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, unambiguous 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 unambiguously 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
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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 occurring, 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 occurring 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 desirable 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 apologist 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 apologist's positive face for admitting the cause of regret imposed on the apologizer, at the same time the cause of regret has damaged the apologizer'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 apologist's positive face.

In relation to preserving the positive face in this remedial interchange, the apologist 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 apologist 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 apologist and the apologizer 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 apologist, 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 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 offender 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 felicitous. 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 (Olshtain, 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 dismissal from the board of directors to his employee. In the latter one, the apologizer automatically expects the apologizree 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 (198:22-3) 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 performatives 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 selha 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 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 stu-
dents (aged 18-25 year old) in Canberra
by Moehkardji (1993): in which the Indo-
nesian respondents preferred using this
substrategy. As the term says, the En-
glish 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 ob-
ject.

Although they belong to the same
framework, Indonesian maaf or Saya
minta maaf, and English Excuse me, For-
give me, and Pardon me have different
features. Indonesian maaf and its var-
iants are speaker oriented indicating of-
fence which has been committed, for-
give, excuse and pardon are hearer ori-
tented, as in Would you forgive me, in-
tended 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 off-
ence, these English verbs are slightly
different from each other, although in
some cases they are sometimes inter-
changeable. Forgive me is commonly
called for after a violation and aimed at
reducing the impact of it. Apologetic ex-
pressions Excuse me, Pardon me or I
beg your pardon are to redress the of-
fence the speaker is surely going to make
soon. In other words these expressions
are usually produced before the occur-
rence of potential offence. Furthermore,
with excuse me the speaker can also
announce the inconvenience s/he is go-
ing 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: Ex-
cuse 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 pos-
sibly Javanese nuwun sewu and not nuw-
un pangapunten which is closely to
sorry. Expressions of Pardon me or I beg
your pardon are usually limited in its us-
age as a request for the hearer to repeat
his/her talk of which case expression ex-
cuse me is also possible.

The semantic formulas of English Re-
quest-for-Forgiveness strategy is as vari-
ous 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 intro-
duce 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 de-
termine the degree of politeness of the
expression. From the exclamation
Maafkan or Maafkan saya to the com-
plete 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 syn-
onym 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 mo-
hon/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 serious-
ness 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 dengen (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 kelaian saya untuk menenmui Anda kemarin sore ...

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

(4) Ananda mohon maaf karena sampai saat ini Ananda belum bisa menepati janji ...

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

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

The most common Expression of Regret in English is sorry --now it is also a common Indonesian apology, but to many Indonesians using sorry sounds very colloquial and therefore this expression is mostly common among young people-- or be sorry and in Bahasa Indonesia is the exclamation maaf. Other verbs that belong to this category are regret in English and menyenyal in Bahasa Indonesia. Both of them are not as frequently used as sorry to express apology. It seems that by saying Sorry or I'm sorry the speaker admits that s/he has committed an offence and therefore tries to amend it in order to avoid further offence of being ignorant and/or to prevent punishment, whereas by saying menyenyal 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 as that followed 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 appointment
(7) I'm sorry about this
(8) I'm sorry to have to tell you though, that ...

Syntactic patterns of explicit apology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression of regret</td>
<td>Request for forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry</td>
<td>Maaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm sorry that</td>
<td>Maafkan saya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm sorry about</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon maaf kepada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm sorry to have to</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon maaf atas/untuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm afraid</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon maaf karena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regret ….</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon sehubungan dengan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgive me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse me</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon sehubungan den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardon me</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon sehubungan den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I beg your pardon</td>
<td>Saya minta/mohon sehubungan den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer of apology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apologize for …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please accept my apology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 subclassifications: 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 se-sudahnya or sekali lagi indicating that the apologizer simultaneously acknowledges directly or indirectly that the offence has occurred. The external intensification is also called "concern for the hearer" and is considered as an indirect apology strategy.

In addition to Olsthoorn's and Cohen's framework, Owen (1983:88) includes the phrase I am afraid but this phrase is only considered apology in certain situations, 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 occurred 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 (Olsthoorn, 1989: 157). In addition to the above mentioned non explicit strategies, Olsthoorn (1989:158) adds ways in which the addressee could intensify or minimize the apology. Intensifying the apology is when the addressee gives more support to the addressee (Concern for the Hearer) and thus, humiliates him/herself more; and/or the addressee 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 sub-strategies. 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 split something on it ...
   Saya tidak sengaja ...

Thus, in expressing responsibility the addressees 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 Olsthoorn (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 addressee 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 correcting 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-occurrence 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 one day 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 apologist 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 apologist 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 apologist gives more support to the apologizee, usually by claiming the inconvenience or the problem the apologist 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 apologist 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 apologist'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 sub-strategy 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 strategy which does not exist in English performative of apology.
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