

CHAPTER II

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.

Yule (1996:3-4) states that pragmatic is the study of contextual meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in the particular context and how the context influences what is said. It also considers about who they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances.

In other words, context has such a big influence to transfer its meaning to the listener. Different context must be known before the speaker talks to the listener therefore both side will understand the meaning for each other. Besides, one word can create or have more than one meaning depends on the context or situation such as place, feeling, or time.

Meanwhile, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. The advantage of studying

language via pragmatics is that no one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes, or goals, and the kinds of actions.

However, goals of pragmatic that will be reached is still the context and the meaning as well. Not only about context but also studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation. It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other communicative intent or speaker meaning.

More recent studies, Leech 1993: 1 (cited in Pradiptia Wulan Utami, Nani Darmayanti, Sugeng Riyanto, 2007) "proposes that one cannot understand completely the characteristic of language, should he/she does not understand pragmatics, that is how language is used to communicate." This statement shows that pragmatics cannot be separated from the use of language because it is used to understand the meaning of its language.

According to (Geoffrey N. Leech: 1983) states that "Pragmatics : how language is used in communication. In other word, pragmatics however is used to understand the meaning of utterances in conversation. Not only the meaning, but also the context because to understand the meaning, the situation must include in utterances so that there will no misunderstand between the speaker and listener.

Only two studies included in their investigation the pragmatic discourse properties that go beyond the meanings expressed by actual words or sentences in

texts, including the distance between the expectations of readers and writers in terms of appropriacy and effectiveness of communication within certain contexts , Yule, 1996 (cited in Hacer Hande Uysal, 2012).

Moreover, pragmatic competence, which refers to the ability to communicate efficiently in the context of the language use, came into the attention of the scholars and teachers. The importance of pragmatic competence can be explained within a language situation. Example:

(1.)“I am sorry”

in Japan saying, “I am sorry” might be enough of an apology in many situations, whereas in other cultures such as that of Jordan, an explanation for the offense might be required (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2008).

In addition, according to Levinson 1993:5 (cited in Iman Santoso, Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna, Sutiono Mahdi, 2014) “Pragmatics, in a traditional sense, comprises “the study of language usage” to be distinguished from syntax, which is “the study of combinatorial properties of words and their parts“and from semantics, “ which is the study meaning “. In other word, pragmatics is related to the meaning in every part of utterances which also discusses about syntax and semantics.

In addition, Verschueren 1999:7 in Jacob L. Mey (2001) states that “Pragmatic does not constitute an additional component of a theory of language, but it offers a different perspective.” In other word, Jacob states that pragmatic

does not include in language because it is all about perspective which is different of people.

Moreover, Pragmatics is seen as the study of language use in particular communicative contexts or situations of necessity, this would take cognizance of the message being communicated or the speech act being performed; the participants involved; their intention, knowledge of the world and the impact of these on their interactions; what they have taken for granted as part of the context: the deductions they make on the basis of the context; what is implied by what is said or left unsaid; etc. Leech, 1983, p. 20; Watson & Hill, 1993, p. 146; Thomas, 1995, p.7 (cited in Suhair Safwat Mohammed Hashim, 2015).

Based on the definitions above, it can be summarized that pragmatics is the study of language or utterance meaning influenced by the context. It emphasizes on the relation of language meaning in the context. However, pragmatics and context cannot be separated because understanding the situation is needed in studying pragmatics as well.

1.2 Context

In linguistics, context carries tremendous importance in disambiguation of meanings as well as in understanding the actual meaning of words. According to Mey (1993:38) , context is a dynamic not a static concept. It is to be understood as the surroundings in the widest sense that enable the participants in the

communication process to interact and that make the linguistic expressions of their interaction intelligible.

Context is more than a matter of reference and the understanding of what things are about. Context is also what gives the utterances deeper. It is also important in assigning a proper value to such phenomenon as presuppositions, implicature and the whole set of context oriented features.

George Yule (2006:114) defined there are different kinds of context. One kind is described as linguistic context, also known as co-text. The co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. The surrounding co-text has a strong effect on what people think the word probably means. In other words, the different context could have different meanings and it effects the meaning as well.

Taking these factors into consideration, Miller and Leacock 2000 (cited in Niladri Sekhar Dash, 2008) have classified context into two types: (a) local context, and (b) topical context. While the local context refers to one or two words immediately before and after the key word (KW) under investigation, the topical context refers to the topic of the text where the KW has been used. According to these scholars, reference to the two contexts is more or less sufficient in understanding the actual contextual meaning of the KW used in a text.

In addition, Though the scope of pragmatics is far from easy to define, the variety of research interests and developments in the field share one basic concern: the need to account for the rules that govern the use of language in context

(Levinson 1983). In other word, language usage in society also role by the government and the context will still need in expressing pragmatics meaning.

More studies, as (Leech 1983:13, cited in Suci Almuslimah) explains context is “any background knowledge assumed to be shared by S (speaker) and H (hearer) which contributes to H’s inetpretation of what S means by given an utterance.” It means that to be able to understand what the speaker says, the hearer must have the same background of knowledge with the speaker-which is , the context.

In conclusion, without context, the listener will find difficultying to understand or interpret the meaning of the speaker’s utterance. When there is no context in conversation, the communication between the speaker and the listener will fail and will not get its purpose. The listener may be confused or misunderstand the speaker’s intention and it effects to the next conversation or action.

2.3 Speech Acts

Austin in Joan Cutting (2008:13) defined speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. It is said that the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analysed on three different levels such as locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act. However, action is needed to be shown when the speaker literally made an utterance.

As (Schmidt and Richards 1980; cited in Iknur stifçi, 2009) state speech acts are all the acts we perform through speaking, all the things we do when we speak and the interpretation and negotiation of speech acts are dependent on the discourse or context. There are a series of analytic connections between the notion of speech acts, what the speaker means, what the sentence uttered means, what the speaker intends, what the hearer understands, and what the rules governing the linguistic elements are.

More recent studies proposed (James R. Hurford, Brendan Heasley, and Michael B. Smith 2007:261) state speech act is an act of assertion is carried out when a speaker utters a declarative sentence (which can be either true or false), and undertakes a certain responsibility, or commitment, to the hearer, that a particular state of affairs, or situation, exists in the world.

In this case, speech act means utterances that need actions to be performed as a responsibility by the speaker to show true or false meaning of each utterances. Not only actions is needed to be shown, but also the appropriate context of each utterances. The hearer must not misunderstand when the speaker knows the appropriate context to send the message.

According to Sadock 2009 (cited in Muthia Damaiyanti, 2010) speech acts: 'acts done in the process of speaking. In other words, it means that during the speaking or conversation, the participants do the action of the utterances. The purpose of people make the utterances is to reach the message and also the action that has been said by the speaker.

When people speak, they use language to achieve a variety of functions like expressing different emotions, start an argument or even insult someone. All of the 'things' described before can be said to be speech acts: 'acts done in the process of speaking' (Sadock, 2009). In other hand, people use language to express their messages or feelings towards other people. Not only about messages, but also in actions that can be done based on the utterances.

The conclusion is that speech act can be an action that is performed by the speaker to the listener through utterances or sentences that have been spoken depends on the context. The utterances have different meanings based on the actions that performed by the speaker to transfer its meaning.

2.4 Types of Speech Acts

The division of speech acts into different subcategories largely goes back to the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1976). Of Searle's five basic categories, representatives, directives, commissives, declarations and expressives, the first three have received considerable attention, while the latter two are less well researched.

Austin (1962) defined speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. Speech act theory said that the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analysed on three different levels. Example:

(2.) John : “Darling, do you want to go out to the show tonight?”

Laura : “I’m feeling ill.”

John : “That’s ok. You stay there and I’ll make soup.”

From the example above, The first level of analysis is the word themselves called *Locution* ‘what is said’, the form of the words uttered; the act of saying something is known as the locutionary act. Notice how Laura didn’t respond to John’s question by saying, “No, I don’t want to go out to the show tonight.” What she actually said –her locutionary act- was “I’m feeling ill.”

The second level is what the speakers are doing with their words called *Illocutionary force(act)* ‘what is done in uttering the words’, the function of the words, the specific purpose that the speakers have in mind. In locution (in speaking) becomes il-locution through phonetic assimilation. In saying that she feels ill, Laura was telling John that she doesn’t want to go out.

The last level of analysis is the result of the words called *Perlocutionary effect*, ‘what is done by uttering the words; it is the effect on the hearer or the hearer’s reaction. Beyond communicating the state of her health and the answer to John’s question, Laura accomplished one more thing through saying “I’m feeling ill.” She got John to make her some soup. A perlocutionary act is focused on the response others have to a speech act.

2.4.1 Locutionary Act

Speech act locution is a speech act to express something: follow say something to the meaning of that word in dictionary and the meaning of the sentence according to the rules of syntax (Gunarwan in Rustono, 1999:37 cited in Citra Sparina, 2012). Focus locution is the meaning of spoken utterances, not questionng the purpose or function of the speech.

2.4.2 Illocutionary Act

In the opinion of J.L. Austin (Rustono, 1999:37 cited in Citra Sparina, 2012) are illocutionary speech acts that had the purpose and function or power of speech. Questions raised regarding the illocutionary acts is “to what speech is done” and was no longer at the level of “what the meaning of the speech?”.

Illocutionary acts of the language is limited by social conventions, for example: accosting, accusing, admitting, mocking, etc. Those the authors can conclude the illocutionary act is the utterances which have a certain power , in this case the speakers not only produce sentences that have a certain sense or specific reference, but also speech illocutionary aims to produce sentences with a view to contribute to the specific interaction of communication.

2.4.3 Perlocutionary Act

Austin developed, but soon abandoned, the performative hypothesis that behind every utterance there is a performative verb, such as 'to order', 'to warn', 'to admit' and 'to promise', that make the illocutionary force explicit.

Austin realised that often the implicit performatives, ones without the performative verbs, as in the original version of this dialogue, sound more natural. He also realised that implicit performatives do not always have an obvious explicit performative understood.

Searle's (1976) solution to classifying speech acts was to group them in the following macro-classes: Declarations, Representatives, Commissives, Directives, and Expressives.

2.4.4 Declarations

Declaration is defined by (Yule,1996:128 cited in Firas Abdul-Munim Jawad) as "a speech act that brings about a change by being uttered, e.g. a judge pronouncing a sentence." It belongs to the type of speech this is an impressive speech with resigning, dismissing, naming, appointing, pronouncing and sentencing. It intends to change the state of the world in an immediate way.

In generally, it can be concluded that the classification according to Searle, the main areas of positive politeness is in the category of illocutionary commissive and expressive categories. Examples:

(3.)“You are fired!”

In this statement is clearly used to explain the person has lost its job. It has strong influence when the speaker uses this declarative sentences to make a deal of something. “Fired” word is used to declare someone has lost his job.

(4.)“You are hereby expelled from the school.”

This statement is explained about the speaker has clearly made a decision to the person for themselves. This example shows that declarative sentence could change someone’s life by some reasons. In this case, “hereby” word is formally used as in declarations utterance.

(5.)“I hereby pronounce you husband and wife”

Meanwhile, this sentence is meant for two people who are getting married and legally acceptable in law and religion. This kind of declarative sentence is mostly used in daily life in society.

2.4.5 Representatives

It is a speech act, the purpose of which is to convey information about some state of affairs of the world from one agent, the speaker, to another, the hearer. Representatives are not constrained as far as their propositional content is concerned they may express “any proposition”.

Searle (1969 cited in Henk Havertake:18), which is equivalent to stating that speakers uttering a representative are in a position to assign properties not only to themselves or to their hearers, but also to any other person. It commits the speaker to something being the case. The different kinds are suggesting, putting forward, swearing, boasting, concluding. Examples:

(6.)“No one makes a better cake than me.”

This kind of sentence has an opinion by themselves to be told. It means that opinion is clearly important in representative sentence to transfer its meaning. The person claims that his cake is the best one compared with other's.

(7.)“I swear I didn't do it.”

It is explained that the person describes that he has nothing to do with the case. Describing is one of representative examples to describe the person's statements or utterances.

(8.)“I think you should do your homework right now.”

“Think” here means that the person has a perspective that it is better to do the homework right now or he would be in a problem. This statement shows the opinion of the person which is including in representatives. “I think” word is clearly showed that as an opinion of someone to clarify his thought.

2.4.6 Commisives

Commissive speech act is a speech act that binds the speaker to carry out all the things mentioned in the utterance. That binds the speaker to carry out the mandate as well as possible. Soejono Dardjowidjojo (2012:106) suggest that commissive speech act do not ask anything or command something it is not act that should be done. It means commissive speech act only in the form of information delivery.

Commissive tend to be convivial than competitive because its implementation is more meets the person's interest rather than the speaker. It commits the speaker to do something in the future. This includes acts in which the words commit the speaker to future action, such as 'promising', 'offering', 'threatening', 'refusing', 'vowing', and 'volunteering'. Examples:

(9.) "I'm going to Jakarta tomorrow to meet you."

In this statement is one of commissives example such as promising. The speaker says this utterance to convince the listener that he will go to Jakarta just to meet the girl as a promise. "I'm going to" as same as "I will" which is clearly as a promise that is said by someone to the listener.

(10.) "I will always love you forever."

This sentences is a promise that has a big influence to listener. Commisives sentences take important role in daily life to convince or trust people based on the sentences the speaker says.

(11.) “ Let me do the work. You look exhausted”

This is a volunteering sentence that the speaker says to help other person. The speaker intentionally helps people used this kind of commissives sentence. Not only promising, but commissive can be as an offering as well. “Let me..” is kind of offering word intended to help someone.

2.4.7 Directives

Directive speech act, also known as speech act impositif. It includes the speaker intended to perform the appropriate action described in the speech help repair tasks.

This type is often put in a competitive category because it also includes illocutionary categories that require negative manners. It intends to try making the addressee perform an action. This category covers acts in which the words are aimed at making the listener do something, such as ‘commanding’, ‘requesting’, ‘inviting’, ‘forbidding’, ‘suggesting’, etc. Examples:

(12.) “Could you close the window please?”

This sentences is kind of commanding in directives. It is explained that the person wants the listener to close the window and it needs some actions to do so. “Could you..” word as a request by the speaker to the listener.

(13.) “Sing me a lullaby please?”

This utterance is a requesting that the speaker asks to the listener directly. The speaker asks to the listener to sing her something to help her sleep well. This kind of utterance is also a request in word “please?” that is used to ask someone for doing something.

(14.) “You better clean up your room now because it’s so messy.”

This is one of suggesting sentences in directives. It is meant that the speaker gives a suggestion to the listener so that he will clean the room immediately for good. Not only in requesting, but directives also have a suggesting statement such as “you better...” word.

2.4.8 Expressives

This speech act also called evaluative speech acts. Its feeling includes in this type of speech act rather sad or happy. It expresses how the speaker feels about the situation. This last group includes acts in which the words state what the speaker feels, such as ‘apologising’, ‘praising’, ‘congratulating’, ‘deploring’, and ‘regretting’. Examples:

(15.) “I’m sorry for your loss.”

This sentence is clearly meant that the speaker feels sorry to the listener because one of his family passed away. The speaker expresses his feeling as a sympathy for his loss. In this utterance, “I’m sorry..” here means as a sympathy feeling by the speaker to the listener.

(16.) “Thank you for your help. I couldn’t do that without you.”

This is some kind of thanking sentence that is used to thanked someone else. It is explained that the speaker expresses thankful feeling because his friend helped him to do it. Not only in apologizing, but also in thanking or feeling grateful. In this case, “Thank you..” is the word of thanking by the speaker to the listener.

(17.) “If I’d known I was gonna live this long, I’d have taken better care of myself.”

In this example, this sentence is about regetting of something. The speaker regrets that he would do best to himself in his entire life and he would not do anything bad. Regretting is also kind of expressives speech act in word “If I’d known..., I’d have..”

For Searle, there is a general condition for all speech acts, that the hearer must hear and understand the language, and that the speaker must not be pretending or play-acting. For declarations and directives, the rules are that the speaker must believe that it is possible to carry out the action, they are performing the act in the hearer’s best interests, they are sincere about wanting to do it, and the words count as the act.

These two types of acts of speech are the basis of the language classification that led to a deeper analysis of the language. Searle (1969) had a systematic approach and classified speech acts under five main categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. The explanation below in Table 1.0 was adopted from Verschueren (1999).

Table 1.0 Speech Acts (Verschuren, 1999)

| SPEECH ACT | DEFINITION | EXAMPLE |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Assertives | Expressing a belief, committing the speaker to truth of what is asserted. E.g. statements | We watched a movie yesterday. |
| Directives | Expressing a wish, making an attempt to get to hearer to do something. | Bring me some hot water. |
| Commissives | Expressing an intention, commitment for the speaker to engage in a future action. E.g. promises, offers | I promise, I will complete the work by tomorrow. |
| Expressives | Expressing a variety of psychological states.E.g. apologies | I am sorry for my disrespectful behavior. |
| Declarations | Bring about a change via words. E.g. baptizing, declaring war, abdicating | Hereby I pronounce you husband and wife. |

Under the category of expressives, apology speech acts hold an important place in human communication as a face saving act of speech. Thus, it is crucial for people to understand what an apology is and how it functions. An act of apology can be considered a remedial act of speech, which means that the speaker is trying to save his or her face because of an action.

In contrary, Verschuren (1999) has categorized the same five types of speech acts as Searle's. But, Verschuren has another name of representatives which is assertives that both of them have the same meaning such as belief or what people may think about something.

2.5 The Natural Meaning of Expressive Speech Acts

In every culture, people have their unique ways of conveying meaning through language; it is important to understand the variations in communication patterns and meanings related to the context to be able to learn and teach a language. One area of linguistics, pragmatics, examines these variations. To be able to communicate and function effectively in the target language context, a learner should be able to understand the pragmatics of the target language, otherwise the communication might not be conducted efficiently. Thus, pragmatic competence is an important aspect of language learning and second language acquisition.

First defined by Austin (1962), Speech Act Theory aims to explain the language as a series of actions. In this theory, speech acts are categorized into five

main domains according to how listeners and speakers are affected by the communication (Celce - Murcia & Olshtain, 2007). These categories include assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

In addition, expressives are speech acts whose illocutionary content is the expression of a psychological state about oneself or the world. Searle & Vanderveken, 1985 (cited in Marc Aguer, Ludovic Le Bigot, Virginie Laval & Josie Bernicot, 2010). In other hand, expressives speech act is all about expressions that is being expressed by the speaker to the listener intended to tell the meaning or the message in utterances.

Meanwhile, expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels, George Yule (1996:55). They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. Those can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker's experience. One of expressive kinds is "sorry" or mostly called apologizing acts.

Apologies, under the category of expressives in speech act theory, have been one of the main field in pragmatics because of their importance in human communication as an act of face-saving and politeness. To be able to reach a clearer understanding of apologies, researchers have approached the matter in different ways. One of the most crucial approaches is to classify apology strategies, such as in Cohen & Olshtain (1983) where they created a classification of universally occurring apology speech acts.

2.6 Apologizing Act

When a talk goes wrong between two speakers of different languages, they may see one another as unfriendly (Bems, 1990). It is known that apology plays a very important role in everyday communication between speakers. It is a justification or defense of an act or idea. It can also be for some thing done wrong. The speaker who has uttered a statement which causes offence to others has a number of rhetorical strategies in response to subsequent calls for apology.

Therefore, with two parties: an apologizer and an apologizee. However, only if the person who caused the infraction perceive himself or herself as an apologizer do we get the act of apologizing. The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to “set things right” (Olshtain, 1983:235).

In other hand, apologizing act is a kind of expressive speech acts where speakers as the apologizer and listener as the apologizee are needed. An expressive speech act is the point of which is that a certain psychological state is expressed, which have no direction of fit, in which a wide range of psychological states can be expressed, in which proposition describes a property or act to the speaker or hearer (Searle: 1977).

Meanwhile, apologizing act is the way of people can express their feeling to the others by asking apology for their faults or wrongs. It is kind of psychological expression where people can express what they think and what

they feel. Expressing sorry must be acceptable and reasonable from speaker to listener intentionally based on the context.

However, the apology process will run well if the offended can agree the offender's goal to forgive the offender's faults. In using apology act, people need to apply certain strategies of apology. These kind of ways will help them to success the apologizing acts and maintain the relationship between the offenders and the offended.

In result, the differences of apologizing acts are related to the behaviour that may also cause differences strategy of apology. It depends on the levels of high or low and complex or simple strategy used. Apology can be stated directly or indirectly related to the strategy used by the offender. People usually use the words "I'm sorry" for expressing apology. These words cannot undo the harm already done, but at least it can restore the dignity of the victim.

Cohen & Olshtain (1983) explains apologies as a speech act occurring between two participants in which one of the participants expects or perceives oneself deserving a compensation or explanation because of an offense committed by the other. In that situation, one participant has a choice to apologize or deny the responsibility or the severity of the action.

As Marquez-Reiter (2000: 44) states an apology is a "compensatory action for an offense committed by the speaker which has affected the hearer. According to Bataineh & Bataineh (2006:1903) apologies fall under expressive

speech acts in which speakers attempt to indicate their state or attitude. They add that in order for an apology to have an effect, it should reflect true feelings.

In other words, as Searle (1979) states a person who apologizes for doing A expresses regret at having done A so the apology act can take place only if the speaker believes that some act A has been performed prior to the time of speaking and that this act A resulted in an infraction which affected another person who is now deserving an apology.

2.7 Types of Apologizing Act

The way apologies are classified depends very much on the way they are defined. Thus, the diversity in definitions of apologies also brings about diversity in classification. According to Daniela Kramer-Moore and Michael Moore (2003: 160-169), there are certain types of apologies that are common across different categorizations, while other types are unique.

2.7.1. Hurt

(18). I know I've hurt you. Believe me that I didn't intend to. I wish I hadn't done it or that I could undo it. Given another chance I would be more careful. I regret having done it.

This type of apology serves as the prototype for the expression of religious repentance. As mentioned above, even this, seemingly most remorseful,

expression carries no information about its sincerity. To clarify this point, consider that not only religions exact a request for forgiveness.

2.7.2 Sorry (for An Excuse, Politely)

(19.) I know that you consider what I've done wrong or impolite. I wish I didn't have to do it, but I had no choice. Given the same circumstances, I'd do it again.

This polite formula has some practical value in that it smoothes interaction in formal social encounters. While it may also contain a modicum of regret, it certainly lacks a promise of non-repetition. The following formula bears this out: "Excuse me! Excuse me!" (Same as the French "Pardon!"), said when pushing through a crowd, bumping into people repeatedly.

2.7.3 Sorry(or Have Lost Your Job, or Unlucky)

(20.) I've got nothing to do with this, but if I could, I'd change it. I say this just to make you feel better, to show that I commiserate.

While expressing misgivings about the addressee's situation, this speaker does not assume any responsibility for it. Consequently they can logically express no regret, nor offer any promises regarding the future. According to Wanderer's

report (2001) the solution of the diplomatic standoff hinged exactly on the ambiguity of "I'm sorry".

2.7.4 Excuse Me?(Polite)

(21.) I didn't hear/understand you; could you please repeat what you've just said? I know this causes you some inconvenience and I wish I didn't have to do it, but I have no choice.

This type bears some similarity to second one, above (both belong to the "polite" category), but it appears in different situations. It implies neither regret nor a promise of future avoidance. One can see its distance from apologizing through common dictionary substitutions, such as the less courteous "Come again?".

2.7.5 Sorry (Intentionally)

(22.) I don't think I've done anything wrong, but if you feel I have, I'll give you the benefit of doubt and apologize.

Not only does this speaker show no regret, they even condescend and blame the other for over-sensitivity. By accepting this left-handed apology they accept the label of touchiness. By rejecting it, they become a bad sport.

2.7.6 Excuse Mé!(Ironical, with Two Exaggerated Stresses).

(23.) I know that you'd prefer if I didn't exist, but I won't give you that pleasure. I have no intention to apologize.

Rather than illustrating apologizing, both this and the following type provide examples of verbal aggression. Instead of offering an apology, the speaker hints that the recipient should feel guilty and apologize. A triple-message characterizes irony and sarcasm: The speaker's unstated agenda, and the two opposing messages these tropes contain.

2.7.7 Excuse Me?(Exaggeratedly Incredulous).

(24.) I can't believe what I've just heard, so I pretend, ironically, that I've misheard you.

As in both of the above types, the ambiguity of this utterance puts the listener at a disadvantage. If s/he takes it at face value and repeats the message, the recipient will most likely retort: "I heard you the first time!" Any other response constitutes joining the fray.

Sincere apologies, in which the individual takes upon self the responsibility for some wrong-doing, absolves one's conscience through so called undoing. At the other end of the above continuum, the use of apology as a method for blaming the other puts the recipient on the defensive, and thus entails the projection of guilt.

Finally, the goals of asking an apology is only to make or to get things right as it is used to be. In apologizing acts, there is not only “sorry” for a mistake but also for anything else such as hurt in physically or having misheard. Apologizing releases the stress produced by guilt feelings, thus serving as a defense mechanism. Sincere apologies, in which the individual takes upon self the responsibility for some wrong-doing, absolves one's conscience through so called undoing.

As a conclusion, there are many different categorizations of apologies. However, as already mentioned in the section on apologising acts, this speech act depends on the context, so not all the categories in taxonomies would work for all the situation or context. Also, one should account both for explicit and implicit apologies. Lastly, categories such as avoiding and postponing apologies should also be part of the taxonomy, as choosing not to apologize or apologize later is also a strategy used when an apology is required.

2.8 Previous Study on Apologies

This research has close relationship with the research entitled “**An Analysis of Apology as a Politeness Strategy Expressed by Jordanian University Students**” by **Dr. Mahmoud Ali Al-Sobh, PhD**”. This study aims at finding the common apology expression used by Arabic native speakers used in different situations. Such studies are useful for Arab EFL learners and Arabic learners who have learnt contain vocabulary items and structures in the target

language and haven developed sociolinguistic competence. Also, this study will be helpful for curriculum designers and textbook writers. It also aimed at finding the apology strategies Arabic native speakers use in different situations..

The most common apology expressions used when some one refuses a gift which is the third situation are: *Hathehi Hurreya Shakhseyya*, *?a: sif Lan Akhudhha*, */asif la asta'tee'*. The forth situation is spilling tea or coffee on someone's clothes. The most common apology expressions used are: *?a:sif'jiddan*. *?a: sif Sawfa onadhef thalik*, *?a: sif laa qsud*, *ana a:sif Jidden*. For the fifth situation which is breaking a dish at home, the most common apology expressions used were: *Sha'y adi*, *intaha omroh*, *?a: sif saashtari wahad Jadeed*. For the sixth situation which is not returning the book on time, the most common apology expressions were: *?a: sif naseet*, *?a:sif dhaa'* *?a: sif Jiddan saashatari ketab jadeed*.

From the research above, The apology strategies students used were apology and regret. explanation, offer of repair. Equal- Equal, low high and responsibility. When a student responded saying that he will bring a new book. this means that he bears responsibility. Also when another students said that he would repair the broken dish, this means that he gave an offer of repair. At the same time, when a student explains the reason being late, this means that he used the explanation strategy.

In conclusion, the researcher takes this research as previous of study intended to continue the study of apologizing acts. The differences are in object and also this research of Dr. Mahmoud Ali Al-Sobh, PhD analyzed about the

strategy of apologizing acts that is used by Jordanian in Arab. Meanwhile, the object that is used by the researcher in this paper is in “Angry Bird” movie.



Dokumen ini adalah Arsip Mlik :

Perpustakaan Universitas Islam Riau

PRAGMATICS

CONTEXT

DEIXIS

REFERENCE

INFERENCE

ANAPHORA

PRESUPPOSITION

SPEECH ACTS

DIRECT AND
INDIRECT

POLITENESS
PRINCIPLE

NEGATIVE AND
POSITIVE FACE

UNDERSTANDING
CONCEPT

TYPES OF SPEECH
ACTS

AUSTIN
(1962)

SEARLE
(1976)

LOCUTIONARY
ACT

ILLOCUTIONARY
ACT

PERLOCUTIONARY
ACT

DECLARATIONS

*'I bet', 'I
declare', 'I
resign'.*

DIRECTIVES

*Commanding,
requisting,
suggesting.*

EXPRESSIVES

*Apologising,
thanking,
regretting.*

COMMISSIVES

*Promising,
offering, vowing.*

REPRESENTATIVES

*Describing, claiming,
predicting.*

1.Hurt

2. An excuse
politely

3.Unlucky

4. Polite

5.Sorry(intention
ally)

6. Ironie

7.Exaggeratedly
incredulous

NB:

: The subject of the research.