Cooper's ways to expose American features. That is why this wilderness which represents the artificiality of civilization, unspoiled nature, and path to spiritual and moral development becomes the distinct characteristic of America. Finally, the attempt of the main character to find his identity is the last Cooper's way to show American feature. The way Cooper compares the main character, The Deerslayer, and Hurry Skurry, another character of the novel, lets the readers to see and to find the answer what are American features. Besides, through names of the main character, the readers also can see that this is the way to describe the features of American characters. That is why, although in this novel as the main character is still young and Natty Bumppo or The Deerslayer is in the stage in finding the identity, this already helps the readers to know about American characteristics. Moreover, even though The Deerslayer still tries to figure out which is the best identity, in this journey to find his identity, the readers has found that the identity pursued by The Deerslayer describes America well. Finally, The Deerslayer can be said that it is an attempt to expose American Literature as some of American's features exposed in the story.
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the addresser has a good communicative competence of his/her language. Thus, in discourse studies of a language, it is important to set up units of analysis called speech act sets (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983).

In this paper, the speech act set that will be discussed is the speech act set for apology. The community involved in this research is Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The research is done in situ – the actual place where one can see people realistically in the language being studied. The research question formulated is what strategies used by the addresser (speaker) in uttering an apology are. The aims of the research are to describe one of the varieties of Minang spoken language, that is, Minang Language with Chinese dialect especially in expressing apologies and to analyze the apology used by Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The significance of this research is to give contribution for further research related to spoken language used by Chinese Generation in Pondok Village, Padang.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Speech Act Sets

A speech act set consists of the explicit and conventional patterns as well as the more implicit or indirect strategies (Searle, 1975). To complete Searle’s ideas, Olshaint and Cohen (1983) in Murcia (1991) have proposed the notion of a speech act set to encompass the major linguistic and pragmatic strategies, any one of which would suffice as a minimal element to represent the particular speech act. It provides the researcher with a framework for defining the relationships holding between illocutionary intent and linguistic repertoire in a specific language and with the possibility of comparing speech act sets across languages. Olshaint and Cohen (1983) states that

“Speech act sets encompass the routinized realization patterns of a speech act related to the semantic criteria and the illocutionary intent. These patterns need to be further matched to sets of pragmatic and situational features according to which any one of these patterns might be more appropriate than others. Such considerations entail both social and situational factors.”

From their statement, it is inferred that there are five factors which determine a speech act set; those are: (1) routinized patterns related to semantic criteria, (2) intention, (3) pragmatic and situational features, (4) social factor, and (5) situational factor.

2. Apologies

Apologies impose on the addresser (speaker) rather than the addressee (hearer). Elis (1985) states that, “An apology requires the speaker to admit responsibility for some behavior (or failure to carry out some behavior) that has proved costly to the hearer.” Furthermore, Olshaint (1989) did the research involving four different languages Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and German and concluded that apologies are largely universal or similar in many ways.

When apologizing, the speaker is willing to humiliate him/herself to some extent and to admit the fault and responsibility for the offense. Therefore, semantic criteria that need to be met by the act of apologizing are an expression of regret and acknowledgment of responsibility for the offender/speaker.

3. Strategies Used in the Apology Speech Act

The apology speech act consists of five strategies or realization patterns (Olshaint and Cohen, 1983), two of which are general and depend less on contextual constrains, and three of which are situational specific. The two general strategies are the explicit expression of apology, which consist formulatic, routinized expression containing some explicit performative verb (e.g., “I'm sorry,” “Excuse me,” “I regret,” “I apologize”), and the expression of responsibility, which reflects the speaker’s degree of willingness to admit to fault for the offense. The other three strategies, an explanation, an offer of repair, and a promise of nonrecurrence, are situation-specific and semantically reflect the content of the situation.

In addition to the main strategies which make up the speech act set, there are ways in which the speaker can modify the apology either by intensifying it or by downgrading it. An intensification would make the apology stronger, creating even more support for the hearer and more humiliation for the speaker. The routinized intensification usually consists of internal modification within the apology expression – in the form of a conventional intensifier such as “really”, “very”, “terribly”.

External modification can take the form –of a comment signaling added concern for the hearer. Such comments intensify the apology since they express stronger interest on the apart of the speaker to placate the hearer. External modification which downgrades the apology can take the form of a comment which minimizes either the offense on the harm it may have caused. For example (as cited on Olshstein and Cohen, 1983):
the addresser has a good communicative competence of his/her language. Thus, in discourse studies of a language, it is important to set up units of analysis called speech act sets (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983).

In this paper, the speech act set that will be discussed is the speech act set for apology. The community involved in this research is Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The research is done in situ – the actual place where one can see people realistically in the language being studied. The research question formulated is what strategies used by the addresser (speaker) in uttering an apology are. The aims of the research are to describe one of the varieties of Minang spoken language, that is, Minang Language with Chinese dialect especially in expressing apologies and to analyze the apology used by Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The significance of this research is to give contribution for further research related to spoken language used by Chinese Generation in Pondok Village, Padang.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Speech Act Sets

A speech act set consists of the explicit and conventional patterns as well as the more implicit or indirect strategies (Searle, 1975). To complete Searle's ideas, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) in Murcia (1991) have proposed the notion of a speech act set to encompass the major linguistic and pragmatic strategies, any one of which would suffice as a minimal element to represent the particular speech act. It provides the researcher with a framework for defining the relationships holding between illocutionary intent and linguistic repertoire in a specific language and with the possibility of comparing speech act sets across languages. Olshtain and Cohen (1983) states that

“Speech act sets encompass the routinized realization patterns of a speech act related to the semantic criteria and the illocutionary intent. These patterns need to be further matched to sets of pragmatic and situational features according to which any one of these patterns might be more appropriate than others. Such considerations entail both social and situational factors.”

From their statement, it is inferred that there are five factors which determine a speech act set; those are: (1) routinized patterns related to semantic criteria, (2) intention, (3) pragmatic and situational features, (4) social factor, and (5) situational factor.

2. Apologies

Apologies impose on the addresser (speaker) rather than the addressee (hearer). Elis (1985) states that, “An apology requires the speaker to admit responsibility for some behavior (or failure to carry out some behavior) that has proved costly to the hearer.” Furthermore, Olshtain (1989) did the research involving four different languages Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and German and concluded that apologies are largely universal or similar in many ways.

When apologizing, the speaker is willing to humiliate him/herself to some extent and to admit the fault and responsibility for the offense. Therefore, semantic criteria that need to be met by the act of apologizing are an expression of regret and acknowledgment of responsibility for the offender/speaker.

3. Strategies Used in the Apology Speech Act

The apology speech act consists of five strategies or realization patterns (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983), two of which are general and depend less on contextual constrains, and three of which are situational specific. The two general strategies are the explicit expression of apology, which consist formulatic, routinized expression containing some explicit performative verb (e.g., “I’m sorry,” “Excuse me,” “I regret,” “I apologize”), and the expression of responsibility, which reflects the speaker's degree of willingness to admit to fault for the offense. The other three strategies, an explanation, an offer of repair, and a promise of nonrecurrence, are situation-specific and semantically reflect the content of the situation.

In addition to the main strategies which make up the speech act set, there are ways in which the speaker can modify the apology either by intensifying it or by downgrading it. An intensification would make the apology stronger, creating even more support for the hearer and more humiliation for the speaker. The routinized intensification usually consists of internal modification within the apology expression – in the form of a conventional intensifier such as “really”, “very”, “terribly”.

External modification can take the form – of a comment signaling added concern for the hearer. Such comments intensify the apology since they express stronger interest on the apart of the speaker to placate the hearer. External modification which downgrades the apology can take the form of a comment which minimizes either the offense on the harm it may have caused. For example (as cited on Olshtain and Cohen, 1983):
“Intention: asking for an apology
Context: forgetting meeting a new boss.
Utterance:
- I’m really very sorry (an intensified expression of apology)
- I completely forgot about it (an expression/acknowledgement of responsibility)
- The alarm on my watch didn’t go off as it was supposed to (an explanation or account of the situation)
- Is it possible for me to make another appointment? Can we meet now? (an offer of repair)
- This won’t ever happen again (a promise of nonreoccurrence)”

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research is a descriptive research. Gay (1987) states that a descriptive research reports the things as what the investigator observes in the field. It involves collecting data by using questionnaire, survey, interview, and observation.

In this research, the investigator did the field work in situ—the actual place where one can see people realistically in the language being studied. This decision was made in accordance with Samarin’s idea (1967, p.10) who states that there are two principal reasons why the field work should be done in situ: First, it will be much easier for both the informant and the investigator to collect a corpus which is culturally relevant and linguistically accurate. Second, by restricting himself to working away from the community, the investigator precludes the observation of important linguistic phenomena. Considering those reasons, the community involved in this research is Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera.

1. Informants

The informants are needed to get the body of data (linguistic corpus). The informants involved in this research are 4 males and 5 females. All of them are Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The informants are selected randomly and all fulfill the qualifications of the informants in terms of cultural/psychological qualities (alertness, intelligence, social qualities) and proficiency of the language (Chinese dialect of Minang language used in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera). The age of the informants vary from 20-21 years old. There is no special training for the informants because all of them are STBA Prayoga students majoring in English who are quite familiar with field linguistic research.

The investigator gained the acceptance of the informants in the community by a relationship in STBA Prayoga society where the investigator teaches the informants. Thus, there is no problem in participation.

2. The Linguistic Corpus

The corpus are expressions of apology used by the informants in six different context. The data were collected by answering the questions on a piece of paper. The questions are: How do you utter your apologize in the situations below with the Minang language which you usually use in your daily life?

1. You open the door and accidentally smash an old man/woman.
2. You come late to your class and you apologize to your lecturer.
3. You come late for a meeting with your friends.
4. You promise to bring your friend's book that you borrow today, but you forget to bring it.
5. You ask permission to walk in a way which is very crowded.
6. You make your boyfriend/girlfriend or your beloved one disappointed.

3. The instrument of the research

The instrument of the research was the investigator herself. In collecting and analyzing the corpus, she involved herself in eliciting the data. Other instruments are blank papers for the informants to answer the questions and a field note to write down everything which is important in collecting and analyzing the corpus.

4. Technique and data collection

The procedure was: the investigator delivered the question orally in Bahasa Indonesia and the informants must write the answer of each question by using the language they usually use in daily conversation (in this case Chinese dialect of Minang language used in Pondok Village, Padang, west Sumatera). This procedure was taken because apologies are face-threatening acts (Elis, 1985). In other words, the data of apology speech act would be difficult to collect by eavesdropping (or selective listening) because the speaker (addressee) who uttered it would better to deliver it privately to the hearer (addressee). Thus, the eliciting technique used in this data collection is scheduled elicitation by creating the investigator’s own questions in the questionnaire. The investigator collected the data on October, 18 2010.
“Intention : asking for an apology
Context : forgetting meeting a new boss.
Utterance :
I'm really very sorry (an intensified expression of apology)
I completely forgot about it (an expression/acknowledgement of responsibility)
The alarm on my watch didn't go off as it was supposed to (an explanation or account of the situation)
Is it possible for me to make another appointment? Can we meet now? (an offer of repair)
This won't ever happen again (a promise of nonreoccurrence)"

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research is a descriptive research. Gay (1987) states that a descriptive research reports the things as what the investigator observes in the field. It involves collecting data by using questionnaire, survey, interview, and observation.

In this research, the investigator did the field work in situ—the actual place where one can see people realistically in the language being studied. This decision was made in accordance with Samarin’s idea (1967, p.10) who states that there are two principal reasons why the field work should be done in situ: First, it will be much easier for both the informant and the investigator to collect a corpus which is culturally relevant and linguistically accurate. Second, by restricting himself to working away from the community, the investigator precludes the observation of important linguistic phenomena. Considering those reasons, the community involved in this research is Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera.

1. Informants

The informants are needed to get the body of data (linguistic corpus). The informants involved in this research are 4 males and 5 females. All of them are Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. The informants are selected randomly and all fulfill the qualifications of the informants in terms of cultural/ psychological qualities (alertness, intelligence, social qualities) and proficiency of the language (Chinese dialect of Minang language used in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera). The age of the informants vary from 20-21 years old. There is no special training for the informants because all of them are STBA Prayoga students majoring in English who are quite familiar with field linguistic research.

The investigator gained the acceptance of the informants in the community by a relationship in STBA Prayoga society where the investigator teaches the informants. Thus, there is no problem in participation.

2. The Linguistic Corpus

The corpus are expressions of apology used by the informants in six different context. The data were collected by answering the questions on a piece of paper. The questions are: How do you utter your apologize in the situations below with the Minang language which you usually use in your daily life?

   1. You open the door and accidentally smash an old man/woman.
   2. You come late to your class and you apologize to your lecturer.
   3. You come late for a meeting with your friends.
   4. You promise to bring your friend's book that you borrow today, but you forget to bring it.
   5. You ask permission to walk in a way which is very crowded.
   6. You make your boyfriend/girlfriend or your beloved one disappointed.

3. The instrument of the research

The instrument of the research was the investigator herself. In collecting and analyzing the corpus, she involved herself in eliciting the data. Other instruments are blank papers for the informants to answer the questions and a field note to write down everything which is important in collecting and analyzing the corpus.

4. Technique and data collection

The procedure was: the investigator delivered the question orally in Bahasa Indonesia and the informants must write the answer of each question by using the language they usually use in daily conversation (in this case Chinese dialect of Minang language used in Pondok Village, Padang, west Sumatera). This procedure was taken because apologies are face-threatening acts (Elis,1985). In other words, the data of apology speech act would be difficult to collect by eavesdropping (or selective listening) because the speaker (addressee) who uttered it would better to deliver it privately to the hearer (addresser). Thus, the eliciting technique used in this data collection is scheduled elicitation by creating the investigator’s own questions in the questionnaire. The investigator collected the data on October, 18 2010.
5. Technique of Data Analysis

The data obtained are analyzed by Oslhtain and Cohen apology speech act strategies (1983). The steps of analyzing the data are

1. Collecting the questionnaire
2. Identifying the strategies used in apology speech act
3. Determining the types of strategy
4. Classifying the types of strategy
5. Summarizing and concluding the discussion of the findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Linguistic corpus and analysis

CONTEXT 1: You open the door and accidentally smash an old man/woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jevon</td>
<td>Oops.. onde.. Sorry pak/buk,… Ndak sengaja… Ada kene pak/buk?</td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendra</td>
<td>Maaf, pak, ndak sengaja. Onde sorry - sorry, maaf - maaf, Bu/Pak.</td>
<td>an expression/acknowledgment of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>Maaf, maaf Pak. Awak indak sengaja Pak.</td>
<td>an explanation or account of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilya</td>
<td>Maaf, maaf Pak. Awak indak sengaja Pak.</td>
<td>an offer of repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festi</td>
<td>Maaf Pak/Bu… Saya ndak sengaja.</td>
<td>a promise of non-reoccurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyardi</td>
<td>Sorry Pak., dak sengaja.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS 1:**

1. In this context, because the action accidentally happened without the speaker's intention, there's no offer of repair and no promise of nonreoccurrence.

2. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Sorry
   b. Maaf

3. The intensified expression used are:
   a. Eh!    d. Onde! sorry –sorry
   b. Ouwwwh! e.Oops!
   c. Maaf-maaf.

The intensified expression can be in the form of interjection (a,b, and e) or repeated expression of apology (c), or the combination of interjection and repeated expression of apology (d).

4. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility is
   a. Ada kene Pak/Buk?
      This is the polite expression to show the addressee that the addresser feels guilty about his/her careless action and cares about the addressee's condition.

5. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Saya ndak sengaja
      ii. Awak indak sengaja
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Dak sengaja
      ii. Ndak sengaja

The variation of the negation used are “indak” and “ndak”. The variation of the pronoun used are: “saya” and “awak”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermawan</td>
<td>Sorry Pak, maaf ya Pak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Ouwwwh… Sorry Kek/Nek.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 41
5. Technique of Data Analysis

The data obtained are analyzed by Oslhtain and Cohen apology speech act strategies (1983). The steps of analyzing the data are
1. Collecting the questionnaire
2. Identifying the strategies used in apology speech act
3. Determining the types of strategy
4. Classifying the types of strategy
5. Summarizing and concluding the discussion of the findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Linguistic corpus and analysis

CONTEXT 1: You open the door and accidentally smash an old man/woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jevon</td>
<td>Oops.. onde.. Sorry pak/buk,... Ndak sengaja... Ada kene pak/buk?</td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendra</td>
<td>Maaf pak, ndak sengaja. Onde sorry maaf Pu/Pak.</td>
<td>an expression/acknowledgement of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>Onde sorry - sorry, maaf - maaf, Bu/Pak.</td>
<td>an explanation or account of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilya</td>
<td>Maaf, maaf Pak. Awak indak sengaja Pak.</td>
<td>an offer of a promise of non-reoccurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festi</td>
<td>Maaf Pak/Bu... Saya ndak sengaja.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyardi</td>
<td>Sorry Pak,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS 1:

1. In this context, because the action accidentally happened without the speaker's intention, there's no offer of repair and no promise of nonreoccurrence.
2. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Sorry
   b. Maaf
3. The intensified expression used are:
   a. Eh!
   b. Onde! sorry–sorry
   c. Maaf-maaf.
   d. Onde! sorry–sorry
   e. Oops!
   f. Maaf-maaf.

The intensified expression can be in the form of interjection (a,b, and e ) or repeated expression of apology (c) , or the combination of interjection and repeated expression of apology (d).
4. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility is
   a. Ada kene Pak/Buk?
   This is the polite expression to show the addressee that the addresser feels guilty about his/her careless action and cares about the addressee's condition.
5. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence :
      i. Saya ndak sengaja
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Dak sengaja
      ii. Ndak sengaja

The variation of the negation used are “indak” and “ndak”. The variation of the pronoun used are: “saya” and “awak”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermawan</td>
<td>Sorry Pak, maaf ya Pak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Ouwwh… Sorry Kek/Nek.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informant

Corpus

Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)

an intensified expression of apology
an expression/acknowledgement of responsibility
an explanation or account of the situation
an offer of a promise of non-reoccurrence
3. The expression of apology used is: sorry
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Interjection + expression of apology
      i. Oi! sorry
   b. Expression of apology + particle “yo” or “ya”
      i. Sori yo         ii. sorry ya.
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry-sorry
   d. Interjection + repeated expression of apology:
      i. Onde! sorry-sorry
   e. One informant had no guilty feeling for being late (Maria) and uttered a defensive imperative statement “jan berang jo den yo!” which forced the others not to blame her.
5. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Den telat
      ii. Tadi ada telat.
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Telat a… (a is a particle)
       ii. telat
6. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Tadi ada… (reason)
      ii. Tadi ada…(reason)
   b. Incomplete sentence
      i. Banyak bisnis
7. The variation of the pronoun used are: “gua”, “ambo”, and “den”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslihtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jevon</td>
<td>Oi.. Sorry telat a…… (alasan)</td>
<td>intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hendra</td>
<td>Sorry semua.</td>
<td>进而加血的表达道歉方式：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natalia</td>
<td>Onde sorry-sorry telat. Tadi gua…. (alasan)</td>
<td>an explanation or account of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emilya</td>
<td>Sorry yo, ambo telat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Festi</td>
<td>Sorry ya.. Tadi ada… (alasan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Riyadi</td>
<td>Sorry-sorry.. den telat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hermawan</td>
<td>Sorry-sorry. Tadi gua lagi…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maria</td>
<td>Jan berang jo den yow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS 2:
1. In this context, the addressers violate the punctuality in making an appointment with his/her friends. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to defend themselves by giving explanations of the situation. Some of them preferred not to give any explanation.
2. All informants do not give offer of repair and promises of non-reoccurrence in this context.
CONTEXT 2: You come late for a meeting with your friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jevon</td>
<td>Oi.. Sorry telat a…..</td>
<td>Oi.. Sorry telat a…..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Festi</td>
<td>Sorry ya.. Tadi ada…</td>
<td>Sorry ya.. Tadi ada…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hermawan</td>
<td>Sorry-sorry, Tadi gua lagi…</td>
<td>Tadi gua lagi…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maria</td>
<td>Jan berang jo den yow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS 2:
1. In this context, the addressers violate the punctuality in making an appointment with his/her friends. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to defend themselves by giving explanations of the situation. Some of them preferred not to give any explanation.
2. All informants do not give offer of repair and promises of non-reoccurrence in this context.

3. The expression of apology used is: sorry
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Interjection + expression of apology
      i. Oi! sorry
   b. Expression of apology + particle “yo” or “ya”
      i. Sori yo   ii. sorry ya.
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry-sorry
   d. Interjection + repeated expression of apology:
      i. Onde! sorry-sorry
   e. One informant had no guilty feeling for being late (Maria) and uttered a defensive imperative statement ‘jan berang jo den yo!’ which forced the others not to blame her.

5. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Den telat
      ii. Ambo telat
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Telat a… (a is a particle)
      ii. telat

6. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Tadi gua ada….. (reason)
      ii. Tadi ada….. (reason)
   b. Incomplete sentence
      i. Banyak bisnis

7. The variation of the pronoun used are: “gua”, “ambo”, and “den”.
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CONTEXT 3: You come late to your class and you apologize to your lecturer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslihtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an expression of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an explanation or account of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an offer of repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a promise of non-reoccurrence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Hendra: Buk, di jalan macet, maaf.

3. Natalia: I'm sorry I'm late, Ma'am/Sir.

4. Emilya: I'm sorry Sir, I don't mean to come late.

5. Festi: Bu, maaf, tadi ada.... (alasan) jadi saya telat.


8. Hermawan: Maaf, Pak, Saya terlambat. Tadi saya....

9. Maria: Misi, Pak/Bu. Saya telat datang.

ANALYSIS 3:

1. In this context, the addressers violate the punctuality in attending the class. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to defend themselves by giving explanations of the situation.

2. All informants do not give offer of repair and promises of non-reoccurrence in this context.

3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Maaf Buk/Pak
   b. I'm sorry, Sir/ Ma'am.
   c. Misi, Pak/Bu.

4. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Saya terlambat
      ii. Saya telat
      iii. Saya telat datang
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Telat

5. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Tadi saya.... (reason)
      ii. Tadi ada.... (reason)
      iii. Ban motor bocor.
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Telat bangun
      ii. Di jalan macet

6. The variation of the pronoun used is: “saya”.

7. Some informants use English since the lecturer usually uses English as the language used in classroom's instructions.
**CONTEXT 3:** You come late to your class and you apologize to your lecturer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natalia</td>
<td>I’m sorry I’m late. Ma’am/Sir. I don’t mean to come late.</td>
<td>I’m sorry I’m late. Ma’am/Sir. I don’t mean to come late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emilya</td>
<td>I’m sorry Sir. I don’t mean to come late.</td>
<td>I’m sorry Sir. I don’t mean to come late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Festi</td>
<td>Bu, maaf, tadi ada…. (alasan) jadi saya telat.</td>
<td>Bu, maaf, tadi ada…. (alasan) jadi saya telat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hermawan</td>
<td>Maaf Pak, Saya terlambat. Tadi saya….</td>
<td>Maaf Pak, Saya terlambat. Tadi saya….</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS 3:**

1. In this context, the addressers violate the punctuality in attending the class. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to defend themselves by giving explanations of the situation.
2. All informants do not give offer of repair and promises of non-reoccurrence in this context.
3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Maaf Buk/Pak
   b. I’m sorry, Sir/ Ma’am.
   c. Misi, Pak/Bu.
4. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Saya terlambat
      ii. Saya telat
      iii. Saya telat datang
   b. Incomplete sentence:
      i. Telat
5. The explanation or account of the situation are:
   a. Complete sentence:
      i. Tadi saya….. (reason)
      ii. Tadi ada…..(reason)
      iii. Ban motor bocor.
   b. Incomplete sentence
      i. Telat bangun
      ii. Di jalan macet
6. Some informants use English since the lecturer usually uses English as the language used in classroom’s instructions.
CONTEXT 4: You promise to bring your friend's book that you borrow today, but you forget to bring it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jevon</td>
<td>Sorry a, beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
<td>Sorry a, beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hendra</td>
<td>Sorry (nama), gua lupa bawa buku lu.</td>
<td>Sorry (nama), gua lupa bawa buku lu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Festi</td>
<td>Sorry ya...Ndak ingek gua do. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?</td>
<td>Sorry ya...Ndak ingek gua do. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Riyardi</td>
<td>Nde mati la... Buka lu lupa gua bawa.. Sorry yo</td>
<td>Nde mati la... Buka lu lupa gua bawa..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS 4:
1. In this context, the addressers forget their promise. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to express their regret.
2. All informants do not give promises of nonreoccurrence in this context.
3. The expression of apology used is: Sorry
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Interjection + expression of apology + particle “yo”
      i. Nde mati la! Sorry yo
      ii. Onde! Sorry yow
   b. Expression of apology + particle “a”, “ni” and “ya”
      i. Sori ni
      ii. Sorry ya
      iii. Sorry a
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry-sorry
   d. Interjection + repeated expression of apology
      i. Onde! sorry-sorry
   e. One informant uttered interjection only
      i. Nde mande!
5. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are in the form of complete sentence
   a. Gua lupa bawa buku lu.
   b. Sabana lupa gua.
   c. Ndak ingek gua do.
   d. Lupa gua bawa bukunya
   e. Buku lu lupa gua bawa..
   f. lupa gua bawak.
   g. Lupo den bawok...
6. There is only one informant who gave explanation or account of the situation in the form of incomplete sentence: dek takaja-kaja
7. The variation of the pronoun used is: “gua”, “den”, “lu”
8. Some of the informants gave an offer of repair:
   a. Beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?
   b. Ingekkan gua besok ya.
   c. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?
   d. Besok la, kalo ndak beko gua anta.
CONTEXT 4: You promise to bring your friend's book that you borrow today, but you forget to bring it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Strategies used in apology speech act (by Oslhtain and Cohen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an intensified expression of apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jevon</td>
<td>Sorry a, beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
<td>Sorry a, beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hendra</td>
<td>Sorry (nama), gua lupa bawa buku lu.</td>
<td>Sorry (nama), gua lupa bawa buku lu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Festi</td>
<td>Sorry ya...Ndak ingek gua do. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba'a kan?</td>
<td>Sorry ya...Ndak ingek gua do. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba'a kan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Riyandi</td>
<td>Nde mati la...Buku lu lupa gua bawa.. Sorry yo</td>
<td>Nde mati la...Buku lu lupa gua bawa..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS 4:
1. In this context, the addressers forget their promise. From the corpus gathered, while dealing in such context, some of the informants tried to express their regret.
2. All informants do not give promises of nonreoccurance in this context.
3. The expression of apology used is: Sorry
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Interjection expression of apology particle “yo”
      i. Nde mati la! Sorry yo
      ii. Onde! Sorry yow
   b. Expression of apology particle “a”, “ni” and “ya”
      i. Sori ni
      ii. Sorry ya
      iii. Sorry a
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry-sorry
   d. Interjection+ repeated expression of apology
      i. Onde! sorry-sorry
   e. One informant uttered interjection only
      i. Nde mande!
5. The expression/acknowledgement of responsibility are in the form of complete sentence
   a. Gua lupa bawa buku lu.
   b. Sabana lupa gua.
   c. Ndak ingek gua do.
   d. Lupa gua bawa bukunya
   e. Buku lu lupa gua bawa..
   f. Lupa gua bawak.
   g. Lupo den bawok..
6. There is only one informant who gave explanation or account of the situation in the form of incomplete sentence: dek takaja-kaja
7. The variation of the pronoun used is: “gua”, “den”, “lu”
8. Some of the informants gave an offer of repair:
   a. Beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha.. SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?
   b. Ingekkan gua besok ya.
   c. Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?
   d. Besok la, kalo ndak beko gua anta.
CONTEXT 5: You ask permission to walk in a way which is very crowded.

Informant | Corpus
---|---
1. Jevon | Numpang lewat...
2. Hendra | Numpang lewat.
3. Natalia | Misi, Pak/Bu.
4. Emilya | Misi
5. Festi | Numpang lewat
6. Bob | Numpang lewat
7. Riyardi | Misi, Pak/Bu.
8. Hermawan | Misi, Pak/Bu.
9. Maria | Misi

Explanation or account of the situation:

1. Numpang lewat.
2. Air panas-air panas.

ANALYSIS 5:

1. In this context, the addressers ask permission to pass the way.
2. All informants do not give expression of responsibility, offers of repair and promises of nonreoccurrence in this context.
3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Misi
   b. Permisi
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Misi-misi
      ii. Permisi-Permisi
   b. Interjection+ expression of apology:
      i. Woi! Misi
5. Explanation or account of the situation:

Informant | Corpus
---|---
1. Jevon | Bro/ sis. Tui pu chi a... Gua khilaf...(alasan). Besok ni ndak gi...sorry yo...yo...yo...
2. Hendra | Maaf ya.
4. Emilya | Maaf ya. Gua betul BETUL minta maaf.
5. Festi | Maaf...Sorry...Adek yang salah.
6. Bob | Sori yank. Ga lagi-deh...
7. Riyardi | Maaf tehah mengecewan kan mu, gak lagi kok suer.
8. Hermawan | Ndeh... sorry a yank...ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah? Yah? Maaf a...
9. Maria | I don’t care!

Informant | Corpus
---|---
1. Jevon | Bro/ sis. Tui pu chi a... Gua khilaf...(alasan). Besok ni ndak gi...
2. Hendra | Maaf ya.
4. Emilya | Maaf ya.
5. Festi | Maaf...Sorry...Adek yang salah.
6. Bob | Sori yank. Ga lagi-deh...
7. Riyardi | Maaf tehah mengecewan kan mu, gak lagi kok suer.
8. Hermawan | Ndeh... sorry a yank...ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah? Yah? Maaf a...
9. Maria | I don’t care!

Informant | Corpus
---|---
1. Jevon | Bro/ sis. Tui pu chi a... Gua khilaf...(alasan). Besok ni ndak gi...
2. Hendra | Maaf ya.
5. Festi | Maaf...Sorry...Adek yang salah.
6. Bob | Sori yank. Ga lagi-deh...
7. Riyardi | Maaf tehah mengecewan kan mu, gak lagi kok suer.
8. Hermawan | Ndeh... sorry a yank...ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah? Yah? Maaf a...
9. Maria | I don’t care!

Saya baru sekali pun melakukannya.
CONTEXT 5: You ask permission to walk in a way which is very crowded.

Informant | Corpus
--- | ---
1. Jevon | Misi..misi… Numpang lewat.
3. Natalia | Permsi. Misi, misi,misi,!!
4. Emilya | Misi. Misi,misi,!!
5. Festi | Misi..misi…air panas…air panas…
6. Bob | Permsi-permsi…
7. Riyardi | Misi, Pak/Bu. Misi…misi…misi…misi…
8. Hermawan | Misi…misi…!!
9. Maria | Woi..misi,woi…woi…!!

ANALYSIS 5:
1. In this context, the addressers ask permission to pass the way.
2. All informants do not give expression of responsibility, offers of repair and promises of nonreoccurrence in this context.
3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Misi
   b. Permsi
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Repeated expression of apology
   i. Misi-misi
   ii. Permsi-permsi
   b. Interjection+ expression of apology:
      i. Woi!Misi

5. Explanation or account of the situation:
   a. Numpang lewat.
   b. Air panas-air panas

CONTEXT 6: You make your boyfriend/girlfriend or your beloved one disappointed.

Informant | Corpus
--- | ---
1. Jevon | Bro/sis. Tui pu chi a… Gua khilaf..(alasan). Besok ni ndak gi..sorry yo…yo…yoo..?
2. Hendra | Maaf ya.
5. Festi | Maaf..Sorry..sorry…Adek yang salah.
7. Riyardi | Maaf telah mengecewakan mu, gak lagi suer.
9. Maria | I don’t care!

Saya baru sekali pun melakukannya.
ANALYSIS 6:

1. In this context, the addressers had caused something that made his/her closest person feel disappointed.
2. Some of the informants used a promise of nonreoccurrence, one used an explanation of the situation, some used an expression responsibility as the strategies.
3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Sorry
   b. Maaf
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Expression apology + particles (“yo..yo..yoo”, “ya”, “yah”, “a”)
      i. Sorry yo..yo..yoo?
      ii. Maaf ya
      iii. Sorry ya.
      iv. Sorry a….yah?
      v. Maaf a
   b. Combination of expression of apology
      i. Ndeh….sorry a yank…. Yah? Maaf a
      ii. Maaf, sorry..
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry ya-sorry ya
      ii. Maaf ya. Gua betul-betul minta maaf.
5. The promise of nonreoccurrence used:
   a. Besok ni ndak gi...
   b. Ga lagi-lagi deh…
   c. gak lagi kok suer.
   d. ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah?
6. One informant did not use the apology speech strategies at all. She just defended herself for doing the mistake.
   a. I don’t care! Saya baru sekali pun melakukannya.

CONCLUSION

Based on the speech act set for apologies proposed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983), the strategies used by Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An expression of apology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expression of regret</td>
<td>Maaf. Sorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An offer of apology</td>
<td>Permisi. Misi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A request for forgiveness</td>
<td>Ndeh, sorry a…yah? Maaf a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explanation or account of the situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tadi saya…</td>
<td>Tadi ada…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dek takaja-kaja.</td>
<td>Ndak sengaja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Awak indak sengaja.</td>
<td>Numpang lewat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An acknowledgement of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accepting the blame</td>
<td>Adek yang salah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognizing the other persons as deserving apology</td>
<td>Telah mengecewakkanmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expressing lack of intent</td>
<td>Dik maksud gitu o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An offer of repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha..SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
<td>Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ingekkan gua besok ya.</td>
<td>Ingekkan gua besok ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Besok la , kalo ndak beko gua anta.</td>
<td>Besok la , kalo ndak beko gua anta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A promise of nonreoccurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah?</td>
<td>Ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ga lagi kok. suer.</td>
<td>Ga lagi-lagi doh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Besok ni ndak gi</td>
<td>Besok ni ndak gi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chinese dialect of Minang language are used by Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. Thus, several vocabularies and particles used are different from Minang language spoken by Minangese generation in Padang, West Sumatera. Some of the expressions found are uttered in English since all the informants also speak English actively in campus. In the case in which the informant does not feel guilty about her action, there is no apology speech act strategies used in her utterance.
ANALYSIS 6:
1. In this context, the addressers had caused something that made his/her closest person feel disappointed.
2. Some of the informants used a promise of nonreoccurrence, one used an explanation of the situation, some used an expression responsibility as the strategies.
3. The expression of apology used are:
   a. Sorry
   b. Maaf
4. The intensified expression of apology used are:
   a. Expression apology + particles (“yo..yo..yoo”, “ya”, “yah”, “a”)
      i. Sorry yo..yo..yoo?
      ii. Maaf ya
      iii. Sorry ya.
      iv. Sorry a….yah?
      v. Maaf a
   b. Combination of expression of apology
      i. Ndeh… sorry a yank… Yah? Maaf a
      ii. Maaf, sorry..
   c. Repeated expression of apology
      i. Sorry ya-sorry ya
      ii. Maaf ya. Gua betul-betul minta maaf.
5. The promise of nonreoccurrence used:
   a. Besok ni ndak gi
   b. Ga lagi-lagi deh…
   c. gak lagi kok suer.
   d. ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah?
6. One informant did not use the apology speech strategies at all. She just defended herself for doing the mistake.
   a. I don’t care! Saya baru sekali pun melakukannya.

CONCLUSION
Based on the speech act set for apologies proposed by Olshtain and Cohen (1983), the strategies used by Chinese generation in Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Expression of regret</td>
<td>Permisi. Misi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An offer of apology</td>
<td>Ndeh, sorry a…yah? Maaf a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A request for forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. planation or account of the situation</td>
<td>Tadi saya…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadi ada…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dek takaja-kaja.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndak sengaja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awak indak sengaja.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numpang lewat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An acknowledgement of responsibility</td>
<td>Adek yang salah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Accepting the blame</td>
<td>Gua khilaf. Ndak ingek gua do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Expressing self-deficiency</td>
<td>Telah mengecewakanmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognizing the other persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ as deserving apology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Expressing lack of intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An offer of repair</td>
<td>Beko gua anta ke tempat lu ha..SMS se gua lu dimana beko di?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besok se ya gua pulangkan. Ndak ba’a kan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingekkan gua besok ya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besok la , kalo ndak bekos gua anta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A promise of nonreoccurrence</td>
<td>Ndak ada koko begitu lagi do yah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gak lagi kok. suer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga lagi-lagi deh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besok ni ndak gi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chinese dialect of Minang language are used by Chinese generation of Pondok Village, Padang, West Sumatera. Thus, several vocabularies and particles used are different from Minang language spoken by Minangese generation in Padang, West Sumatera. Some of the expressions found are uttered in English since all the informants also speak English actively in campus. In the case in which the informant does not feel guilty about her action, there is no apology speech act strategies used in her utterance.
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DECONSTRUCTING THE POSITION OF THE SAVIOR AND THE DAMNED IN FLANNERY O'CONNOR’S “THE LAME SHALL ENTER FIRST”
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Abstract

This paper aims to show the use of deconstruction theory by Jacques Derrida to offer other possible meanings in a short story entitled “The Lame Shall Enter First” by Flannery O’Connor. The researcher shows the flaw in the binary oppositions constructed by the text and reveals the failure of the logical arguments of the oppositions by redefining qualities of the opposite characters in the story, Sheppard, Norton, and Rufus. The researcher used descriptive-qualitative method as it is a qualitative research of which the data are nonnumeric.

The researcher finds three binary oppositions that become the center of the story. The first pair of binary opposition is religion and logic. The second are selfishness and compassion, and the third is ignorance and sympathy. The oppositions are represented by characters Sheppard, Rufus, and Norton. By closely reading the text and attacking the basic premises of the text, the researcher finds that the binary oppositions no longer serve as the foundation of the story since the story proves that all those binary oppositions eventually show otherwise.

Keywords: deconstruction, binary opposition, character

THE STORY

Sheppard was a City Recreational Director who also worked in a reformatory house every Saturday. His wife passed away just a year ago. He lived with his only begotten son, Norton. Norton was just ten years old and Sheppard felt helpless about Norton since he could not forget her mother. In the reformatory, Sheppard knew a boy named Rufus Johnson whom he considered brilliant yet had a