CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

In this chapter the writer will explain about the theory and studies that are related to her research. Theories are important when people want to make a study. They are needed as their reference to their study, especially in making research concerning this study on apology strategies; the writer uses the theory of apologizing strategies that has been written by Bergman and Kesper (1993). In this study, the writer tries to see the phenomenon in apologizing that occurs based on pragmatics field.

2.1 Apologizing

Apology is done the speaker did an offense to the hearer. The speaker who has done the offense to the hearer should apologize to the hearer in order to restore the hearer's face and maintain the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Offense is the action that is done by the speaker that attacks the hearer's feeling. When the speaker talks to the hearer, the speaker needs positive face because the speaker wants to be admitted as the member of the hearer. Then, if misunderstanding occurs that affects an offense to the hearer, the speaker positive face will be threatened and affect the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. The interaction that has been offended can be restored by the speaker using apologizing. Therefore, the speaker should apologize to the hearer, in order to restore the condition and the relationship. Apology as a face threatening act, which damages to the speaker's positive face since in doing it the speaker admits that she or he has done an offense (Brown and Levinson, 1987:68). Apology as a speech act addressed to B's face needs and intends to remedy an offense for which A takes responsibility and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer and B is the person offended) (Holmes, 1990:159).

According to Blum Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989:12) states that an apology is the acknowledgement by the speaker that a violation has been committed and an admission that he or she is at least partially involve in its cause. The speaker has done something that is annoying the hearer. Therefore, the speaker (he or she) regrets for having done the act or utterances and he or she takes the responsibility for the act or utterances by uttering an apology. According to Trosborg (1995:374) apologies are offered to express regret for having offended someone. As such they imply cost to the speaker and support for the hearer.

Apologies count as remedial work and have been traditionally regarded as hearer supportive, as they provide some benefits to the addressee at cost to the speaker (Fraser & Nolan, 1981). Apology is as a remedial work that needs a response from the hearer. The remedial is not success when the hearer does not accept the apology but when an apology is accepted by the hearer, the remedial is success. Owen (1983 cited in Wolfson, 1989) states that positive response occurs when the recipient of an apology responds to the remedial interchanges. On the other hand, negative response occurs when the recipient of an apology ignores the remedial interchanges. When the speaker admits the offense that he or she has done, he or she will apologize to the hearer. When the speaker apologizes to the hearer, it is done in different ways. Each speaker has his or her own ways to apologize. In the next section below, the writer will explain the apology strategies that are used by the speaker in apologizing based on Bergman and Kasper's theory (1993)

2.2 Apologizing Strategies

The speaker usually does apology in different ways. The speaker sometimes admits the offense that has been made explicitly, for instance: *I am sorry, or I apologize*. On the other hand, the speaker admits the offense in different way such as giving explanations. When the speaker apologizes to the hearer because of the offense the speaker should pay attention to the components in apologizing, so that the offense can be restored. In doing apology, the speaker needs appropriate apologizing that requires the specified knowledge fast and flexibly (Bergman and Kasper, 1993:84). The restoration that is done by the speaker may be performed directly or implicitly, therefore the hearer and the speaker's ability in using the language should be paid more attention, so that the hearer and the speaker can infer the intention or the utterances. When the speaker does apologies to the hearer, he or she can use many ways to express his or her guilty. Each person has different kind in terms of the way to apologize to someone. Based on the phenomenon, Bergman and Kasper (1993) proposed six kinds of apology strategies that will be described below:

2.2.1 Using IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device)

IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) is formulating routines expressions that are used by the speaker to express his or her apology explicitly. In IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device), the speaker is specifying the force of apology.

Example: "I'm sorry"

"I'm afraid"

"I apologize"

2.2.2 Upgrading

The speaker admits the offense that he or she has done by using common formula such as sorry, but the speaker also uses the adverbial intensifier such as "really or terribly" to emphasize the apology. The elements such as "really or terribly" are used to increase apologetic force.

Example: "I'm terribly sorry"

"I really did not mean to hurt you"

2.2.3 Taking on responsibility

The speaker recognizes his or her fault in causing the offense in an effort to restore the hearer's condition. The speaker recognizes her or his fault that she or he has done in causing the offense. Therefore, she or he acknowledges the offense by taking the responsibility of the offense. In third strategy, taking on responsibility includes:

2.2.3.1 Self Blaming

The speaker takes the responsibility by blaming herself or himself about the offense that he or she has done to the hearer. The speaker admits the fault that she or he has done, so that he or she blames himself or herself in order to show his or her regret to the hearer. Example: "how stupid I am"

2.2.3.2 Lack of Intent

The speakers explain to the hearer that he or she does not have any intention to do the offense.

Example: "I didn't mean like that"

"I didn't mean to do this"

2.2.3.3 Admission of fact

The speaker takes on responsibility by admitting the offense that he or she has done. The speaker tries to tell the truth to the hearer about the offense that has been done by the speaker.

Example: "I haven't graded it yet"

2.2.4 Downgrading Responsibility or Severity Offense

Downgrading Responsibility or Severity Offense means an utterance that reduces speaker's accountability for the offense, therefore the utterance can reduce severity of offense.

Example: "I'm only 10 minutes late"

In addition, there are five kinds in downgrading responsibility:

2.2.4.1 Excusing

The speaker tries to find argument to support his or her apology. The speaker mitigates his or her offense by giving explanation or account or the situation.

Example: "My watch had stopped"

2.2.4.2 Justification

The speaker provides argument to persuade the hearer that no blame can be attached to him or her. The speaker's argument is used to Persuade the hearer that the speaker cannot be blamed because of the offense.

Example: "I was suddenly called to the meeting"

2.2.4.3 Claiming Ignorance

The speaker avoids the responsibility by ignoring the complaint that is given by the hearer. The speaker tries to pretend that she or he does not have done the offense.

Example: "I didn't know you were expecting me"

2.2.4.4 Problematizing a precondition

The speaker uses certain condition or situation as a reason to avoid the responsibility. The speaker tries to evade the offense by giving a reason about the situation or condition that is not supposed to be.

It is done by the speaker to reduce the offense.

Example: "we weren't supposed to meet before 12.00"

2.2.4.5 Denial

The speaker denies that an offense has occured in the interaction. The speaker denies the offense that she or he has done to the hearer so the speaker tries to evade the responsibility.

Example : "I didn't do it"

"it wasn't my fault"

2.2.5 Offering of Repair

The speaker offers to repair the damage because of offense that is done by the speaker. The speaker offers to remedy the damage by an action to restore the damage.

Example: "I'll pay for the damage"

"I'll have it marked tomorrow"

"You can borrow my dress instead"

2.2.6 Verbal Redressing

There are three kinds of strategies in Verbal redress:

2.2.6.1 Concerning for offended party

The speaker expresses his or her concern toward the hearer's condition.

The speaker pays attention to the hearer's condition because of the offense that has been done by the speaker.

For example: "I hope you weren't offended"

"I hope you didn't wait long"

2.2.6.2 Effort to appease

Effort to appease is the situation where the speaker tries to appease the hearer's condition because of the offense in order to the hearer can feel better than before.

Example: "Let me buy you a drink"

2.2.6.3 Promising or forbearance

Promise or forbearance is a condition where the speaker admits the offense by expressing regret and the speaker promises not to do the same mistake or act for which he or she has just apologized. The speaker promises not to repeat the offense that he or she has done. In promise forbearance sometimes uses the word "promise".

Example: "It won't happen again"

"I'll try not to do that again"

