

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter the writer explains the theories that underlie the analysis in this research. The theories used are theories of Politeness strategies and Apology strategies. These theories are useful to analyze the data about apology strategies.

2.1.1 Politeness strategies

In this case, politeness strategies are used because apology is included in the negative politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson (1978) sum up human politeness behavior in four strategies such as; bald-on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off- record. There are politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson:

1. **The bald on-record strategy** does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer's face.
2. **The positive politeness strategy** shows recognize that the hearer has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity,
3. **The negative politeness strategy** also recognizes the hearer's face. Some other examples "I don't want to bother you but..." or "I was wondering if..."

4. **Off-record strategy**; this strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say “wow, it’s getting cold in here” insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn up the thermostat without directly asking the listener to do so.

Brown and Levinson (1987) construct their theory of politeness on the premise that many speech acts are intrinsically threatening to face. Some of the FTAs that are threatening to the speaker’s negative face include expressing gratitude, accepting a thank you, an apology, an offer, and making promises. Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Model regards apologies as “negative politeness strategies” in that they convey respect, deference, and distance rather than friendliness and involvement. Negative politeness is an avoidance based on record strategy of self-effacement and restraint. Evidence of negative politeness can be seen in both of the apology strategies themselves (avoiding, responsibility) as well as individual linguistic and extra linguistic elements with constituting these strategies (agent-less verbal constructs) and intonation.

2.1.2 Apology strategies

Trosborg (1995) who also made a research on politeness strategy particularly the apology strategies states that an apology is basically a speech act which is intended to provide support for the H (hearer) who was actually or potentially affected by a violation X. An apology is a polite speech act used to restore social

relations following an offence. There are eight apology strategies that consist of: Rejection, minimizing, explanation or account, Acknowledgment of responsibilities, Expression of Apology, Expression Concern for Hearer, Promise of Forbearance, and Offer of Repair.

Table 2.1 The classification of apology strategies based on Trosborg.

Strategies	Sub Strategies
1. Rejection	Explicit denial of responsibility Implicit denial of responsibility Justification Blaming someone else Attacking the complainer
2. Minimizing the degree offence	Minimizing Querying preconditions Blaming someone else
3. Acknowledgement of responsibility	Implicit acknowledgement Explicit acknowledgement Expression of lack of intent Expression of self deficiency Expression of embarrassment Explicit acceptance of the blame
4. Explanation or account	Implicit explanation Explicit explanation
5. Expression of apology	Expression of regret Offer of apology Request for forgiveness
6. Expressing concern for hearer	
7. Promise of forbearance	
8. Offer of Repair	Repair Compensation

These are the apology strategies that proposed by Trosborg (1995)

1. Rejection

A rejection or denial of responsibility can take various forms, from blunt refusals to evasive responses (Trosborg, 1995). Although an apology is the act by means of which a complainee can restore her or his own social standing, the complainee may refrain from performing an apology. Which is implied that apologize is not explicitly stated in all complaints. Rejection consists of apology strategies because not all complainee express their mistake through apologies; they not directly apologize when they feel guilty. They can reveal a guilt by denial the complaint such as argue with complainer or discuss about another topic.

A person may deny the responsibility because he feels not guilty. The denial of responsibility can be shown by the use of rejection strategy. Trosborg (1995) observed five different strategies. The complainee may make an explicit denial of responsibility with arguments like "I know nothing about it", I or she/he can make an implicit denial of responsibility, for example by ignoring a complaint, by talking about something else, etc. Furthermore, the complainee may provide a justification to the effect that no blame can be attached to her/him. Either the complainable has not occurred at all, or it can be fully justified. The complainee may also seek to evade responsibility by blaming someone else, and finally, if s/he lacks an adequate defence for her/his own behaviour, s/he may choose to use the strategy of attacking the complainer instead.

Rejection consists five sub-categories:

1.1 Explicit denial of responsibility

The apologizer denies that he has committed the infraction explicitly.

e.g. “I know nothing about it”.

1.2 Implicitly denial of responsibility

The apologizer may try to evade responsibility by ignoring the complaint or talking about other topics.

e.g. “I don’t think that’s my fault”.

1.3 Justification

The apologizer tries to give arguments that he cannot be blamed.

e.g. “I’ve already finished my job yesterday, so there’s no reason I could be blame about this”.

1.4 Blaming someone else

The apologizer blames a third party or even complainer himself.

e.g. “It wasn’t me, maybe you do it by yourself in purpose”.

1.5 Attacking the complainer

The apologizer may attack the complainer if he feels that he cannot defend himself.

e.g. “I’m warning you! You can’t blame me for this trouble”

2. Minimizing the degree of offence

Minimizing the degree offense is closely related to the strategies in which the complaine fails to take on responsibility. The difference lies in the fact that the complaine does not deny responsibility. Instead she or he seeks to minimize the degree offence, either by arguing that the supposed offence is of minor importance, in fact is 'hardly worth mentioning', or by querying the preconditions on which the complaint is grounded. Finally, the complaine may be only partly responsible. The following three sub strategies apply:

2.1 Minimizing

The apologizer tries to minimize the degree of offense by saying that the offense is not a big deal.

e.g. "Oh, what does that matter, that's nothing".

2.2 Querying preconditions

The apologizer may argue that the offense is minor of importance by querying preconditions.

e.g. "What is love then?" (in responding, "You don't love me")

2.3 Blaming someone else

The apologizer regards that a third party is also partly responsible for the offense.

e.g. "I believe another person also responsible to this problem"

3. Explanation or account

In an explanation or account, a complainee admits that what she or he has done was undesirable, but she or he tries to lessen the blame which can be attached to her / him by referring to mitigating circumstances that may excuse his behavior. The following sub strategies apply:

3.1 Implicit explanation

The apologizer explains the situation implicitly.

e.g. “Such things are bound to happen”.

3.2. Explicit explanation

The apologizer explains the situation explicitly.

e.g. “Sorry, I’m late, but my car broke down”.

4. Acknowledgement of responsibility

A precondition for apologizing is that the infraction is acknowledged. A complainee who chooses to acknowledge responsibility, can do so implicitly or explicitly and with varying degrees of self blame. The sub categories below are all hearer supportive and self demeaning, and they are ordered with respect to the degree of recognition with which the complainee accepts the blame. The following sub strategies apply:

4.1 Implicit acknowledgement

The apologizer blames himself implicitly.

e.g. “Perhaps I shouldn’t have done it”.

4.2 Explicit acknowledgement

The apologizer admits his mistake explicitly

e.g. “I’ll admit I forgot to do it”.

4.3 Expression of lack of intent

The apologizer expresses that he does not have intention to commit the offense.

e.g. “I didn’t mean to”.

4.4 Expression of self deficiency

The apologizer expresses his own deficiencies

e.g. “You know I’m bad at...”.

4.5 Expression of embarrassment

The apologizer shows that he feels embarrassed for the offense.

e.g. “I feel so bad about it”.

4.6 Explicit acceptance of the blame

The apologizer feels that the complainer has the right to blame him.

e.g. “You’re right to blame”.

5. Expression of apology

Expression of apology involves a routine formula generally accepted to express apology. Various formulae can be distinguished with regard to level of

formality and restrictions on occurrence. The sub strategies of expression of apology apply:

5.1 Expression of regret

The apologizer uses the common routine formula to express his regret. He may also use the adverbial intensifiers such as: really, terribly, etc.

e.g. "I'm sorry".

5.2 Offer of apology

The apologizer may offer an apology for the offense.

e.g. "I apologize".

5.3 Request for forgiveness

The apologizer shows that he expects forgiveness.

e.g. "Please forgive me".

6. Expressing concern for hearer

In order to pacify a complainer, the complainee may express his concern towards the complainer's condition.

e.g. "It won't happen again, I promise".

7. Promise of forbearance

The apologizer promises either never to do the same mistake or to improve his behavior. The utterance is often signaled by the word 'promise'.

e.g. “It won’t happen again, I promise”.

8. Offer of repair

An apologizer may offer to “repair” the damage which has resulted from his/her infraction. Repair may be offered in its literal sense or as an offer to pay for the damage. In situations in which actual repair is not possible, the apologizer may offer some kind of “compensatory” action or “tribute” to the complainer.

8.1 Repair

The apologizer intends to pay for the damage.

e.g. “I will pay for the cleaning”.

8.2 Compensation

If the repair is not possible, the apologizer may offer a compensatory action.

e.g. “You can borrow my dress instead”.

The classification levels and examples provided above will be used as reference in order to analyze each conversation by customer service officers in Telkomsel towards their customers.

2.2 Related Studies

In doing this study, the writer uses several related studies that have been conducted by other researches. The studies are used by the writer as references in conducting deeper analysis about the study. The writer uses two unpublished thesis

by (Dwi Ermawati, 2010) and (Fransisca Julia, 2007). Dwi Ermawati is an English Department student of Airlangga University. Ermawati (2010) conducted research entitled “Apology Strategies Used by the English Department Student of Airlangga University”. Her study analyzed the types of apology strategies that occur in the conversation among the English Department Students of Airlangga University. In conducting her study, she applied the apology strategies proposed by Bergman and Kasper. The result of her study showed that the most apology strategy used by the English Department students is downgrading responsibility.

The second unpublished thesis is Julia (2007), she is an English Department Student of Petra Christian University. She conducted a research entitled “Study of Apology Strategies Used on Telephone Conversation by Male and Female Call Center Agents in Telkom 147. Her study analyzed the types of apology strategies used by male and female call center agents in Telkom 147. In conducting her study, she used apology strategies proposed by Aijmer. The result of her study showed that female call center agents tend to be more cooperative in explaining the problem than male call center agents.

Those two studies investigated the apology strategies as well as the present study. However, the present study differs greatly from the previous studies. Ermawati used the apology strategies proposed by Bergman and Kasper. Julia applied the apology strategies proposed by Aijmer while the present study used the apology strategies proposed by Anna Trosborg. Furthermore, Ermawati conducted a study

among English Department student of Airlangga University, Julia conducted a study among Female and male in the call center agents of Telkom 147 while the present study conduct a study among the Customer Service Officers of Telkomsel and the Customers.