

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews some related literature including speech acts, apology strategies, and previous studies.

2.1 Speech Acts

Speech acts is an utterances that has performative function in languages and communication, according to Levinson (1983) speech acts is doing things by uttering something. People are using necessary words to perform communicative action in real world context. For example, when we say, "Could you please pass the phone to me?" we wish to achieve the goal of having the intended interlocutors help us to gain access to the phone. The principle of speech act theory is by saying something, we actually do something.

In a book entitled "How to Do Things with Words", Austin (1962) argues that utterances can perform three kinds of act. First, the locutionary act is the act of saying something or producing a series of sounds which mean something. Second, the illocutionary is a performance of an act in saying something as opposed to performance of an act such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, etc. The last is perlocutionary act that produces some effects upon thoughts, feeling, or actions of audiences. The core of speech act is the illocutionary acts.

2.2 Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary act is the action performed by the speaker in producing a given utterance. Yule (1996, p.48) claims that the illocutionary act is thus performed via the communicative force of an utterance which is also generally known as illocutionary force of the utterance. Basically, the illocutionary act indicates how the whole utterance is to be taken in the conversation.

It takes an effort to determine what kind of illocutionary act the speaker performs. To know his intention and to show how the proportion should be taken the speaker uses many indications, ranging from the most obvious ones, such as unambiguous performative verbs to the more opaque ones, among which mainly various paralinguistic features (stress, timbre and intonation) and word order should be mentioned. All these factors influence the meaning of the utterance are called Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices, or IFID (Yule, 1996).

It is necessary for the hearer to be acquainted with the context the speech act occurs to correctly decoding the illocutionary act. Mey (1993, p.139) stated that one should not believe speech act to be taking place, before one has considered, or possibly created, the appropriate context.

Furthermore, there is another important thing which should not be forgotten while encoding or decoding speech act, is that certain speech act can be culture-specific and that is why that can not be employed universally. Mey (1993) also shows this on French and American conventions. He uses a French sentence to demonstrate the cultural differences.

Mais vous ne comperenez pas! (literally, ‘But you don’t understand!’)

While a Frenchman considers this sentence fully acceptable, an American could be offended if addressed in similar way as he could take it as a taunt aimed at the level of his comprehension or intelligence (Mey, 1993, p.133).

The interpretation of speech acts differs throughout the cultures and the illocutionary act performed by the speaker can be easily misinterpreted by a member of different cultural background.

It should be clear by now that the issue of illocutionary acts is sometimes quite complicated because one and the same utterance can have more illocutionary forces (meanings) depending on the IFIDs, the context, the conventions and other factors. In the other hand, one illocutionary act can have more utterance acts or even locutionary acts.

There are hundreds or thousands of illocutionary acts and that is why, for better understanding and orientation, some linguists proposed their classification.

Austin divided illocutionary acts into five categories; verdictives, exercitives, commissives, expositives, and behabitives. Searle proposed five categories of illocutionary acts, such as declaratives, representatives, commissives, directives, and expressive.

2.2.1 Illocutionary Acts According to Austin

Austin (1962) proposed a taxonomy that contains five categories of illocutionary acts:

1. Verdictives. These consist in the delivering of a finding, official or unofficial, upon evidence or reasons as to value or fact so far as these is distinguishable.

The examples are: acquit, hold, calculate, describe, analyze, estimate, date, rank, assess, characterize, and describe.

2. **Exercitives.** One of these is the giving of a decision in favor of or against a

certain course of action or advocacy of it, a decision that something is to be so, as distinct from a judgment that it is so. The examples are order, command,

direct, plead, beg, recommend, entreat, advise, appoint, dismiss, nominate, veto, declare closed, declare open, announce, want, proclaim, and give.

3. **Commissives.** The whole point of a commissive, Austin tells us, "is to commit

the speaker to a certain course of action." The examples are: promise, vow, pledge, covenant, contract, guarantee, embrace, and swear.

4. **Expositives** are used in acts of exposition involving the expounding of views,

the conducting of arguments and the clarifying of usages and references. The examples are: affirm, deny, emphasize, illustrate, answer, report, accept, object

to, concede, describe, class, identity, and call.

5. **Behabitives.** This class includes the notion of reaction to other's people's

behavior and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone

else's past conduct or imminent conduct. The lists of examples are: apologize,

thank, deplore, commiserate, congratulate, felicitate, welcome, applaud,

criticize, bless, curse, toast, and drink, dare, defy, protest, and challenge.

2.2.2 Illocutionary Acts According to Searle

Searle (1975, pp.12-20) classifying illocutionary acts into five ways:

declaratives, representatives, commissives, directives, and expressive.

1. Declaratives are speech acts in which the world having immediate changes via the utterances. For example in act of declaring war, marrying, proclaiming, naming, and christening.
2. Representatives are speech acts in which the words state what the speaker's commitment to the truth of his/her utterance. For example act of agreeing, concluding, disagreeing, and asserting.
3. Commisives are speech acts in which the words indicating a speaker's commitment to future actions. For example act of threatening, promising, offering, warning, and reminding.
4. Directives are speech acts in which the words indicating a speaker's attempt to direct others to do something. For example act of requesting, commanding, asking, and ordering.
5. Expressive are speech acts in which the words expressing psychological states of a speaker. For example act of congratulating, apologizing, welcoming, and condoling.

2.3 The Act of Apologizing and Face Threatening Acts

An action or an utterance which has insulted other person, such as offending someone else, neglecting his or her duty, or causing trouble will cause misunderstanding and break relationship. Hence, Fahey (In Anam, 2010) stated that when someone recognizes his fault, he apologies to repair the relationship.

Apology makes us realize how important to maintain good relationship with other. In occasion, as human we do violation to other through our utterance unintentionally. Moore (2003) stated apology is often used in speech act to serve

different purposes ranging from maintaining polite rituals that could vary from one society to another, to the acknowledgement of serious offences. Moore (In Anam, 2010) also explained is spoken and written interactions and in effect of intercultural interactions it becomes relevant to determine what condition must be present for the adequate performance of an apology.

Supporting Moore's idea, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) also stated that an apology is a speech act that is used to restore relationships between a speaker (S) and a hearer (H) after S has offended H intentionally or unintentionally. The act of apologizing is called for when some behaviors violated social norms. When an action or utterance (or the lack of other one) has resulted in the fact that one or more persons perceives themselves as offended, the culpable person (s) needs to apologize. The act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to "set things right".

In addition with that, Holmes (In Riyani, 2010) defines apology as "speech act addressed to B's face needs and intended to remedy an offense for which A takes responsibility and thus to restore equilibrium between A and B (where A is the apologizer or who is responsible for the offense, and B is the person offended).

For certain people apology is difficult to do. They feel ashamed to do apology because 'loosing face' for doing apology according to Goffman (1967).

When it is done right, an apology can enhance both reputations and relationships.

However, when it is done wrong, an apology can compound the original mistake, sometimes can cause worse consequences.

In the position of seeking unconditional pardon, the speaker should know the main components of apology that proposed by Regher and Gutheil (2002, as cited in Riyani, 2010):

1. Acknowledgement of the offense or provision of a truthful account of the offense so that the victim's experience can be publicly verified.
2. A willingness to admit wrong doing or, in effect, issue a *mea culpa* (through my fault).
3. A willingness to state that the act will not be repeated.

Viewing from the perspective of politeness theory, the act of apologizing is included in an FTA (Face Threatening Act). FTA is the condition when people cannot fulfill the positive or negative face. It is according to Brown and Levinson (1987) which defines face threatening act is an act that inherently damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. At minimum, there must be at least one of the face threatening acts associated with an utterance. It is also possible to have multiple acts working within a single utterance.

Negative and Positive Face-Threatening Acts can cause damage to either the speaker or the hearer. Negative Face-Threatening Acts is the desire to be free from imposition. In the other hand, Positive Face-Threatening Acts is the desire to be well-thought, such as to be respected, to be considered as a friends, to be considered as beautiful/charming. When doing the act of apologizing, speaker is damaging his positive face by admitting that he regrets one of his previous acts.

2.4 Direct Speech Act

Grundy (2000, p.59) divided a sentence into three forms, namely declarative, imperative, and interrogative. Each of them has different function in communication. The function of declarative form is to asserting or making statement, the function of imperative form is to commanding or requesting, and the interrogative form is used for questioning. In the direct speech acts, Grundy (2000, p.59) defined that the direct speech acts has compatibility between the form and the function or they are match. Related to the direct speech act, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) proposed that IFIDs (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices) as a direct apology.

2.4.1 Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs)

Olshtain and Cohen (1983) stated IFIDs are formulaic, routinized expressions in which the speaker's apology is made explicit. The IFIDs fulfill the function of signaling regret; the speaker asks forgiveness for the violation that motivated the need to apologize, thereby serving to placate the hearer. There are language specific scales of conventionality which determine preferences for IFIDs realizations. The most common form in English is '(be) sorry'. Another examples are; 'excuse me', 'I apologize for..', 'forgive me', 'pardon me for..', 'I regret that..', and 'I'm afraid..'

2.5 Indirect Speech Act

Grundy (2000, p.59) stated that indirect speech acts are speech acts which the form and the function do not match but the message is still conveyed. The example below are taken from Grundy (2000):

- You'd better eat your dinner fast (declarative form functioning as an order)
- Have a good journey (imperative form functioning as an assertion)
- Who cares? (interrogative form functioning as an assertion)

People tend to use indirect speech acts mainly in connection with politeness (Leech, 1983) since they thus diminish the unpleasant message contained in requests and orders for instance.

There is a variety of reasons for the use of universal indirectness. Thomas (1995, p.143) introduces the main factors which influence the application of indirect speech acts in the discourse, she claims that the motivation for indirectness includes:

1. The desire to make one's language more/less interesting
2. To increase the force of one's message
3. Competing goals
4. Politeness

Another way in which one can perform an apology (with or without an IFID) is to use an utterance which contains reference to one or more elements from a closed set of specified propositions the semantic content of which relates directly to the apology preconditions. In addition, Faerch and Kasper (1984) argue

that an utterance which relates to: (a) the cause for the act that the speaker did or abstained from doing, (b) the speaker's responsibility for the act that was perceived as a breach of social norms, (c) the speaker's willingness to offer repair for the damage, and (d) a promise of forbearance on the speaker's part (that it will never happen again) can serve as an apology.

Comparing with indirect speech acts that proposed by Grundy, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) suggests indirect apology into four potential strategies. They are taking on responsibility, explanation or account, offer of repair, and promise of forbearance.

2.5.1 Taking on Responsibility

In an attempt to placate the hearer, the speaker chooses to express responsibility for the offence which created the need to apologize. The subcategories for this strategy may be placed on a continuum from strong self-humbling on the speaker's part to a complete and blunt denial of responsibility. The acceptance of responsibility would be viewed by the hearer as an apology, while denial of responsibility would testify to the speaker's rejection of the need to apologize (Blum-Kulka, 1987).

1. **Explicit self-blame.** The speaker explicitly acknowledges the fact that he or she has been at fault. The example is 'My mistake.'

2. **Lack of intent.** The speaker explicitly states that he or she had not intended to hurt the hearer through his or her offence. The example is 'I didn't mean to upset you.'

3. **Justify hearer.** The speaker communicates to his or her hearer that he or she fully understands the latter's reactions to the offence inflicted upon him or her. The example is 'You're right to be angry.'
4. **Expression of embarrassment.** The example is 'I feel awful about it.'
5. **Admission of facts but not responsibility.** The speaker does not deny his or her involvement in the offensive act but abstains from openly accepting responsibility. The example is 'I haven't read it, I missed the bus, I forgot about it, I haven't had time to mark it yet.'
6. **Refusal to acknowledge guilt.** The speaker completely rejects responsibility for the offence, in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Denial of responsibility. The example is 'It wasn't my fault.'
 - b. Blame the hearer. The example is 'It's your own fault.'
 - c. Pretend to be offended. The example is 'I'm the one to be offended!'

2.5.2 Explanation or Account

A common reaction to the need to apologize is a search for self-justification by explaining the source of the offence as caused by external factors over which the speaker has no control. Depending on the situation, such an explanation can act as an apology (Blum-Kulka, 1987). Explanations vary by specificity and relevance: being late can be explained by reference to the specific event that caused it ('The bus was late') or by a general statement which is implicitly brought forth as relevant to the situation ('Traffic is always so heavy in the morning').

2.5.3 Offer of Repair

If the damage or inconvenience which affected the hearer can be compensated for, the speaker may choose to offer repair; this offer must be directly related to the offence perpetrated: in other words, you can only repair a reparable (Blum-Kulka, 1987). For example, 'I'll pay for the damage' or 'I'll go and enquire in the kitchen.'

2.5.4 Promise of Forbearance

In some situations the feeling of responsibility is so strong that the speaker feels the need to promise forbearance. Promise of forbearance is usually expressed by a promise that the damage will never happened again (Blum-Kulka, 1987). For example, 'This won't happen again.'

Furthermore, the illocutionary force of the apology can be intensified or downgraded.

2.6 Intensification and Downgrading

Blum-Kulka (1987) stated intensification usually takes one or more of the following; an intensifying expression within the IFID, expressing explicit concern for the hearer-external to the IFID or the other strategies used, and the use of multiple strategies.

Intensifier of the apology are:

a. IFID internal:

1. **Intensifying adverbials.** The example is 'I'm very/terribly/so/really/awfully sorry.'

2. **Emotional expressions/exclamations.** The example is 'Oh/Oh no/Oh Lord/God.'

3. **Expressions marked for register.** The example is 'I do apologize..'

4. **Double intensifier or repetition of intensifying adverbial.** The example is 'I'm really dreadfully sorry/ I'm very, very sorry.'

5. **Please.** The example is 'Please forgive me'.

b. Other:

1. **Concern for the hearer,** in which the speaker takes explicit cognizance of the hearer's feelings, which he or she may have offended. The example is 'I hope I didn't upset you'.

2. **Combinations of the above** may occur.

According to Blum-Kulka (1987) downgrading of an apology is the results from the speaker adding to the strategy which he or she uses. Tactical moves by which the speaker tries to divert the hearer's attention from his or her own responsibility for the offence include the following:

a. **Query precondition.** The speaker attempts to throw doubt on the modalities of a previous arrangement which he or she broke. For example, 'Are you sure we were supposed to meet at 10?'

b. **Act innocently/pretend not to notice the offence.** For example, 'Am I late?'

c. **Future/task-oriented remark.** The speaker tries to make light of his or her offence by diverting the hearer's attention from the past (his or

her offence) to the future (what needs to be done now). For example,

‘Let’s get to work, then!’

- d. **Humor.** Used as a strategy to pacify the hearer. For example, ‘If you think that’s a mistake, you ought to see our fried chicken!’ (spoken by a waiter who brought the wrong dish).

- e. **Appeaser.** As opposed to the “Offer of Repair”, compensatory offers which form the content of “Appeaser” are not directly connected with the speaker’s offence. For example, ‘I’ll buy you a cup of coffee’ (spoken after speaker had kept hearer waiting for him).

Lexical and phrasal downgraders listed above are used to modify an apology. The decision to perform the act of apologizing and then the decision to choose one or more strategies is affected by a number of different factors. Some of these are socio-cultural and relate to the performance of speech acts in general, such as social distance, social power, and age. Other factors are closely connected to the situational context bringing about the need to apologize.

2.7 Previous Studies

The aim of this research is to describe and to identify apology strategies used in Barack Obama’s speech at Strasbourg Town Hall. The researcher uses three other studies to get the other perspective about apology strategies and to help the researcher doing his investigation.

The first study is done by Anam (2010) entitled “Apology used in *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* movie.” The aim of his study is answering the problem of what and how apologies are used in *Bridget Jones: The Edge of*

Reason movie.” After analyzing the data using Daniela Kramer-Moore and Michael Moore’s theory of apology strategies, he found that the characters of *Bridget Jones: The Edge of Reason* movie used 5 types of apology: (1) Type 1 explains to express of repentance and we can find the element of regret and promise not to repeat the offense, (2) Type 2 explains contain a bit of regret and certainly lacks a promise not to repeat the offense, (3) Type 4 explains that the speaker wants the listener repeat again about something or other, this utterance not for regret, (4) Type 6 explains that the speaker make the listener feels sorry (Ironic, with two exaggerated stresses) and (5) Type 7 explains an ambiguity of the utterance that puts the listener at a disadvantage (Exaggerated incredulous).

The mostly used types of apology in this movie are Type 1 and 2.

The second study is composed by Riyani (2010) entitled “Apology Strategies used by The Characters of Joe Wright’s *Pride and Prejudice* movie.”

She conducted her research to answer the question, “How are apology strategies used by upper class and middle class characters of Joe Wright’s *Pride and Prejudice* movie?”. From the analysis, she found that apology is mostly used to request for forgiveness, showing that one feels guilty because they have offended other people. She also found the strategy of acknowledgement of responsibility and expressing lack of intent used by the character to give explanation that he did not have any intention to cause the problem. There are some types of politeness strategy used by both upper and middle class: exaggerate, be voluble (speak a lot), minimize threat, apologize, use family names and titles, be taciturn (speak little),

and use own language or dialect. The most strategy used by them is speak a lot (be voluble).

The third study is conducted by Ristinawati (2009) entitled “Sociopragmatics Analysis on Apology Strategies Used by Kevin Rudd in Political Apology.” She is interested in figuring out the apology strategies which were used in Kevin Rudd’s political speech. Through her research, she found that there are five types of apology strategies which are used by Kevin Rudd in political apology, namely acknowledgement of responsibility, expression of apology, explanation or account, promise of forbearance, and offer of repair. Furthermore, she also found five social functions of apology. They are admitting responsibility for a state which affected someone in an adverse way, asking to be forgiven, showing good manners, assuaging the addressee’s wrath, and getting off the hook.

Those are three previous studies that may have relevant theory with the present research. The present research discusses apologizing strategies used in Barack Obama’s Speech at Strasbourg Town Hall. The difference between this research and the research proposed by Anam is the apologizing taxonomy that is used. He used Daniela Kramer-Moore and Michael Moore’s theory of apology, this present research used Cohen and Olshtain’s Apology Strategies to identify act of apologizing (direct and indirect). The writer chooses this classification because it is considered describing even clearer than others. The other two previous studies composed by Riyani and Ristinawati. Those two previous studies used theory of apology strategies which is proposed by Trosborg, meanwhile this present

research used Cohen and Olshtain's apology strategies. In Riyani's study is described and identified apology strategies used by upper class and middle class character. In Ristinawati's study, she analyzed Kevin Rudd's apology strategies in his political speech. In this research, the researcher tries to identify different subject which is Barack Obama's apology strategies.

