationship and the harmony after an offence occurred. Apology is an attempt by the speaker to make up some previous actions that interfered with the hearer's interests, counteracts the speaker's face wants (Blum kulka 1989).

Holmes (1992) considers apology as a speech act directed to the addressee's face need and intended to remedy an offense for which the speaker takes responsibility, and thus to restore equilibrium between the speaker and addressee. Searle (In Trosborg, 1994:373) states that apology has the effect of paying off a debt, thus compensating the victim for the harm done by the offence.

According to Trosborg (1995: 373), there are three roles involved in solving the unpleasant situation between the speaker and the hearer, which are a complainer or a person who complaint, complainee or a person who receive the complaint and a complaint or an expression of

dissatisfaction. Olsthain and Cohen (in Trosborg, 1994:373) define that the act of apology is called for when there are some behaviors which have violated social norms.

An apology is a speech act that is used to rebuild relationships between a speaker and a hearer after speaker has offended hearer intentionally or unintentionally. The act of apologizing is related about two main things: an apologizer / complainee and a recipient.

There are kinds of offences, and apology has the effect of paying the debt, thus compensating the victim for the harm done by the offense (Searle and Katz in Trosborg,1994:373). An offense is considered as face threatening act toward the offended, and apology is intended to remedy the offense. Apology is used because it is caused by offences. Holmes (In Wagner's paper) divided the following categories of offenses, they are such as:

a.   Space offenses

This offence involves some acts such as bumping into someone, queue jumping, etc.

b.   Talk offenses

This offence involves some acts such as interrupting, talking too much, etc.

c.   Time offenses

This offence involves some acts such as keeping people waiting, taking too long, etc.

d.   Possession offenses

This offence involves some acts such as damaging or losing someone's personal property.

e.   Inconvenience offense

This offence involves some acts such as giving someone the wrong item, etc.

f.   Social behavior offences

It can be an act which can make the hearer get angry to the speaker. It can also be an impolite act done by the speaker to the hearer.

2.4.1 The apology strategies

In delivering the act of apologizing, the offender or the comlplainee/ the apologizer needs to employ certain strategy of apology that is appropriate with the case. It may be performed directly by means of an explicit apology utilizing one of the verbs directly signaling apology (apologize, be sorry, excuse, etc.), or it can be done indirectly by taking on responsibility or giving explanations (Trosborg, 1994:376). There are a number of linguistic strategies for expressing apology. The following parts below are the further explanations of Trosborg's apology strategies:

a. Evasive strategies / Minimizing offense

This strategy is closely related to the strategies in which the compliance fails to take on responsibility. But the speaker does not

deny the responsibility. The difference can be seen in the facts that the apologizer/ complainee doesn't deny responsibility. Instead, the complainee seeks to minimize the degree of offense, either by arguing that the supposed offense is of minor importance, in fact is 'hardly worth mentioning', or by querying the preconditions on which the complaint is grounded (Trosborg, 1995: 379). This strategy is divided into three sub strategies, such as Minimizing , Querying preconditions as example: Well, everybody commonly does that ; Blaming someone else is the offence committed by the complaint can be partly excused by an offence committed by a third party, e.g. : I broke the jar because she suddenly pushed me.

Further explanation of these sub- strategies can be seen below:

1. Minimizing

    In this sub-strategy, the complainee tries to minimize the degree of offense by saying that the happening is not a big deal and the complainee seeks to minimize the degree of offense by arguing that the supposed offense is of minor importance (Trosborg,1995:379). Minimizing itself means reducing something, especially something bad to the lowest possible level.

    Examples:

    "Oh, what does it matter, that's nothing, that's just so so"

     "It doesn't matter".

    "What about it, it's not the end of the world"

"Take it easy, it's not the end of the world."

" Everyone ever does that"

" Don't take so seriously"

"Well, everything will be alright again, don't think too much

about it"

2. Querying precondition

In this sub strategy, the complainee may cover the complaint

by querying precondition. The complainee attempts to throw doubt

on the modalities of a precious arrangement. It can be said also that

the complainee or apologizer may argue that the offense is minor

of importance. Querying itself means expressing doubt about

something whether something is correct or not.

Example:

"Who told you that I would marry you?"

"Are you sure we were supposed to meet at 1 p.m?"

"Do you believe that Jen deserves to get this?"

"What is love then?" (in responding, "You don't love me").

"Don't put Dian's name on the checklist, I'm not sure she is

coming"

3. Blaming someone else

In this sub-strategy the offense is committed by the complainee

which can be excused by an offence committed by a third party

(Trosborg, 1995:379). The apologizer regards that the third

party is also partly responsible for the offense (Trosborg, 1995:379). Blaming itself means is the act of thinking tor saying that somebody, someone else or something is responsible for something bad.

Example:

"I don't know traffic jump could be so long along the road this morning."

"I've tried to tell you the case, but you always busy with your hobby."

"The bus was late"

"Look, I really feel bad about this. But this would never have happened if she had done exactly as I told her to do."

"I believe someone else also is responsible for this problem, she or he may also takes part in this problem"

b. Direct Apology / Expression of apology

In this type of apology strategy, the complainee may choose to express his/her apology explicitly. In this case, a small number of verbs apply and the expression is a routine formula generally accepted to express apology. There is also semantic content here and it may be an expression of regret, an offer of apology, or a request for forgiveness (Trosborg,195:381).There are the subcategories of this strategy :

1) Expression of regret.

It is the type in which complainee uses the common form to express his or her regret by using some terms such as really, terribly and so on.

Example:

"I'm sorry to keep you waiting".

"Sorry about that"

"I'm sorry to have been so long in getting in touch with you"

"I'm really sorry"

"I am sorry for ...."

2) Offer of apology.

It is the type in which a complainee or the apologizer may choose to express his / her apology explicitly. The complainee may offer an apology for the offense.

Example:

"I apologize for…"

"Please accept my sincere apology for…"

"My client would like to extend his apology to you for the inconvenience involved."

"I apologize"

4. Request for forgiveness.

It is the type in which an apologizer or the complainee may choose to express his / her apology explicitly in the form of explicit

performative constructions (Trosborg, 1995:381). In this case, the complainee shows that he expects for forgiveness.

Example :

"Please, forgive me".

" I'm terribly sorry about…"

"Excuse me"

"I'm sorry for interrupting you, but…"

"Pardon me, I didn't hear what you said".

c. Indirect apology / acknowledgement of responsibility

It is the strategy in which the complainee tries to describe his/her role in what has happened and whether or not he/she was responsible. The complainee chooses to take on responsibility by using various degrees of self-blame from low to high intensity.

Speakers can implicitly or explicitly claim to be responsible for their action. The speakers also usually blame themselves. This strategy is aimed to give support to the hearer.

This strategy divided into some sub-strategies such as:

1. Implicit acknowledgment

In this case, the complainee blames himself implicitly,

Example: "I can see your point, perhaps I shouldn't have done it".

2. Explicit acknowledgment

In this case, the complainee admits his mistake explicitly,

Example: "I'll admit I forgot to do it".

3. Expression of lack of intent

It is the type in which the complainee expresses that he does not

have intention to commit the offense,

Example: "I didn't mean to".

4. Expression of self deficiency :

In this type, the complainee expresses his own deficiencies.

Example: "I was confused"

"You know I am bad at…"

5. Expression of embarrassment

It is the type in which the complainee shows that he feels

embarrass for the offense.

Example: "I feel so bad about it".

6. Explicit acceptance of the blame

In this type, the complainee feels that the complainer has the

right to blame him

Example: "It was entirely my fault"

"You're right to blame me"

d. Explanation or account.

In this apology strategy, the complainee may try to

reduce the guiltand impact by giving an explanation about the

situation of violation. In this strategy the speakers argue that

the offense is not something he wanted to occur.

It is can be divided into some sub-strategies, they are:

1. Implicit explanation.

   The complainee explains the situation implicitly

   Example: "Such things are bound to happen".

2. Explicit explanation.

   The complainee explains the situation explicitly

   Example: "Sorry, I'm late, but my car broke down".

e. Offer of repair.

In this type of apology strategy, the complainee may offer to 'repair' the damage he has done or caused by his/her offense. Repair may be offered in its literal sense or as an offer to pay for the damage.

There are two sub-strategies of this, they are included:

1. Repair.

   The complainee intends to pay for the damage,

   Example: "I will pay for the cleaning".

2. Compensation.

   If the repair is not possible, the complainee may offer a compensatory action,

   Example: "You can borrow my dress instead".

f. Expressing concern for hearer.

In this type of apology strategy, the complainee may express his concern towards the complainer's condition. To comfort the hearer, the speaker may demonstrate his attention. The

complainee may show the sympathy toward the complainer's condition.

Example: "I know you do not feel comfortable with what I've done".

"Actually, I don't want it to happen to you."

g. Rejection

This type of apology strategy, a person may deny the responsibility because he feels not guilty. The denial of responsibility can be shown by the use of rejection strategy. There are some categorizations of this apology strategy, they are such as:

1. Explicit denial of responsibility.

In this type, the complainee denies that he/she has committed the infraction explicitly and the complainee explicitly denies that he/she should be responsible for something unpleasant that has happened. The complainee deny being responsible for the violation occurred. They may be emphasizing the ignorance of the matter

Example: "You know that I would never do a thing like that."

"I know nothing about it"

2. Implicit denial of responsibility.

   In this type, the complainee may try to evade responsibility by ignoring the complaint or talking about other topics. The complainee tries to change the conversation piece or ignore the complainer in order to evade the responsibility. They generally avoid responsibility by ignoring complaints or talking about something else.

   Example: "I don't think that's my fault."

3. Justification.

   In this type, the complainee tries to give and provide arguments to persuade the complainer that he cannot be blamed for the inconvenient situation that happens. It is set to affect the hearer not to blame the speaker

   Example:

   "I've already finished my job yesterday, so there is no reason I could be blame about this"

   "I've told you before that I'll give you the money, but I didn't promise anything, did I?"

4. Blaming someone else.

   It is a type in which the complainee blames a third party or even the complainer himself as the cause of further violation.. The complainee seeks to evade responsibility by blaming someone else. (in which the case the complainee is

likely to cause further offense). The complainee avoid responsibility by blaming others.

5. Attacking the complainer.

This type, the complainee may attack the complainer if he feels that he cannot defend himself. Sometimes in this case, the complainee attacked the hearer in a much ruder manner. If the complainer lacks an adequate defense for his/her own behavior, he/she may choose to attack the complainer instead. This yet another way of evading responsibility, though undoubtedly in most cases it is a more abusive strategy than blaming someone else.

Example: "I'm warning you! You can't blame me for this trouble."

h. Promise of forbearance

In this apology strategy, the complainee takes responsibility by expressing regret, and he/she will be expected to behave in a consistent fashion and not immediately to repeat the act for which he/she has just apologized. The complainee promises either never to do the same mistake or to improve his behavior. The utterance is often signaled by the word 'promise',

In this case, an apology is not only related to the violations that have been done but also related to the behavior in the future.

This speech act apology contains a commitment from the speaker not to repeat his action.

Example : "It won't happen again, I promise".

2.5 Review of related studies

There are a number of researcher had been doing a research about apology, some of them are:

1. Apology strategies in Persian (Mohammad Shariati & Fariba Chamani: 2011). The study examined the frequency, combination, and sequential position of apology strategies in Persian to see how the universality of apologies should be treated in this language. The investigation is based on a corpus of 500 naturally occurring apology exchanges, collected through an ethnographic method of observation. The results revealed that explicit expression of apology with a request for forgiveness was the most common apology strategy in Persian. The aforementioned strategy together with acknowledgement of responsibility formed the most frequent combination of apology strategies in this language. The same set of apology strategies used in other investigated languages was common in Persian; however, preferences for using these strategies appeared to be culture-specific.

2. The other is "Apology Strategies: Are Womens different from Men's?" from Nani Fitriani (2011). She studied on the implementation of power and solidarity in apology strategy. The

study focused on observing the way men and women use to apologize and trying to find out whether the apology strategies used by both groups correspond to the theory of politeness as well as to the theory of language and gender. Theory used in her study is the theory of apology speech act which is related to the theory of politeness and the theory of language and gender.

3. "The Apology Strategies Used by the Workers to the Old and Young Bosses" (Lili and Mardijono, 2011). Their study conducted the type of apology strategies used by the workers to the old and young bosses. The result of their study showed the most frequent apology strategy used by the workers to the old and young bosses was explanation or account. The workers applied more strategies (8 strategies) and combinations (7 combinations) of apology strategies to the old boss than to the young boss (3 strategies and 2 combinations).

Related to this study, the researcher concludes that this research has similar discussion, this thesis and previous discuss about the apology strategy. But, although each of the studies above identifies apology strategy this research quietly different from previous researchers. Nanny (2011), she only focuses on in the apology in women and men language gender by using Aijmere's theory in and Fasold theory about language gender. Fariba (2011), the focus of study is on common apology Persian based on corpus

analysis and used Wofson's theory, then Lili and Maridjono (2011) focuses on the type of apology strategies used by the workers to the old and young bosses. In this study, the researcher would like to find how the characters express apology and what type of apology strategies used with its offence caused in "Stuart Little 2" movie which is used Trosborg theory.