Apology : Its Nature and Patterns

Rio Rini Diah Moehkardi

1. Introduction

This paper is an outline of what apology is. Examples from English and Bahasa Indonesia --mostly taken from a study carried out among Australian and Indonesian undergraduate students in Canberra University (Moehkardi, 1993)– are given in order to have a clearer picture of the realization of apologizing. It will focus on the discourse situations which usually calls for apology of which realization does not only deal with utterances but also with the notion of face. It is also necessary to bear in mind the need of understanding the semantic formulas – "word, phrase or sentence which meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy, and any one or more of these can be used to perform the act in question" (Fraser, 1980 in Wolfson and Judd, 1983:20)– that would be appropriate in performing apology, especially in the setting of the two languages mentioned above.

2. The Nature of Apology

2.1. Speech acts

Austin (1962:6) has observed that utterance of some sentences can be treated as the performance of an act or even, several simultaneous acts, and thus, they are considered as having illocutionary force (Austin, 1962:98). Some verbs, referred to as performative verbs or the performatives, name the act which is being performed, but as Searle (1979) points out the same speech act may be brought about indirectly by semantically different verbs, such as, instead of saying *I hereby request you to open the door* one can say *Please, open the door.* Similarly, an utterance can express more than one illocutionary force, such as *Would you sit down* could be either a request or an offer.

Apologize in I *apologize* according to Austin is the explicit performative, precisely a behabitive performative in which the verb performs the act of apologizing which can also actually be achieved by the utterance of *I am sorry* and other verbs expressing regret. On the other hand, *I am sorry* is not an explicit performative but it is rather a primary performative in which it can in some way be used to perform the speech act of apologizing, but in some other way its use is only a report, for example in *I am sorry to have to say that today is Monday* (Austin, 1962: 66). However, by recent researchers, such as Olshtain, Blum-Kulka and others, such utterances are considered as the explicit or direct apology.

Furthermore, Searle argued that the verb apologize does not always carry the illocutionary force. It is restricted to certain conditions in order to perform apologizing act, that it is "present indicative active, with a first person subject" (in Owen, 1983:116). So *I apologized or He apologizes* are beyond the speech act of apologizing, they are merely a report of apologizing act. Besides, this performative must have the following propositional contents (Searle in Owen, 1983:116-7)

a. it must concern an act, rather than a state of affairs;

b. the act described in the propositional content must be an act of the speaker;

c. the act of the speaker must be a past act

For items b Owen adds that the speaker may apologize for an act done by other people s/he is in charge of or responsible for. In item c she adds that apology may be realized in the course of a potential violation.

Whereas performatives apologize and be sorry are speaker-oriented in which the verbs show that the speakers regret the offence they have committed, forgive is hearer-oriented and it is a response to apology. Thus the function of forgiving is to show that an apology has been accepted and ended the offence. Forgive in *Please forgive me* , and its variants, is in some way a request in which the speaker asks the hearer to do something for the speaker.Therefore, this verb is often labelled in the study of apology as request for forgiveness.This is another example of how one speech act functions as other speech acts.

Speech act of apologizing is among the common routine formulae in most languages, including English and Bahasa Indonesia. As verbal interaction it often calls for polite realization. The use of politeness in an interaction is intended to ensure that:an individual satisfies the face wants of the other, while at the same time making sure that this satisfaction does not in any way clash with his own interests" (Bayraktaroglu, 1991:9).

2.2.Face, Politeness and Apologies

According to Goffman (1971 in Bayraktaroglu,1991:6) "social order is maintained if each individual is respectful to others' rights as much as he is to his own rights." In other words, a successful member of a society is someone who is sensitive to his own and others' needs to preserve their faces. Brown and Levinson (1978:66) define the term 'face' as 'the public self-image that every member

wants to claim for himself.' Face is thus something that can be lost, damaged, maintained, or enhanced and must be attended to constantly in an interaction. Therefore people tend to conduct themselves in an interaction so as to maintain both his own face and the face of the other participants. This results in face preserving behaviour which has a positive 'approach' aspect and a negative 'avoidance' aspect, known as 'politeness' (Owen, 1983:15). Although the degree of politeness in linguistic realization are culturally relative, the notion of politeness seems to be universal to all language pragmatics. The idea of politeness is related to face, because politeness can function as face saving before and after a damage to face occurs. It can prevent the damage—as in introducing a request—as well as wipe the effects of it (Goffman, 1972 as quoted by Bayraktaroglu, 1991:8).

Brown and Levinson (1978:73-5) list five categories of politeness strategies in relation to face threatening acts (FTA): a) *bald-on-record* is a strategy in which the speaker wants to do the FTA with maximum efficiency using the least complicated, direct, unambigous realization of the communication act; b) *positive politeness* is hearer's positive-face oriented and conveys the speaker's desire to strengthen solidarity; c) *negative politeness* is oriented toward the hearer's negative face; d) off-record depends on the addressee's power to infer the speaker's utterance expressed to avoid coerciveness toward the hearer; e) not doing the FTA (silence).

When the hearer's negative face is damaged, a speaker would be considered polite if s/he redresses the damage directly. By saying *I apologize* the speaker unambigously expresses the FTA of apologizing. Thus, apology tends to be direct (Holmes, 1990: 160) or hearer supportive (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989:12). Other apology strategies may strengthen or weaken the

politeness and thus the sincerity of the apology. For example, expression of responsibility is more face saving for hearer but minimization is face saving for speaker, and thus weakens the apology realized.

Goffman's notion of face covers the participants' efforts not only in preserving face in which the participants prevent a damage to face from occuring, but also in saving face after a damage occurs. Brown and Levinson's (1978) idea of politeness strategies do not only preserve face but also maintain face while a damage is occuring by reducing the impact of the offence being committed. As an individual and at the same time social being, people want to keep their privacy and freedom of movement and speech unimpeded by others and at the same time they want to contribute to the social world surrounds them, and hoping their contributions are desireable to others. And this gives each individual a *double face* (Brown and Levinson, 1987:61):

Negative face: the basic claims to territories, personal preserves, rights to nondistraction,i.e. freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

Positive face: the positive consistent self-image or personality claimed by participants

In other words, when someone offends someone else whether the offended realizes it or not, it is considered polite if the offender initiates remedial work to set things right again. However, this remedial activity risks not only the offender's face due to his/her pointing out the offence and the risk should the remedy fail, but also the offended's face because s/he has to preserve the face of the apologizer unless s/he is considered unsympathetic for being unable to accept the apology. Therefore both "the offender and the offended simultaneously attempt to initiate an apology" (Goffman in Owen 1983:15).

In the case of apologizing, it damages the apologizer's positive face for admitting the cause of regret imposed on the apologizee, at the same time the cause of regret has damaged the apologizee's negative face. Apologizing is regarded as negative politeness strategies because it is "oriented mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) hearer's negative face" (Brown and Levinson, 1979:75) and thus also help saving the apologizer's positive face.

In relation to preserving the positive face in this remedial interchange, the apologizer tends to embed his/her explicit apology with other elements of apology to make his/her apology sincere and thus satisfy the other party's positive face. At the same time the apologizer must save their own face by putting the blame on something or somebody else so as to reduce the seriousness of the offence they have committed. This kind of interaction is what Goffman (in Owen 1983) calls *remedial interchange* in which activity the apologizer and the apologizee simultaneously redress their positive face needs.

Remedial interchange includes apology and request. Whereas apologizing usually occurs after an offence has been committed and mostly burden the apologizer, remedial work in request burden both parties: the speaker who imposes on the hearer to do him/her the favor; and the hearer who may feel imposed on to do something s/he does not want to do. Thus in request, offence potentially occurs before the request for the speaker and after the request should the hearer does not comply to the request.

Goffman (1967 in Owen, 1983:17) refers to apology as an act of remedy in an interchange which comprises "the offence, the offender, and the victim." Further he observes that the interchange "provides a remedy for an offence and restores social equilibrium or harmony" (in Holmes, 1990:159). Similarly, Holmes defines apology as " a speech act addressed to B's face needs and intended to remedy an offence 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 offence, and B is the person offended" (1990:159).

The act of apologizing is needed when there is some behaviour which has violated social norms (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983:20) or is intended to give support for a hearer who has actually or potentially been affected by a 'face threatening act' (FTA) (Olshtain, 1989:156.) By apologizing the speaker acknowledges the offence and admits to the fact that s/he is "at least partially involved in its cause" (Blum-Kulka, House, Kasper, 1989:12)

Initially the need to apologize depends on how the offender perceives the FTA. A sensitive one would directly apologize when s/he, for example, accidentally stepped on someone feet in a crowded bus, whereas the lesser one would prefer silence. The apology would lose its strength of felicitousness if the course of apologizing is reversed. It happens if the supposed offender does not apologize because s/he is ignorant of the FTA or because they opt for silence so as to avoid the risk of losing face. The offended who recognizes the FTA demands apology. In this situation the apology realized by the speaker does not actually satisfy both parties. The speaker suffers from the humiliation for being demanded to recognize and admit the FTA and the offended realizes that the apology is half-hearted. In short, this kind of remedial exchange is lack of sincerity and the harmony is thus half-heartedly restored or not at all. Even sometimes the offender denies the need to apology and to be responsible for the effect of an offence, and s/he would rather blame the other participant , for example by saying,: It's your fault

The degree of FTA determines the realization of apology. The more serious the violation, the more apologetical gestures may be employed by the apologizer in order to make his/her apology felicitious. Olshtain and Cohen found that the politeness and the sincerity of the apology also depend on the tone of delivery and the word choice (1983:29). They also agreed that the social status of the participants also determine the remedial exchanges of apology (1983:21)

In a spoken setting, a remedial exchange that follows an apology may restore simultaneously the positive face needs of both speaker and hearer (Holmes, 1990:162). However, in the written setting, where the remedial exchange is delayed, the writer who apologizes will provide elements accompanying his/her apologies to soften his/her own offence and at the same time to redress the damage to the victim's positive face (Olhstain, 1989:167)

In its wider range, however, the functions of some semantic formulas of apology may extend to the border of expressing sympathy (as in *I'm sorry* in offering condolence or other inconvenience caused by nature or institutions, and request (as in *Pardon me* or *Excuse me*). In the former case the apologizer is not necessarily the one who breaks the equilibrium, s/he may apologize for the offence or inconvenience done by something or someone s/he is in charge of, for example, inconvenience caused by animal or children, or s/he is represented of, for example, a subordinate who gives a letter of dimissal from the board of directors to his employee. In the latter one, the apologizer automatically expects the apologizee to do something in his/her favor, for example, in expressing *Excuse me* or *Pardon* me the speaker expects the hearer to repeat what s/he has said. Apologies are also produced before an offence occurs but in this case the speaker is sure that his/her action is going to offend the hearer, like in request. Apologies are also used when someone asks for permission or consent or simply to show someone's intention to his/her hearer.

3. The Patterns of Apology

Based on the work of Olshtain and Cohen (1983:22-3) apology can be realized using explicit or direct routinized formulae, the *IFID* (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device)—a term formulated by Searle (1969:64) and indirect apology strategies of which are realized by reference to set of specific proposition, consisting of : expression of responsibility, explanation or account of the situation, offer of repair, a promise of forbearance. However, in verbal realization these direct and indirect strategies are not separately independent. They are sometimes uttered in the same sentence. For example: *I am sorry that I haven't been able to repay any of the money that you loaned me.* In this sentence there are two strategies of apology. The *I'm sorry that* can be classified as the direct or explicit apology which is followed by another strategy, i.e. the explanation *I haven't been able to repay any of the money that you loaned.*

3.1. Direct apology

As the term implies, the strategies included in this category use the performative verbs, they are: a. an offer of apology; b. request for forgiveness; c. an expression of regret. From earlier studies on apologies (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983), it seems that there are "language specific scales of conventionality which determine preferences for IFID realization" in every language community. In English, for example, the most common expression is **be sorry**, in Hebrew is **slixa** which means literally **forgiveness** and in Bahasa Indonesia is maaf equal to **be sorry** or **minta maaf** equal to **apologize** or **ask for forgiveness**.

Most of the examples cited in this paper are taken from the writer's previous research on similar subject. In this study the respondents (age 15-25) responded to a given situation which had different degrees of offensiveness. A written setting was chosen in order to give the respondents freedom to express as many elements that follow apology. Other examples are found from other sources.

In *offer of apology* the English performative verb *apologize* represents this strategy, for example: *I apologize for being late.* The phrasal verb *apologize for* is subject to a gerundive nominalization and according to Searle it does not take That- clause (quoted in Owen, 1983:129). Another variation derived from similar verb, like *Please accept my apology* or *Would/will you accept my apology* are also included in this strategy. However, according to Barret (in Owen, 1983:138) *I offer you my apology(ies)* and/or *I offer to apologize* cannot be considered as apology. The verb *offer* introducing the apology is a "type of promise, committing the speaker to some future action, and apology does not do this". These expressions are considered as committing the speaker to apologize not as apology itself.

The realization of expression *I apologize* is not frequently used in spoken interaction, it is usually used in formal written communication, like in announcement.In a research investigating the use of this apology in written interaction, the occurrence of this strategy was very low (Moehkardi, 1993). The seriousness of offence and the distant relationship of the participants seemed to determine the choice of this strategy. From the same study there was a case of an independent Australian student who was unable to return the money he borrowed from his parents and he saw this as embarrassing and offensive. In his letter to his parents he chose *I apologize* rather than the more common expression *I'm sorry*.

Whereas English separates lexical meanings of *apologize* and *request for forgiveness*, Bahasa Indonesia includes the meaning into the lexical phrase *minta maaf*-preceeded by first personal subject— which is included into the *request for forgiveness* in this apology frame-

work. This phrase and its variants seems to be the most common explicit sub-strategy used in Bahasa Indonesia. This assumption was justified in a research carried out in a circle of Indonesian students (aged 18-25 year old) in Canberra by Moehkardi (1993:) in which the Indonesian respondents preferred using this substrategy. As the term says, the English verbs that equal to this substrategy are *forgive, excuse,* and *pardon* (Norrick in Owen, 1983: 138) and all of these verbs are followed by first personal object.

Although they belong to the same framework, Indonesian *maaf* or *Saya minta maaf,* and English *Excuse me, Forgive me,* and *Pardon me* have different features. Indonesian *maaf* and its variants are speaker oriented indicating offence which has been committed, *forgive, excuse* and *pardon* are hearer oriented, as in *Would you forgive me,* intended to end the impact of an offence.

Unlike *minta maaf* which can cover all the functions of *excuse me, forgive me* and *pardon me* before or after the offence, these English verbs are slightly different from each other, although in some cases they are sometimes interchangeable. *Forgive me* is commonly called for after a violation and aimed at reducing the impact of it. Apologetic expressions *Excuse me, Pardon me* or *I beg your pardon* are to redress the offence the speaker is surely going to make soon. In other words these expressions are usually produced before the occurrence of potential offence. Furthermore, with *excuse me* the speaker can also announce the inconvenience s/he is going to make and expects the hearer to do him/her a favor. For example when the speaker wants the hearer to repeat what s/he has said, s/he could introduce her/his request with either *excuse me* or *pardon me.* In the study of request these sub-strategies of apology are considered *alerters* (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989:17). In formal setting, *excuse me*

may also be used to introduce asking for permission or consent, for example: *Excuse me, may I leave the room?.* In other cases it is simply a polite way to inform the hearer of the speaker's intention, for example, passing in front of someone in a theatre. In this case *excuse me* is possibly Javanese *nuwun sewu* and not *nyuwun pangapunten* which is closely to sorry. Expressions of *Pardon me* or *I beg your pardon* are usually limited in its usage as a request for the hearer to repeat his/her talk of which case expression *excuse me* is also possible.

The semantic formulas of English *Request-for-Forgiveness* strategy is as various as its Indonesian counterpart. There are structural variations with *forgive me* for example a more polite way *Would you forgive me,* or *Excuse me* or *Would you excuse me* or *Pardon me* or *I beg your pardon.* Because *excuse me* may introduce the speaker's intention of asking the hearer to do something, the speaker must add his excuse with the request. Similarly, Indonesian *minta maaf* has many variations of which each may determine the degree of politeness of the expression. From the exclamation Maafkan or *Maafkan saya* to the complete lexical phrase; *Saya minta maaf* there are variants of subject *saya,* of the verbal predicate of *minta* which has also an internal variant by adding a prefix "me-" and an external one which is the synonym *mohon* and /or by adding "me-" to it which intensifies the degrees of formality. So, *Saya mohon/memohon maaf* was considered more polite and formal than *Saya minta/meminta maaf.* Using mohon/memohon also makes the apology sound intense and serious, and thus is more face threatening to the speaker. However, intonation plays an important role as well in determining the seriousness of using these verbs. Moreover, maaf and/or its variation can be followed by *kepada* (to) and followed by a noun or noun phrase as an object; *atas* or *untuk* (for) followed by a noun or a noun

phrase; *karena* (because) followed by a clause; and *sehubungan dengan* (in relation to) followed by a noun or a noun phrase (as found in Moehkardi, 1993). The following is examples:

(1) Saya meminta maaf kepada Ba-pak dan Ibu ...

(2) Mohon maaf atas kelalaian saya un-tuk menenmui Anda kemarin sore ...

(3) Maafkan saya untuk waktu mbak yang sudah tersia-siakan karena kealpaan saya

(4) Ananda mohon maaf karena sam-pai saat ini Ananda belum bisa me-nepati janji ...

(5) Saya meminta maaf sehubungan dengan keterlambatan saya dalam mengembalikan uang ...

As also found in the same study, most occurences of these Request for Forgive-ness are usually followed by mentioning the offence the speakers have committed or events causing the offence.

The most common *Expression of Re-gret* in English is *sorry* --now it is also a common Indonesian apology, but to many Indonesians using sorry sounds very colloquial and therefore this expres-sion is mostly common among young people-- or *be sorry* and in Bahasa Indo-nesia is the exclamation *maaf*. Other verbs that belong to this category are *regret* in English and *menyesal* in Bahasa Indonesia. Both of them are not as fre-quently used as *sorry* to express apology. It seems that by saying *Sorry* or *I'm sorry* the speaker admits that s/he has commit-ted an offence and therefore tries to amend it in order to avoid further offence of being ignorant and/or to prevent pun-ishment, whereas by saying *menyesal* or *regret* the speaker simply recognizes his/her offence to others.

English *sorry* also has many variants. It can occur with just exclamation *Sorry* or with added address term, such as *sir, mate, maam* or with an Intensifier, such as *again* or *once again*. The lexical

phrase of *I am sorry* is somewhat fixed with an intensifier inserted before *sorry* such as *very, really, terribly* or *so* but there was some variability in the words following the phrase, such as *that* fol-lowed by a clause; *about* followed by a noun or noun phrase; and *to have to* followed by an infinitive (Moehkardi, 1993). For example:

(6) Sorry again that I missed our ap pointment

(7) I'm sorry about this

(8) I'm sorry to have to tell you though, that ...

Syntactic patterns of explicit apology

English	Bahasa Indonesia
Expression of regret Sorry	Request for forgiveness Maaf
I'm sorry that	Maafkan saya
I'm sorry about	Saya minta/mohon maaf kepada
I'm sorry to have to	Saya minta/mohon maaf atas/untuk
I'm afraid	Saya minta/mohon maaf karena
I regret	Saya minta/mohon maaf sehubungan dengan
Request for forgi-veness	Expression of regret
Forgive me	.. dengan menyesal saya
Excuse me	...Maaf
Pardon me	Sorry
I beg your pardon	Sayang/sayang sekali saya
	Saya khawatir
Offer of apology I apologize for ... Please accept my apology	

Intensification in apology strategy could be divided into two types: internal and external. The internal intensification usually goes with the direct apology, and could be divided into two subclassifica-tions: Intensifier (for example, in English language: *so, very,* etc. and in Bahasa Indonesia: *yang sebesar- besarnya; sekali, benar-benar,* etc.) and Multiple

Apology by repeating the apology and usually by adding again or once again The BI Multiple Apology usually takes the form of *sebelumnya* or *sebelum dan sesudahnya* or *sekali lagi* indicating that the apologizer simultaneously acknowledges directly or indirectly that the offence has occured. The external intensification is also called "concern for the hearer"and is considered as an indirect apology strategy.

In addition to Olshtain's and Cohen's framework, Owen (1983:88) includes the phrase *I am afraid* but this phrase is only considered apology in certain situation, for example, in this utterance: *I'm afraid I can't offer you drink*, but not in *this I'm afraid he's going to fall*. It is similar to BI expression *sayang/sayang sekali* and also *khawatir* , which is also situation specific, like in *Sayang sekali saya tidak bisa datang ke pestamu* but not in *Saya sayang sekali padamu* and *Saya khawatir pelayanan ini tidak memuaskan Anda* is apologetic but not this *Saya khawatir dengan keselamatannya. I'm afraid* and *sayang* function as informing hearer that offence has occured without speaker explicitly expressing responsibility .

3.2. Non Explicit Apologies

Unlike direct apology which is readily interpreted, the non explicit strategies are usually more difficult to interpret because *explanation, offer of repair, promise of forbearance* are very situationally specific and will semantically reflect the content of the situation. Expression of responsibility, although it is a non-explicit strategy, relates to speakers's explicit willingness to admit fault (Olshtain, 1989: 157). In addition to the above mentioned non explicit strategies, Olshtain (1989:158) adds ways in which the addressor could intensify or minimize the apology. Intensifying the apology is when the addressor gives more support to the addressee (Concern for the Hearer) and thus, humiliates him/herself more; and/or the addressor intensifies or repeats

his/her apology. Minimizing it is when the speaker downgrades the offence or the harm.

Expression of responsibility often contains formulaic phrases of which are variations of the expression *"It's my fault"* and yet could be expressed regardless of the situation. This strategy is in a continuum of the speaker accepting the blame by strong humbling at one end, and on the other end of the continuum the speaker may reject responsibility that would be presented by denial of fault. There are four types of Expression of responsibility : (a) accepting the blame, (b) expressing self-deficiency, (c) recognizing the other person as deserving apology, and (d) expressing lack of intent. The first sub-strategy, accepting the blame, is a direct acknowledgement of responsibility and the rest are indirect substrategies The following are respectively some examples:

(9) I know I've inconvenienced you ....
Saya sadar saya melakukan kesalahan .....

(10) I haven't got the money to pay you ..
Saya memang belum punya uang ...

(11) You're right Anda benar

(12) I accidentally spilt something on it, ...
Saya tidak sengaja...

Thus, in expressing responsibility the addressors do not only admit the blame, they also risk greater loss of face of explicitly taking the responsibility for the offence. Therefore in a research carried out by Olshtain (1989:168-9) she found that this strategy was closely related to the special function the apologizer fulfills with respect to the violation. So it was rarely used by respondents with socially lower status occupations, such as waiter and driver. Using this expression the addressor does not only admit his/her fault but also grant responsibility which might cost them not only their face but possibly

their job. So it is understood if they use other strategy following the direct one in order to intensify their apology. For example , a waiter who spilt the soup over the guest's lap used an IFID and support it with offer of repair rather than using expression of responsibility: *Oh Maaf, Pak. Akan segera saya ambilkan kain kering dan sup baru.* Whereas to a manager coming late to a meeting or a professor unfinishing correting the student's paper, expression of responsibility do not harm them their jobs.

Explanation or account is a common reaction to the need to apologize by explaining the source of the offence as caused by external factors over which the speaker does not have control and it almost always immediately follows direct apology. In some cases explanation can act as an apology by referring to either the specific event that causes the offence, for example in the case of being late: *I had a flat tyre* or by a general statement which is implicitly brought forth as relevant to the situation: *The traffic is congested* (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989:21).

Although expression of responsibility and account are likely to occur similarly frequently, their lexical patterns of realization are different. Account or explanation is usually a loose expression in which content reflects the situation (Olshtain, 1989:187). Here is an example following a direct apology when the speaker admitted that he broke his arrangement to meet his friend: *I wanted so much to go with you, but something really important came up, I couldn't avoid it , you know;* there is unlikely co-occurence of similar syntactic nor semantic pattern in the same or other situations.

Olstain and Cohen (1983:23) expect that *Offer of repair* is highly predictable in a situation where "physical injury or other damage has resulted". In other words, if the speaker thinks that the offence or inconvenience can be compensated for, s/he can choose to offer repair. Thus this

strategy is immediate promise to repair the damage or to compensate the inconvenience. This expectation was justified in the earlier study (Moehkardi, 1993) of which most of the Australian and Indonesian respondents chose this strategy in a situation where they spoiled the leather jacket they had borrowed: *I'll get you another jacket as soon as I get the one that suits you* or even an invitation to dinner. Nevertheless offer of repair can also be vague and distant promises, as also found in the study: *...hopefully oneday I'll be in a position to spoil you guys like you spoil me* to a parent whom the respondent had apologized for being unable to repay the money she had borrowed and , despite this, had requested more.

Whereas Offer of Repair is an implicit promise of which the hearer must be able to deduce the utterance as so, *Promise of Forbearance* explicitly uses the performative "I promise" and thus, it is more face threatening to the speakers. It seems that the former strategy, offer of repair, is preferable to the adult apologizer because by expressing offer of repair s/he shows their intention of not being ignorant of the inconvenience they have caused. With the latter strategy, the speaker seems to avoid the consequence or punishment of the inconvenience they have made. Therefore in earlier studies, this strategy was adopted by children or teenager (Mutkal et al, 1985 in Olshtain, 1989:162 and Moehkardi, 1993).This strategy resembles explicit apologies and acknowledgement of responsibility in that it is likely to be lexically fixed. It is usually expressed by a promise that x will never happen again.

Using *Concern for the Hearer* the speaker or apologizer intensifies the illocutionary force of her/his apology. This can be done within the IFID or direct apology using intensification such as very, so, etc. and /or using multiple strategies, such as *again*. Besides, concern for the hearer can be expressed explicitly

outside the direct strategy. Its realization depends on the situation where the offence occurs . For example: *I hope you didn't wait for too long* was expressed when the speaker came late to an appointment or *Kamu tidak marah bukan ?* (Moehkardi, 1993). In other words, by using this strategy the apologizer gives more support to the apologizee, usually by claiming the inconvenience or the problem the apologizer has caused.

Unlike concern for the hearer which satisfies hearer's face wants, *Minimization* intends to downgrade the offence (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989:21). The apologizer can either minimize the offence, for example, when arriving late, saying: Sorry, *but we never start on time anyhow,* or downgrade or soften the effect of the offence: Sorry, *but you shouldn't get so upset.* Included in this strategy is also the apologizer's request of the apologizee's understanding for what have happened, for example: I hope you understand my situation indicating that the offence has happened beyond the speakers's control.Whereas concern for the hearer strengthens the apology, minimization may make the apology sound insincere.

The realization of apology does not necessarily contain all these indirect strategies, nor the use of the IFID. The use of either IFID with one or more indirect strategies, or nonIFID with one or more indirect strategies may create higher intensity of apology. However the decision to choose the strategies is determined very much by a number of different factors. Besides situational context, i.e. the seriousness of the offence and the speakers's perception to apologize, social distance, social power, and age, determine the choice of apologizing strategies made by the speaker. Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989:21) add that socio-cultural factors also decide the types of strategy commonly used in a particular culture..

In contrast to choosing one or more of these strategies, the speaker may deny the need to apologize: *There is no need for you to get insulted* or deny the responsibility, such as It was your fault. (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983:23) In this case the speaker thinks the FTA is so unbearable that s/he puts the blame on the hearer. In the same case the speaker may prefer silence pretending the violence did not occur or silence yet her/his bodily movement indicates that s/he regrets the violence.

4. Summary

The act apologizing is called for when there is some behavior which has violated social norms. And thus in apologizing there are elements of the violence, the offender-- who causes and takes the responsibility for the violence, or does not cause the violence but takes the responsibility-- and the offended. Apologizing needs an action or utterance to restore the harmony broken by the violence between the parties.

There is a set of semantic formulas in apologizing which can be expressed directly--using the performatives, including the semi- performatives such as *sorry and excuse* or indirectly using utterances which are mostly situation-specific. The decision to elicit some elements of apology put the speaker's positive face at risk. S/he loses face for already admitting the violence, a greater loss when s/he recognizes the responsibility for the offence, and even greater damage to face should her/his attempt to apologize fail. Therefore in an understanding social interaction where a remedial work occurs, the hearer should cooperate in restoring the imbalance.

Whereas the common apology substrategy in English is *sorry,* in Bahasa Indonesia is *maaf* which can cover the whole range of the English IFID. There are some other expressions of regret in Bahasa Indonesia, though. Moreover,

conventionally, maaf is much more flexible in most discourse situations where apology is called for than its English counterparts. Even *sorry* in some situations is not as appropriate as *maaf* in the same situation. *Maaf* also has internal politeness elements, i.e. the verbs and their variants accompanying the sub-strategy which does not exist in English performatives of apology.

Bibliography

Austin, J.L. 1976. *How to do Things with Words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayraktaroglou, A. 1991. "Politeness and inter-actional imbalance," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.* 92:5-34.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1989. "Playing it safe: the role of conventionality in indirectness," in S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (eds) 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies.* Volume XXXI in the Series Advances in Discourse Processes edited by R.O. Freedle, New Jersey: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., J. House, and G. Kasper. 1989. "*Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: an introductory overview,*" in S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper (eds).

Blum-Kulka, S. and E. Olshtain. 1984. "Requests and apologies: a cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns," *Applied Linguistics* 5(3): 196-213.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson. 1978. "Universal of language usage: politeness phenomena" in E. Goody (ed) *Questions and Politeness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. (ed) 1981. *Conversational Routines Exploration in Standardized Communication Situation and Prepatterned Speech.* The Hague: Mouton.

Coulmas, F. 1981. "*Poison to your soul: thanks and apologies contrastively viewed,*" in F. Coulmas (ed.)

Edmonson, W.J. 1981. "*On saying you're sorry,*" in F. Coulmas (ed.)

Fraser, B. 1981. "*On apologising*" in F. Coulmas (ed.)

Goffman, E. 1967. "On face work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction," in E. Goffman. *Interactional Ritual.* New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, E. 1969. *Where the Action is: Three Essays.* London: Penguin Press.

Holmes, J. 1990. " Apologies in New Zealand English," *Language in Society* 19:155-199.

Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Moehkardi, R.R.D. 1993. "Written apologies and request in Australian English and Bahasa Indonesia: a comparative study. Study Project Reports. Canberra: University of Canberra

Olshtain, E. 1989. "*Apologies across languages,*" in S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (eds)

Olshtain, E, and A.D. Cohen. 1983. "Apology: a speech act set," in N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.) Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House.

Owen, M. 1983. Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: a Study of Language Use in Social Interaction. New York: Mouton.

Rintell, E.M. and C.J. Mitchell. 1989. "Studying requests and apologies : an inquiry into method," in S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (eds)

Searle, J.R., 1969. Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R., 1979. Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tentang Penulis

Penulis menyelesaikan pendidikan S1 di Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, UGM pada bulan November 1984 dan menyelesaikan program S2 di bidang TESOL di Faculty of Education, University of Canberra pada tahun 1993.