

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the writer explains about the theory used in this research. The theory that is used to analyze the data is apology by Robinson (2004) in the conversation between non-native speakers.

2.1 Adjacency Pair Organization

In analyze explicit apologies, Robinson (2004) focuses on adjacency pair organization. It is important because in analyzing conversation we also need to understand the sequence structure. Schegloff (2007) says that there are two type of structure, current and next turn that are can be placed in adjacency pair (as cited in Putri, 2007). According to Schegloff and sack (1973), adjacency pair is characterized by certain feature:

- 1) two utterance length,
- 2) adjacent positioning of component utterances,
- 3) different speakers producing each utterance,
- 4) relative ordering of part (i.e., first pair part precede second pair parts),
- 5) discriminative relations.” (p. 296)

The speaker’s production of the sequences is producing a typology. According Schegloff and Sack (1973), the typology operate operates in two ways: “It partitions utterance types into ‘first pair part’ (i.e., first parts of pair) and second pair parts” (p. 296). Further they explain that both first pair part and second pair part form a ‘pair type’. The example of pair types is ‘question-answer’, ‘greeting-greeting’, offer-

acceptance/refusal’, and ‘invitation-acceptance/refusal’ (Schegloff & Sack, 1973). The basic rule of adjacency pair is “given recognizable production of first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type of which the first is recognizably a member” (Schegloff & Sack, 1973). The example of adjacency pair is the second pair part answers “fine” to “how are you?” from first pair part.

2.2 Conversational Analysis

Conversational analysis is a method used to analyze the conversation or in Schegloff term is talk-in-interaction. CA is developed in sociological context which to analyze the action was product (Heritage & Goodwin, 1990). CA is used for analyzing the interaction which more focuses on: turn-taking, action sequences, repair, adjacency pair and many more. However, in this chapter, the writer merely focuses on action sequence.

2.2.1 Action Sequence

In this section, the writer explains more about the action sequence which based on Schegloff’s theory (2007). The action sequence is divided into 4 which are invitations, requests, offers, and apologies. Most of the action sequences are hard to differentiate because most of the actions are similar to the others, except for the last action which is very different. Schegloff explains, invitation also can be said as sub-

class of offers (as cited in Putri, 2007). Sometimes, requests can also be known as offers which understanding the different is quite difficult. In this section the writer explains more about invitation, requests, offers, apologies, as well as the ambiguous of the action which are part of the action sequence.

Invitations

Invitations are the action that we found a lot in conversation. People use invitation to socialize to other. They use invitation to tighten the relation between them, like invitation to dinner, watch movie, reunion, and many more. However, it is important to know how to invite properly.

Before explaining about the invitation, the writer explains first about the pre-invitation. Schegloff (2007) says that "preliminaries that project such specific imminent First Pair Part (FPPs) is called type-specific pre-sequence" (as cited in Putri, 2007). There are two functions of pre-invitation as Schegloff added, "there are two function of pre-invitations: to project the possibility that a base FPP (invitation) will be produced and it also makes relevant next the production of second pair part (response to pre-invitation)". The example of the pre-invitation: "are free tonight?" or "do you have something to do, now?". Pre-invitation is as important as invitation.

Pre-invitation is also divided into three types of response which are similar to previous response: go-ahead, hedging, blocking responses. Putri (2007) says "a go-ahead response supports the recipient of the response to go-ahead with the invitations" (p.17). The example of go-ahead response supports is "yes" to "are you

free tonight?”. We can see above that the second person accepts the invitation from the recipient by saying “yes” to “are you free tonight” which means that the second person has free time to go. The blocking response can help the recipient understand that the invitation is going to be rejected. The example of blocking response is “I have homework to do” to “what are you doing tonight?” This example shows that the invitation from the recipient declines because, in this example, the second person rejects the invitation by saying that s/he has something else to do and s/he cannot accept it. The last type of response is hedging. Hedging response is the situation where the recipient does not know whether the invitation accepted or rejected. Nevertheless, putri (2007) says that “this response can make a full response contingent on what the invitation is going to be”. Further she explains that the example of this type of response is “why”, which can be combined with another type of response either go-ahead or blocking.

(1) SB,1 (continued) (Schegloff, 2007, p.31)

1 Judy: Hi John.
 2 John: → Ha you doin- <say what 'r you doing.
 3 Judy: → Well, we're going out. Why.
 4 John: → oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over
 5 here and talk this evening, [but if you're going
 6 out you can't very] well do that.
 7 Judy: ["Talk," you mean get
 8 drunk, don't you?]

Offers

Offers are an action that we can't exclude from our life. Just like invitations, offers are also important and before making offers at least we know how to make

appropriate offers. Similar to invitations, offers also have pre-sequence called pre-offers. Schegloff explains that “in pre-offers, those who have something to offer will try to assess whether their offers will be accepted or not and that the offers will depend on the response of the pre-offers” (as cited in Putri, 2007). Not only invitation but offers are also divided into three kinds of responds, which are go-ahead, blocking, and hedging response. Below is the example of pre-offers with go-ahead type of response.

According to Putri (2007),” pre-offer is the considered very useful in deciding whether the base sequence, the offer, can be done or not, but the shift from pre-sequence base sequence is not always smooth” (as cited in Putri, 2007).

(2) Debbie and Nick 1:34-2:59 (Schegloff, 2007, p.36)

1 Debbie: 'hhh Um:: u-guess what I've-(u-) wuz lookin' in
 2 the paper:.-
 3 → -have you got you waterbed yet?
 4 Nick: uh huh, it's really nice °too, I set it up
 5 Debbie : oh rea:lly? □already?
 6 Nick: Mm hmm
 7 (0.5)
 8 Debbie : Are you kidding?
 9 Nick: No, well I ordered it last (week)/(spring)
 10 (0.5)
 11 Debbie : Oh-no but you h- you've got it already?
 12 Nick: Yeah h!hh+ ((laughing))
 13 Debbie : =hhh [hh 'hh] ((laughing))
 14 Nick: [I just] said that
 15 Debbie : O::hh: hu[h, I just couldn't be[lieve you c-
 16 Nick: [oh (°it's just) [It'll sink in 'n
 17 Today[s fr'm now (then) ((laugh))]
 18 Debbie : [((laugh))] oh no cuz
 19 I just got- I saw an ad in the paper for a real
 20 discount waterbed s' I w'z gonna tell you 'bout
 21 it=
 22 Nick: =No this really, you (haven't seen) mine you'll
 23 really Like it

24 Debbie : Ya:h. It's on a frame and everythi[ng?
 25 Nick: [Yeah
 26 Debbie : 'hh Uh (is) a raised frame?
 27 Nick : °mm hmm
 28 Debbie : How: ni::ce,

The example above shows pre-offer of locking response.

Requests

Another type of response is requests which are similar to invitations and offers. As it goes along with two previous responses, requests also have pre-sequence, pre-requests. However, this pre-sequence not like the others. According to Putri (2007),” in the previous actions, the response to pre-invitation and pre-offer is a go-ahead response which then leads to the base sequence: an invitation or an offer” (p.20).

Below is the excerpt of pre-request that generates offer instead request

(3) SBL, (Schegloff, 2007, p.91)

1 Beth: and uhm I have her book
 2 (1.0)
 3 Beth: Have you read it?
 4 Abby: I think I have seen her book, I don't know whether
 5 I've read it all or not.
 6 Beth: I Believe in Miracles
 7 Abby: Yes,
 8 Beth: and uh [I (have) -
 9 Abby:→ [You have it you say?
 10 Beth: Uh I Believe in Miracles
 11 Abby:→ I say do you have it?
 12 Beth: Yes.
 13 Abby: Uh huh,
 14 Beth:→ And I'll be glad to (.let you have it (a week' r
 15 two).
 16 Abby: Yes I'd like to.

Apologies

Apology is an important aspect in our life. Apology can be used to mend the relationship with other. According to Putri (2007), “apology helps reestablish social harmony between speakers whenever one of them performs some actions that may cause offenses” (p.23).

This study uses Robinson’s theory. Robinson focuses his study only “explicit” apology. According to Robinson (2004) “explicit” apologies include offers of apology and Sorry-based units of talk (e.g. I’m sorry, my apology). Sorry-based talk is different from other offense-remedial-related actions in social action (Robinson, 2004). In his study, Robinson (2004) classifies apologies can occur in five different places:

- 1) as “initial turn-constructive unit (TCU) of a turn that is part of an adjacency-pair sequence of action, 2) as a second pair part where it is subordinate to the primary action as a second pair part where it is subordinate to the primary action, 3) as “second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions, 4) as first pair part, and 5) apology to accomplish nonapology action.

First, Robinson (2004) says that the first position of apology is as “initial turn-constructive unit (TCU) of a turn that is part of an adjacency-pair sequence of action” (p.296). Further, he explains that “in this position, the action of apologizing is typically subordinate to the adjacency-pair action being pursued” (p.296). In this type action of apology, the apology does not need appropriate response because the apology only preface of following action, it also does not need response because it is not the main action. Below is the example of this type of apology:

- (4) (Robinson, 2004, p.296)
- 1 MOM: Wha' I'm concerned about us do I give fluids, or
 2 DOC : .hhh[h Yeah]
 3 MOM: [Or what.] I just don't know: [w.]
 4 DOC : → [>.h<] >Sorry<
 5 how old is your daughter, >did you say?<
 6 MOM : [Sh]e:'s
 7 eightee:n.
 8 Doc : Eightee:n.

The apology happens in line 4 and then there is response in line 6. In the example above the apology is uttered by doctor as second pair part. However, the apology in this type can be as first pair part and also second pair part. The apology is used as subordinate to initiate turn constructional unit (TCU). The apology is used to accomplish different action, e.g. nonapology action. The pattern of this type is the apology is followed by different action. In the example above, the mother role is as first pair part and the doctor role as second pair part.

In line 1, the mother provides information and in line 2 the doctor just ignores it and the mother pursues the answer in line 3. The doctor answer in line 2 is not adjacent to the question that the mother asks. The answer is not what mother expects. The doctor apologizes to mother and says "sorry" because the question he asks might offend the mother because she has provided the info he asks. According to Robinson (2004) that " in this case, the action of apologizing is produced and understood as being subordinate to the primary action of this turn, which is requesting information" (p.297). the doctor asks the mother "how old is your daughter, did you say?" which that information has already provided by her. While in line 6 is the response to the question directly. The mother doesn't response to ".sorry," because it is only a

grammatically complete turn-constructural unit (Robinson, 2004). The example of adjacency pair appears in line 4 until 7. The answer of the question is what the doctor expect.

Further Robinson (2004) explains, the second position of apology is as a second pair part where it is subordinate to the primary action. In this position, an apology is different from previous because apology is done as second pair part of adjacency pair. This apology does not need to respond because it is only a preface to first pair part. Further she explains that “some examples of apology as second pair part are apology-prefaced declination and apology-prefaced account”. Apology-prefaced declination is apology that is used as declination. The second pair part declines the invitation or offer from first pair part then s/he apologizes. However, the apology-prefaced account is used as apology that stand as no. the second pair part apologize which stand as no. For example, the second pair part answers “I can’t, sorry” as apology-prefaced declination and “sorry, got homework to do” as apology-prefaced account to invitation “let’s watch movie together”. Below is the example of an apology as a second pair part with preface of account as function.

(5) (Robinson, 2004, p.296)

1 LES: A:re you thinking (.) o:f coming (.) to thuh
 2 meeting toni:ght.
 3 MYR:→ >Do you know< I’m terribly sorry. > I was
 4 going da ring you in a short while, <. hhi
 5 had=a phone call from Ben. (he’s/whose) down
 6 in Devon. `nhe’s not going to get back
 7 toni:ght, .h [h
 8 LES: [Yes=

9 Myr: =And mommy's going to this k-k=uh: (.) that
 10 [ca:rol̩ [<concert>]
 11 LES: [(y) - Yes [of course] I think my husband's
 12 going to that too: . =

In the example above, apology can be found in line 3. In this example, Les is the first pair part. As explain before, the role of first pair part is usually as the one who ask question. In line 1 until 3 can be classified as adjacency pair because the answer of Les question is adjacent. Les asks Myr that is he coming to the meeting and Myr answer it with apology that stand as no.

In line 3, there is apology as second pair part apology-prefaced. Myrtle's apology is at line 3 treating as subordinate to the primary action. Robinson (2007) explained that "Myrtle's turn at line 3 through 7 is an apology-prefaced account that stands as a No answer, not an apology to be responded to in its own right" (p.299).

Next, the third position of apology is as "second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions (e.g. complaints) (Robinson, 2004). In this case the apology action as primary, but doesn't need to make response.

(6) (Robinson, 2004, p.300)

1 GOR: Are you going' toni:ght=h
 2 NOR: Mm,
 3 GOR: .hhh(.) Would you mind givin' me a lift=[h
 4 NOR: [No
 5 that's a'righ'
 6 GOR: .hhh (0.2) Very kind of you.
 7 NOR:→ Caught me in thuh bath ag[ain,
 8 GOR: [.ph]hhh Pardon?=
 9 NOR:→ =(heh)Caught [t me in thuh ba[th
 10 GOR:→ [.thh [O(h)h(h)I'm s(h)orr(h) y
 11 hee=. hu-(.) .hhhh (uh/oh) well I sh'(ll) let
 12 you get back to it,=h
 13 (0.2)
 14 GOR: .hhh Uh: :m (.) (.th) (0.2) sh'll I expect

15 you about quartwe past ei:ght?
 16 (0.7)
 17NOR: Ah::lb-uh) (0.8) Yeah.

The example above is the example of the third position of apology, second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions. In the example above the apology appears in line 10. Line 9 and 10 are adjacent. From the name of this position, second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions, the organized action above is the complain in line 9 and the response is apology in line 10. Adjacency pair organized action is when the first pair part complaints about something second part do, the second responses it with apology which is adjacency pair. The apology happens in line 10 which responses to complain made in line 7 and 9. In this case, in line 7 Gordon said “caught me in the bath again” which also means that he tries to tell Gordon that he calls in wrong time and the possibility offense him.” Norman’s announcement in line 7 operates something like complain to which apology may be a specifically relevant response” (Robinson, 2004). In line 8, Norman utters apology to accomplish nonapology action which will explain further in this section.

The fourth position of apology is as primary action of first pair part. Robinson (2004) says that apologies solicit response as the evident (p.301). The apology is used as acknowledgment the commission of a possible offense and the response as claim that no offence was actually taken (Robinson, 2004). However, as mentioned before that this study is based on adjacency pair. In this apology Robinson (2004) classified the response of apology into: absolution (that’s okay), disagreeing with the need of

apology (No), oh-preface (oh, that's okay) and delay (silent). Below is the example of apology as first pair part:

(7) Wake Up (Schegloff:Openings #328)

((Ring))

1 WIF: Hello-o? ((sleepy voice))
 2 HUS: yeah. Did I wake yih up?
 3 WIF: Yea:h.
 4 HUS:→ Sorry gal.
 5 WIF: That's (okay dool),

From the example above, in line 4, the apology is uttered by first pair part. The response can be found in line 5 for the response of the apology in line 4. In this position, apology is as primary action. At the first, the wife role in line 1 is as first pair part. The husband responses "yeah" which is adjacency pair as second pair part. The husband becomes the first pair part when he asks question in line 2. In line 3, the wife answers which is still adjacency pair. In line 4, the husband apology as first pair part because the husband become the first pair part when he asks question in line 2. The apology in line 4 is as primary action. The apology is uttered as acknowledgment of mistake.

Below is the other example of apology as first pair part.

(8) (Robinson, 2004, p.309)

1 DOC: → Hello: s[orry I'm running] late.
 2 PAT : [Hi:]
 3 → (.)
 4 DOC: 'T' s a typical Monday.
 5 PAT :→ Oh you're not running (late)=
 6 DOC: =(N)ot doin' too ba:d,
 7 PAT : No: :

The doctor in the example above is as first pair part. in line 1, the doctor apology to the patient because s/he late. However, the patient only responses to greeting in line 2. The apology in line 1 is primary action. The delay happens in line 3 with silent where no apology-relevant response occurs. The doctor pursuits the response by giving offense excuse in line 4. In line 5, the patient responds by giving an apology-relevant response by disagreeing to the apology. The patient does not responds to the pursuit of a response, but as an apology that is why the patient responds to the apology.

“Sorry” also can be used to accomplish non-apology actions. Robinson (2004) explains that “sorry” also can be used as “expression of personal regret” and to express condolence. Below is the example.

- (9) (Robinson, 2004, p.317)
- 1 NAN: <Wul>wh:at=a sh↑a:me↓> did ya<have ta go in
 2 thuhhos↑pita[l?↓]
 3 EMA: [N:] o: : Ijust had a local
 4 de:al, =an' :=uh I'wa (d)n't any fu:n but I'm
 5 better I w's: lying on thuh couch out in
 6 f[ront.]
 7 NAN:→ [Oh:] : I'm so:rr[y E:m]ma:?
 8 EMA: [Ah: : .]
 9 EMA:→ I:am too. >why- (d) on' <=cha come an' see me.=
 10 NAN: =.h We:ll= i: was gunna call an' ask you if...

Besides that, “sorry” also can be used as initiate repair as the example below

- (10) (Robinson, 2004, p.318)
- ((Telephone Rings))
- 1 LES : Hello: : :↓°
 2 MOM: °↑Hello: : :↓°
 3 (.)
 4 MOM : °(Leslie?)°
 5 (0.2)
 6 LES :→ Sor↑ry:↓?
 7 (0.2)

8 MOM: → Leslie?
 9 (.)
 10 LES : oh yeah. Sorry. = I couldn't hear you very
 11 [well.jem]'s m-
 12 MOM: [° (oh:)°]
 13 LES : (m) = [je:m's s-
 14 MOM: [Are (your) <fam]ily>o:ff?

2.2 Review of Related Study

There are some several studies about apologies that have already been discussed. The studies that are closely related to this study are Demeter (2000) from North University of Baia Mare, Romania; Alfattah (2010) from University of Mysore, and journal written by Isabel and Cruz (2012). The descriptions of their research are explained below.

Special attention has been paid to study done by Demeter (2010) about apologies that are used among foreign language learner, cross culture, different culture and language. He has done the research about the apology as one type of speech act. The object of this study is english non-native speakers. He conducts the research using Bergman and Kasper's theory (1993). Demeter's study is in a field of pragmatic. The finding shows that the culture also affects the apology strategies.

Another research is al-fattah (2010) who investigates apologies that are used among the student of EFL university, Yemen. The subjects of his study believe that should consist of this expression as a compulsory component accompanied by any one of the other strategies. The study based on apology as speech act which in pragmatic field. However, the research focuses on the apologies produce by English

nonnative speakers. The purpose of this study is to get clear picture about the cross-culture apologies produced by non-native speakers to help understand the universally pragmatic. He analyzes the data using theory of Blum-Kulka and Olshtain(1984); Trosberg, (1987); and Holmes, (1989). He concludes that the use of strategies is also depending on the situation, and the orientation toward negative politeness is by attempting not to damage their own positive face.

Next study is from journal made by Isabel and Cruz (2010). Their study is about apology in spanish: a study of the strategies used by university student in Las Palmas De Gran Canaria. The focus of this study is the apology strategies that used by the student of university. They conclude that apology does not refer to the same social act across all culture and societies. This study examines the apology as speech act in pragmatic field.

From those several studies that are related to the discussion of this study, there are similarities and differences amongst them. Firstly , comparing to all studies above, the object of the study is English nonnative speaker with the purpose to differentiate or known the cross-culture apology usage. However, all of the studies analyze the apology from pragmatic view, apology as part of speech act. In this study, the writer analyzes the apology from discourse view which is different from all the studies. However, this study also analyzes the apology uttered by English nonnative speaker. Furthermore, this study does not only analyze the explicit apology but also analyzes the apology from whole context.