CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES AND

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1   Pragmatics

Pragmatic has several definitions, which every linguist has a different explanation of the pragmatic definition. The study of pragmatics, defined as the field of examining forms of expression in accordance with social distances that limits participants involved in certain conversations (Yule, 1996). It can be defined that pragmatics is a study that discussed about how people could understand the meaning of the words between speaker and listener.

The term pragmatics more broadly is the rules of the use of language, namely the choice of the form of language and the determination of its meaning in connection with the intent of the speaker in accordance with the context and circumstances. Thus, pragmatics here also includes why someone can say "thanks" to peers, but not to the teacher or parents. In conversation, the speaker's expression can be done in many different ways as there are different purpose when it comes to communication.

2.1.1 Apology

Apology is one of the acts used by speaker in conversation, which is defined as an act of expressing guiltiness or empathy with some related reasons such as mistake or hearing bad news. In a relationship whether it is romantic, friendship, or

family, miscommunication or disagreement is bound to happen. It is used to maintain relationships and harmony after the violation occurs. Apology's purpose is to express remorse for offending and making things uncomfortable for someone who can ruin a relationship. Holmes (2013) defined apology as a speech act that directed at the face needs and intended to correct the violations the speaker is responsible, and thus restore the balance between the speaker and the listener. Apology refers to the act of speaking that rebuilds the relationship between the speaker and the listener, after the speaker has offended the listener intentionally or unintentionally. The act of apologizing is related to two main things: apologizing or the complainant and the recipient.

2.1.1.1 The Apology Strategies

In delivering an apology, the offender needed to use a specific strategy of apologizing that is appropriate for the situation. It can be done directly through an explicit apology using one of the verbs that directly signifies an apology, which are apologize, excuse, and more. It can also be done indirectly by taking responsibility or giving an explanation (Trosborg, 1994). There are several linguistic strategies that can be used in expressing apologies, as shown below are further explanations of Trosborg's (1994) apology strategies.

1.   Evasive Strategies/Minimizing offense

This strategy is closely related to the strategy where the speaker had failed to take responsibility, but the speaker does not deny responsibility. The difference can be seen in the fact that the person who apologizes to the hearer does not refuse responsibility. Instead, it filled towards the hearer in order to minimize the level of

violations, either by arguing that the violations that it considers to be unimportant, are in fact 'hardly worth mentioning', or by asking the preconditions on which the hearer are based (Trosborg, 1994). This strategy can be in three forms, such as minimizing, requesting prerequisites for example: Well, everyone usually does that; Blaming others is that violations committed by complaints can be partly.

2.   Direct Apology/Expression of apology

The speaker may choose to express apology directly in this form of apology strategy. This strategy applied small number of certain verbs, and the expression is formed in a certain accepted formula of expressing apology. The speaker may express regrets or request for forgiveness to the hearer. Austin (Austin, 1962) point to expression to the apology indication active with a first person singular subject as the explicit performative for the act of apologizing.

3.   Indirect Apology

This is a strategy where the speaker will try to describe what had happened and whether is responsible or not. The speaker may choose to take responsibility using low to high intensity levels of self-deviation, which can be counted as the apology in acknowledgement of responsibility. Speakers can claim responsibility directly or indirectly for their actions, which they usually blame themselves. In this apology strategy, the speaker can also try to minimize the impact of the guilt by giving an explanation of the violated situation. In this strategy, the speakers would argue that the violation is not something he wanted to happen. (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984) suggest the notion of apology speech act set to encompass the potential range of apology strategy and may count as a realization of an apology.

4.   **Remedial Support**

Apologies that occurred in social situations often do not meet the demands of how apology should be to express sincerity. So, several additional support to add in the apology in order to express sincerity are offered, which can be the expressing of concern to hearer, promise in regard to future behavior, and the offer for repair. In the strategy of expressing concern to hearer, speaker can express his concern and sympathy to the hearer's condition. While, apologizing in term of promising, it meant that the speaker is responsible for expressing remorse, and he will be expected to behave consistently and not immediately repeat the action he just apologized. The speaker would promise not to make the same mistakes or to correct his behavior. Lastly, the offer of repair is when the speaker expressed his apology and offer to repair the damage he had caused or done. Apology occur as a social routine which may not meet the demand express in the sincerity condition. (Owen, 1983)

2.1.1.2 Factors of Apology

According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), there are factors that could influence a person's decision to apologize, where the intensity is done. Basically, three different levels of factors can be distinguished, namely the cultural level, personal, and contextual. Depending on the level of commitment made, such as the violation of norms on behavior, affection on the role, and relationship of the interlocutor, the speaker could choose the intensity of a specific apology.

1. **Cultural**

At a cultural level, arriving late to a meeting can be seen as a more serious offense at an American meeting than in comparable Israel. Therefore, Americans will apologize with more intensity for coming late.

2. **Personal**

The individual level refers to differences in a person's personal apology behavior. Some people tend to apologize more than others.

3. **Contextual**

Regarding the contextual level, physical arrangements may be relevant. Crashing into someone on a crowded bus might be considered a lesser offense than crashing into someone in an open space.

2.2   Previous Research

Belfas and Musyahda (2015) had conducted an analysis on the apology strategies most commonly used by Telkomsel's customer service personnel. It has the purpose to reveal what type of apology strategy happens the most in conversation, which can contribute more knowledge about apology strategies in public services. This study used apology strategy theory proposed by Trosborg in order to analyze data. This research applied method with a qualitative research method approach. From the analysis, the result showed that the customer service officers at Telkomsel mostly used explanations or accounts with 50% incidence to respond on the customer complaints, because it can satisfy the customer and soften the customer's feelings.

Nabilah and Aliah (2016) focused on analyzing apology strategies, namely ways to express apology and social functions of apology in the film "The Proposal". The researcher has the purpose to find out the expressions of verbal and nonverbal apologies taken from English film transcripts. The researcher used the theory of apology strategies as theorized by Olshtain and Cohen. Descriptive method research is applied to investigate the phenomenon of apology. The result researchers found 32 data that contained apologies expressed by the characters. Expressions of remorse emerge as the dominant strategy, which direct apologies are expressed more than indirect ones, and defusing the recipient's anger is the most dominant function of apologies. Although making mistakes or violations is unavoidable in communicating, by conveying an apology, the speaker would be able to minimize its effects, resolve problems, and restore threatened relationships.

Cedar (2017) conducted an analysis that has the purpose to investigate the effect of the level of English proficiency on the apology strategies used by Indonesian EFL students (English as a Foreign Language) of two levels of English proficiency. The researcher applied the apology strategy theory framework from Olshtain and Cohen along with Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper to analyze data. This study used the method of DCT (Discourse Settlement Task) questionnaire and involved 21 A2 students and 21 B1 students majoring in English in their first year period from a university in Indonesia. The findings result show no significant differences between the two subject groups in the overall use of the apology strategy, although differences are noted in each individual strategy level. Nevertheless, group B1 uses apology and strategies more frequently than group A2.

In addition, this study found two forms of pragmatic transfers carried out by the subject and a new apology strategy.

Najihah (2019) investigated apologies spoken by EFL students when they arrive late into the classroom, in order to find out their real intentions of apologizing. It used Lakoff's courtesy theory and elements of apology proposed by Smith as the basic theory to analyzing data. Method applied with descriptive qualitative research because it is carried out to get a deep and detailed analysis of objects, which are in the form of speech and words. Data were taken from students of the Faculty of Cultural Sciences majoring in English and Literature at the State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang. This research was conducted to aimed in depth the types of apology's elements found in students' apologies and how the elements of apology represent the principle of politeness. The results showed at least 3 elements were found and a maximum of 6 elements were involved. Students generally realize that what they do remains the other party but the remarks do not fully mean apologizing, some even show a good apology. Furthermore, it is possible to include that the maxim of modesty from the principle of politeness is the dominant proverb found in this study. The principle of politeness is well represented by the elements of apology found in students' remarks.

Savana and Rosiah (2019) discussed apologies on Whatsapp by Japanese Department Students of Yogyakarta Muhammadiyah University in several situations using semantic formulas. The purpose of this study was to find out how Japanese Language Department Students from Yogyakarta Muhammadiyah University expressed their apologies through Whatsapp in some situations to

teachers, seniors, and friends. The theory used in this research is theorized by Blum-Kulka about apology strategy with semantic formula. Theory of this research used descriptive method with a qualitative approach because it is analyzed descriptively with qualitative methods. The analytical method uses a semantic formula to classify an apology based on the situation. The result of this research is the tendency of students that most of them used the appointment of speech act instructions and they do not really use emojis to express apologies to teachers.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

```
                    ┌─────────────────────┐
                    │     Pragmatic       │
                    │   (Yule, 1996)      │
                    └─────────────────────┘
                               │
                    ┌─────────────────────┐
                    │      Apology        │
                    │ (Janet Holmes, 2013)│
                    └─────────────────────┘
                    ┌──────────┴───────────────────────┐
        ┌─────────────────────┐         ┌──────────────────────────┐
        │  Apology Strategies │         │    Factors of Apology    │
        │  (Trosborg, 1994)   │         │(Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984)│
        └─────────────────────┘         └──────────────────────────┘

   ┌──────────┐  ┌──────────┐        ┌──────────┐       ┌──────────┐
   │ Evasive  │  │  Direct  │        │ Cultural │       │Contextual│
   │Strategies│  │ Apology  │        └──────────┘       └──────────┘
   └──────────┘  └──────────┘
       ┌──────────┐  ┌──────────┐          ┌──────────┐
       │ Indirect │  │ Remedial │          │ Personal │
       │ Apology  │  │ Support  │          └──────────┘
       └──────────┘  └──────────┘

   ┌────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
   │              The Last Song (2009) Novel                     │
   └────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```