

APOLOGIZING STRATEGIES REALIZATION OF INDONESIAN: A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KUNINGAN STUDENTS

Ayang Winda SW
Galileo English Course, Indonesia
Email: ayang.yasha@yahoo.com

APA Citation: Winda, A. (2014). Apologizing strategies realization of Indonesian: A case study of the University of Kuningan students. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 200-208

Received: 01-03-2014

Accepted: 30-03-2013

Published: 01-06-2014

Abstract: This study examines the apologizing strategies used by 20 Indonesian students of the Kuningan University. A 8-item Discourse Completion Task and interview are used to collect the data to know the apologizing strategies and the dominant strategies they used. This research applied the apologizing speech act of Indonesian in apologizing which is analyzed by using Blum-Kulka (1984). The findings show that there are various strategies used by them when apologizing. That strategies including IFID, addressed, an explanation or account of situation, acknowledgement of responsibility, offer of repair and promise forbearance, phatic and interjection. IFID was used by them as a favorite strategy. Generally, they used different ways when apology depend on power, social distance and ranking of imposition.

Keywords: *apology, strategy, Indonesian students*

INTRODUCTION

Language can not be separated from culture as they are assumed as two sides of the same coin (Fatimah, et al: 2011). Language is a result from what the person has taken from the culture. Language is used as a tool of communication in doing activities in social life. In other words, language is a unifying every culture in the world that serves as a medium of communication between one culture with another culture. In addition to cultural differences, language can also be used by an individual who are in the same culture and so it can be said that language is an important part of a culture. By using language, people can interact, communicate and also they can express their thought and feeling to another. One of Indonesian culture that shown through the use of language is apology. Apology shows our feeling of regret, so we can apologize to another by using language.

Apology is an action used to create a better situation, especially a bad situation created due to someone's mistake. This apology is a social custom that takes place in the community. Smith (2008: 19) defines that apology is a 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, and B is the person offended).

Searle (1979) assigns apologies as the category of "expressive" which further includes: thanking, congratulating, condoling, deploring, and welcoming. Apologies as transactions involving "a bid to change the balance-sheet of the relation between *s* and *h*" (Leech, 1983: 125). People in most cultures would probably agree that an apology is needed when an offence or violation of social norms has taken place.

Deutschmann (2003) in Ogeirmann (1984) says that apology can be negative

face but Larina (2003) thinks that it can be positive face. Based on two opinion above, the writer can say that apology can be positive and also negative depend on where we see. It can be negative because it is focussing on the damage caused by the offence that done by the speaker to the hearer without focussing on S's face when apologizing. Also it can be positive because in this point, we can see the function of apology is to repair S's mistakes to the addressee. So we can see the S's respect and S try to maintenance the better relationship with the addressee.

By apologizing, the speaker recognizes the fact that a violation of a social norm has been committed and admitted to the fact that s/he is at least partially involved in its cause. Hence, by their very nature, apologies involve loss of face for both interlocutors. According to Leech's classification of illocutionary functions (1983), apologies can be assigned to the convivial speech act type, in which the illocutionary goal similar to the social goal. In the case of apologies, it is the goal of keeping harmony between speaker and hearer, which makes them inherently polite.

There are some strategies (Blum-Kulka, 1984) used by Indonesian students such as (a) IFID, (b) an explanation or account of situation, (c) acknowledgement of responsibility, (d) offer of repair, (e) promise forbearance. The following example illustrates the five strategies (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989: 290) in Jucker (2008: 231). " I'm sorry (IFID), I missed the bus (RESPONSIBILITY), and there was a terrible traffic jam (EXPLANATION). Let's make another appointment (REPAIR). I'll make sure that I'm here on time (FORBEARANCE)."

In Indonesia, the people used some strategies (Choer 2010: 97) to express their apology such as addressed, phatic and interjection. Owing to the fact

that sometimes the speakers use more than one strategy. They can merge one strategy with another. Mostly, they used IFID followed by addressed like "*maafkan saya bu*". But when they know to whom they apology, they will more pay attention their politeness which can be seen from power, distance and ranking of imposition. They will use formal situation when apologizing to the higher power like their lecturer, and they usually use informal situation when apologizing to their friends which is in same power or have close social distance. They mostly add phatic or interjection to express their apology in informal situation like '*wah maaf ya hehe*".

Like in most cultures, Indonesian students has been familiar with apologetic expression which is said by person after doing a mistake. When Indonesian apologizing, it can make the speaker behaves impolite just because of a small thing like "*maaf*" or sometime they say in English "*eh, sorry ya*" or just "*sorry*" which isn't reveal the explicit meaning when the speaker asking for apologizing. Aziz & Lukmana (2006) argue that the Indonesian people behave likes that may be because of their ignorance, unconscious and their coincidence. The culture of apologizing in Indonesia is influenced by other factors out of linguistics such as gender, age, sosial distance and imposition.

This is a case study which aims to analyze Indonesian students strategies in asking for apology in the university of Kuningan. This research talks about speech act, in which apology strategy types are dealt with. To make clear about apologizing used by Indonesian students, this study involved 20 respondents of Indonesian language and literature students to get the answer of two research questions: (1) what are the apologizing strategies used by Indonesian students? and (2) what are the dominant apologizing strategies they use?

METHOD

This study was conducted in the University Kuningan, West Java, Indonesia. This study involved twenty students of Indonesia language and literature, the university of Kuningan as respondents. They have a same ethnic, Sundanese indicating the same opportunity to get '*Bahasa Indonesia*'. The participants are chosen by using purposive sampling. Sugiyono (2012: 124) defines purposive sampling is a technique of determining a sample with certain consideration.

In this study, the disparity of student's ability in mastering speaking and writing are selected in hope to extend important information and also give a qualified data because it can show the influence of the performance in asking for apology. The respondents are chosen purposively from the first level of this department in hope the researcher know the capability of using apologies speech act of Indonesian students in this University of Kuningan. The participants are chosen based on some considerations.

Discourse Completion Task (DCT) and interview were used to collect data. DCT is a form of questionnaire making use of some natural situation in which the respondents are expected to respond by making apology. Items in a DCT include a situational description and a brief dialogue which has one turn as an open slot (Oatey, 2000: 292).

They are given eight apologetic expressions in '*Bahasa Indonesia*' which a university student is likely to encounter in his/her daily language interactions in the classroom activities. The students are asked to relate to the situation and express their normal language reaction in such situations. According to Ogeirman (2009: 68) DCT can be translated in other language because this instrument is very ideal to be changed into other language for comparing speech act produced

in the balance situation in different language.

Besides DCT, the interview was also held to know their reason about apologizing in depth when they were selecting the strategies, but the interview was held for some respondents based on their respond in questionnaire. These interviews involve unstructured and generally open-ended questions that are few in number and intended to elicit views and opinions from the participants (Creswell, 2009: 181). Interview can provide additional information that was missed in observation and can be used to check the accuracy of the observation (Maxwell, 1996: 76).

On the other end of the continuum, collecting data might involve visiting a research site and observing the behaviour of individuals without predetermined questions or conducting an interview in which the individual is allowed to talk openly about a topic (Creswell, 2009: 15). In interviewing the participants, the interviews will be taped. Creswell (2007) states in his book (2009: 183) that an interviewing process should use interview protocol for asking questions and recording answers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data, from eight situations which is spread to the 20 participants, there are 160 utterances consist of 558 strategies appeared. The 558 strategies are classified into 8 general strategies. The 8 general strategies are Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID), an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility which has three subcategories like accepting responsibility, explicit self blame, denial of fault. The fourth category is an offer of repair which has two sub categories, there are specified and unspecified offer of repair. Then, a promise forbearance, addressed, phatic and the last is

interjection. The most dominant category used by Indonesian students is IFID with the frequency is 169 or it can reach 30,3

%. The detail description of apologizing strategies will be shown in the table below :

Table 1: *The description frequency of apologizing strategies*

No	Types of apologizing strategies	Frequency	%
1.	IFID	169	30,3
2.	An explanation or account of the situation	48	8,6
3.	An acknowledgement of responsibility	114	20,4
	a. Accepting responsibility	75	13,4
	b. Explicit self blame	28	5
	c. Denial of fault	11	2
4.	An offer of repair	36	6,4
	a. Specified offer of repair	25	4,5
	b. Unspecified offer of repair	11	2
5.	Promise of forbearance	28	5
6.	Addressed	116	21
7.	Phatic	37	6,6
8.	Interjection	10	1,8
	Frequency	558	100

Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID): the formulaic expression of regret (performative verb). IFID was the most frequent strategies used by Indonesian students both to their lecturer and their classmates in the teaching learning process. Choer (2010) says that the most utterances which is used by Indonesian people is “*maaf*” or it can be called in English language as performative verb like *(be) sorry, apologize, pardon, regret*, etc. Because of that, this utterance can be easily to use by people for indicating their apology because that utterance is really well-known by the hearer. The Indonesian are never rare with “*maaf*” because in this present era, we can see or we can say “*maaf*” directly as a tool in asking for apology. They use that words easily because it is their habitual language which is used in their daily activities. The following are utterances of IFID situation employed by the participants:

Maaf, saya enggak akan ngobrol lagi.
 (I'm sorry, I will not chat again)

Maaf pak, saya akan mencoba membuat yang baru. Mohon maaf, ini kesalahan saya
 (I'm sorry sir, I will try to create a new.
 I'm sorry, this is my fault)
Aduh maaf ya teman – teman. Aku juga bingung. Maaf ya.
 (Oops sorry my friends. I am also confused. Sorry)

Sometimes, IFID used in double time in an utterance. It may happened when the speaker really sorry for making an offence to the hearer. It shows that they are feeling regret for what they are having done.

An explanation or account of situation:
 An explanation may be explicitly related to the offence or it may present the ‘state of affairs’ in a general way, thus relating implicitly to the offence (Blum Kulka, 1984: 208). Explanations are indirect apology strategies (Ogeirmann, 2009: 134). These following utterances are the example of what the participants said when answering an explanation or account of situation:

Maaf pak, kemarin saya dapat info kalau bapak tidak akan hadir hari ini dan saya tidak mendapat info lagi.
(I'm sorry sir, yesterday I got information that you will not come today and I didn't get the information again)

Most of Indonesian were using an explanation or account to show their reason why they made an offence or it said to imply apology in affair or indirectly apology especially when they were coming late to the class. It can be seen in the third situation that there are 15 utterances showed explanation or account of the situation. The other data showed that the Indonesia students explained uncontrolled situation. They force to make an offence because they could not control the situation for avoiding the mistake. The strategy of explanation has been defined as a form of "self-justification by explaining the source of the offence as caused by external factors over which the speaker has no control". This case mostly presented in the first situation. And these are the following utterance said by the respondents in explanation situation:

Iya pak maaf, saya lapar soalnya tadi belum sempat sarapan
(Yes sir, I'm sorry. I am hungry because I had not yet had breakfast)
Maaf bu, saya lupa tidak membawa tugas saya, tadi saya buru - buru
(Sorry mom, I forgot to bring my task, I had to rush)

But there are some students who answered the situation using an account and the lecturer can accept their reason because it can cause unexpected risk like the following utterance employed by the respondents:

Maaf pak karena saya sakit perut kalau tidak makan soalnya saya punya maag
(I'm sorry sir.....because my stomach will be sick if I don't eat because I have

stomach disorder)
Saya lapar takut maag saya kambuh
(I'm hungry. I'm afraid my stomach disorder will be relapse)

An acknowledgement of responsibility:
In this data, there are 20% or 114 strategies of acknowledgement. The most obvious strategy termed 'acknowledgement of responsibility' is that it presupposes some degree of responsibility acceptance. the speaker realizes their responsibility of the offense. Based on Blum - Kulka et al (1984), this strategy consist of three sub categories called accepting responsibility (S expresses trait of self-deficiency), explicit self-blame, and denial of fault.

Accepting responsibility: show the admission of the speaker for what he had been done. They accept it as their fault. Olshtain in Ogeirmann (2009: 134) states that an expression of S's responsibility "could realize an apology in any situation" (1989: 157). In the three sub categories of acknowledgement, accepting responsibility showed the highest frequency 13,2%. It shows that the Indonesian students are not shy in acknowledging their fault. This strategy can show the speaker's deficiency in doing a mistake. The following are utterances of accepting responsibility situation employed by the participants :

Maaf pak, saya salah
(Sorry sir, I was wrong)
Maaf, saya sudah mengacaukan presentasi anda
(Sorry, I stir your presentation up)

The data show that the respondents used accepting responsibility after using IFID to insist their apology. Beside that, there are some students who used accepting responsibility before using IFID but it has same meaning that they wants to insist their apology. This strategy can show the speaker's

deficiency in doing a mistake. The following are utterances of accepting responsibility situation employed by the participants :

Kami sadar kami salah, kami meminta maaf
(We realize we were wrong, we are sorry)
Kami salah dan khilaf. Kami minta maaf
(we were wrong and erroneous. We are sorry)

Explicit self blame: shows that the speaker explicitly acknowledges the fact that he or she has been at fault (Blum Kulka et al, 1989: 291). We can see that in this strategy, the speaker's face threatening is occurred in accepting his blame. The following are utterances of explicit self blame situation employed by the participants.

Maaf pak / bu, ini kesalahan saya
(Sorry sir/ mom, this is my fault)
Maaf, itu semua salah saya
(Sorry, that's all my fault)
Ini murni keteledoran saya
(this pure my negligence)

Those data above show that the speaker really blamed their self for what they having done. They were judging their own self. They judged that all of the confusion was done by them, it was their fault. The word "*keteledoran*" is a judging word that they means as their boner and thought that only they who did a mistake.

Denial of fault: shows the speaker's refusal to acknowledge guilt. The speaker completely rejects responsibility for the offence. This strategy includes all the utterances negating the speaker's involvement in the offence and shifting the blame to other people or the hearer (Ogeirmann, 2009: 139). This strategy can be found both in questionnaire and interview. these are the following utterance said by the respondents in denial of fault situation:

Maaf saya telat, saya dengar bapak tidak akan masuk jadi bukan salah saya
(Sorry I came late, I heard that you will not come so it was not my fault.)
Maaf tapi kan saya sudah menjelaskan sebisa saya
(Sorry but I have explained as much as I can)

The data show the explicit denying of speaker's mistake. They directly said that "*jadi bukan salah saya*" or it can be translated "it's not my fault". Even, they were wrong because they were coming late but they can't realize that they were wrong. They served a reason which support that they were right. The word "*tapi*" can be a key for denying. s/ he indirectly deny their mistake. When interviewing, the researcher found some students who said that they couldn't apology because they think that they were right. Here are the following utterances employed by the respondents:

mmmmmm, saya pernah sih gamau minta maaf hehe. Ya soalnya saya ngerasa kalo diri saya paling benar. Apapun yang saya lakukan saya ngerasa bener, jadi saya rasa tidak perlu minta maaf. Gengsi dong hehe.
(mmmmmm, I've still not want to apologize hehe. Because I feel that I am always in the righteous. Whatever I do I feel right, so I feel no need to apologize. It's so prestige hehe)

Another respondent said:

pernah sih gamau minta maaf hehehe, soalnya saya males buat minta maaf. Apa yang dia tuduhkan kan tidak semuanya benar jadi kenapa saya yang harus minta maaf, harusnya dia dong yang minta maaf ke saya kan dia sudah menuduh saya.
(I ever does not want to apologize hehehe, because I am lazy to make apologies. What he accused to me, it was not right at all so why should I apologize, he should apologize to me because he had accused me).

The interview result shows that the speaker chose this strategy because of their ego. They are saving their face and deny their mistake. Implicitly, they didn't want that the hearer know their fault so they act as if they were always right.

An offer of repair: show that the students compensate to repair their fault. As Blum kulka et al (1989: 293) said that 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. Here are the following utterances employed by the respondents in offer of repair situation:

Maaf bu saya meminta waktu untuk mengerjakan kembali tugas saya
(Sorry mom I ask for the adding to rework my task)
Maaafkan aku. Aku yang akan bicara pada dosen itu agar mau menerima tugas kamu
(I'm sorry. I will talk to the lecturer in hope she would like to receive your task)
Maaf pak, saya akan mencoba membuat yang baru
(I'm sorry sir, I will make a new)

From the above example, the respondent showed that they served their repairment specifically. They pointed out what will they did to correct their mistake. Here are the following utterances that employed by the respondents in the offer of repair situation:

Kami bersedia menerima apapun untuk menebus kesalahan kami
(we are willing to accept anything for changing our fault)
Apapun yang Bapak minta, kami akan melakukannya asalkan bapak mau memaafkan kami.
(whatever you ask, we will do it in the hope you want to forgive us)

From both data above show that the speaker wants to repair their mistake but they didn't know what to do. They believed to the offended for the the repairment for their fault. They accept their fault and they want to repair. They ask for the repairment because they wanted to make sure the hearer that they were really sorry

Promise forbearance: the speaker promise that the offence will never happen again. Promises of forbearance are generally offered in potentially recurrent offensive situations, which makes them highly context-specific (Ogeirmann, 2006: 196). These are the following utterances that employed by the respondents in the promise forbearance situation:

Pak, mohon maaf atas kesalahan kami.
Kami berjanji tidak akan mengulanginya lagi
(Sir, Sorry for our fault. We promise that we will not do it again)
Untuk kali ini saja pak, selanjutnya saya berjanji tidak akan mengulanginya lagi
(only for this moment sir, for the next time I promise that I will not do it again)
Kami janji kami tidak akan mengulaginy lagi
(we promise will not do that again)

The word "*saya janji*" or "I promise" indicates that they will never do the same fault again. In the strategy of promising, the speaker promise to the hearer to change his or her behavior and showed their intention not to repeat the mistake. They ensured to the hearer that their bad behavior will never do again in the future.

Addressed: showed to whom they apologize. Generally, they used addressing in formal situation or they used it when they apologized to the person who has higher power than them, like to the lecturer. These are the following utterances that employed by the respondents in the addressing situation:

Ibu, mohon maaf
(Sorry mom)
Pak, maafkan saya
(sir, forgive me)
kami minta maaf pada bapak
(we are sorry to you sir)

The addressing above addressed to the higher age or higher power. It can show their politeness when they were apologizing. It is the way to maintain social relationship between people in a society.

Phatic: serves to seek approval or opinion from the opposed speaker. The use of phatic “*ya*” implies the meaning that the apologizing is accepted by the opponent (Choer, 2010: 97). These are the following utterances that employed by the respondents in the phatic situation:

Iya maaf. Maafin atuh ya
(yap sorry. Forgive me yeah)
Aduh mohon maaf ya
(ouch, I'm sorry ya)
Iya bu maaf
(yap mom, sorry)
Wah maaf ya
(ouch, I'm sorry yeah)

Interjection: shows emotive (eg.: expressed pain, sadness, regret, disappointment). The use of interjection “*wah*” and “*aduh*” imply a sense of sorrow. These are the following utterances that employed by the respondents in the interjection situation:

Aduh mohon maaf ya
(ouch I'm sorry)
Waduh maaf ya hehehe
(ouch I'm sorry hehe)
Wah maaf ya
(ow, I'm sorry yeah)
Aduh maaf pak hehehe
(ouch, I'm sorry sir hehe)

CONCLUSION

Indonesian students were used 8 general apologizing strategies to express their sorry like Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID), an explanation or account of the situation, an acknowledgement of responsibility which has three subcategories like accepting responsibility, explicit self blame, denial of fault. The fourth category is an offer of repair. Then, a promise forbearance, addressed, phatic and the last is interjection. The dominant strategies used by Indonesian students is Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) which reached 169 frequency or 30,3%. The second highest strategy is addressed with 116 or 21%, the third is an acknowledgement. And the fourth strategies used by Indonesian students is an explanation or account of the situation which the frequency is 48 or 8,6%. Phatic is the fifth highest frequency used by the Indonesian students with reach 37 or 6,6. And the sixth strategy used by Indonesian students is an offer of repair. For the seventh and the last strategies are promise and interjection with the frequencies are 28 and 10 or 5% and 1,8%.

The Indonesian students used IFID when they are asking for apology. They say “sorry” followed by addressing to make sure their apology are addressed to whom. Beside that, they also can accept their fault by giving an explanation of the situation why they did the mistake. Generally, they offered a repair to correct their fault. They made a promise that they will not do the wrongdoing again in hope the hearer will be sure with their apologizing. But they also used phatic and interjection. For all the strategies that used by Indonesian students, it can be called that Indonesian students have a politeness enough when they were apologizing. They can realize their fault and accept their fault by giving a repair.

REFERENCES

- Achmad, S. (2012). Strategi kesopanan berbahasa masyarakat bugis pinrang provinsi sulawesi selatan. *Bahasa dan Seni*, Tahun 40, Nomor 1, Februari 2012.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aziz, E. A. (2000). *Refusing in Indonesian: Strategies and politeness implications*. Unpublished dissertation in Department of Linguistics. Australia: Monash University
- Aziz, E. A. & Lukmana, I. (2006). Realisasi pertuturan meminta maaf dan berterima kasih di kalangan penutur bahasa indonesia: sebuah kajian kesantunan berbahasa. *Jurnal Linguistika*, vol 13, no. 25, 122-142.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatic: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Thesis Doctoral at Universitat Hamburg: John Benjamins.
- Blum-Kulka, S & Olshtain. (1984). Request and apologies: A cross cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper. (1989). *Cross cultural pragmatics: Request and Apologies*. Norwood, Nj: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brown & Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universal in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan berbahasa*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Creswell, J. R. (2009). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative and mixmethod approaches (3rd edition)*. California: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fatimah, A. et al. (2011). *Strategi-strategi meminta maaf yang digunakan oleh penutur asli bahasa Indonesia dalam berbahasa Inggris*. Makasar: Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Gunawan, I. (2013). *Metode penelitian kualitatif: Teori & praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Jucker, A. H. & Taavitsainen, I. (2008). *Speech act in the history of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Maros, M. (2006). Apologies in English by adult Malay speakers: Pattern and competence. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Cultures*. 19 (pp.1-14)
- Mey, J. L. (2009). *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Oatey, H. S. (2000). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). *On apologizing in negative and positive politeness culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing company
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis an introduction*. London: MPG Books Ltd.
- Searle, R. J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, N. (2008). *I was wrong: The meaning of apologies*. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.
- Subana, et al. (2000). *Statistik pendidikan*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introducing to pragmatics*. Newyork: Longman Publishing.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Newyork: Oxford University Press.